Quechua People, Their Indigenous Identities and Their Potential Collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples

BRENDA POLAR

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN SOCIAL WORK
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

August 2025

© Brenda Polar, 2025

Abstract

This study examined the relationship that Quechua immigrants living in Tkaronto, Ontario, have with Indigenous Peoples in Canada. The objectives were twofold: to explore the engagement of Quechua people with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations; and to examine how the Indigeneity of Quechua people can help them engage in collaboration. Indigenous Quechua immigrants are Indigenous Peoples who are originally from Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and, to a lesser degree, Colombia and Argentina. I interviewed Quechua people as part of my research. I also interviewed one Kishwa immigrant: Kishwa people are Indigenous Peoples who originally shared roots with Quechua people from Ecuador. In this dissertation, the participants and I took a reflective stance to consider what it means for Quechua people to settle in these lands and, from these positionalities, explore forms of collaboration that might be more suitable for Quechua people. The results of the research indicate that we need to address the oppression perpetuated by social structures as well as discrimination at the individual level that Indigenous immigrants experience. In this case, white allies need to address these forms of discrimination towards Indigenous immigrants.

I contend that if the oppression of racialized people, such as Indigenous people from other lands, is not addressed, it is difficult for them to cope even when they are also complicit in settler colonialism. Racialized immigrants' oppression must be addressed while they also take on their responsibilities to collaborate. Any decolonization moves must be led by First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, and ideally coordinated with other racialized and white ally settlers.

Acknowledgements

First, I want to acknowledge and thank all the participants who dedicated their time and shared their stories and experiences without really knowing me much. Thank you for allowing me to share your stories, experiences, and knowledge.

I want to acknowledge and thank these lands where I have lived without the permission of Indigenous Peoples. I have pursued my studies because of this opportunity to come to Canada.

To Dr. Chris Chapman, who has been the engine that pushed me when I felt like giving up: your kindness and wisdom helped me every time I needed a hand. You planted the possibility that I, too, can belong in this academic world. Thank you for helping me gain the self-esteem and courage to think I could dream high after finishing this degree. Your kindness and humbleness are unbelievable. There are not many like you out there in the world.

To Dr. Ruth Green, for challenging me and teaching me more about how to relate to Indigenous Peoples from these lands: thank you for expanding my knowledge and being kind to me with what I did not know, which was/is a lot. Thank you for sharing your witty sense of humor and wisdom and being patient when I didn't get it. And most of all, thank you for sticking around and supporting me throughout this long journey.

To Dr. Miguel Gonzalez, who helped me see different ways of relating to the theories and concepts I was using: thank you for pushing me to learn more about myself and my Mestiza roots and helping me connect more to my thesis. Thank you for taking the time and being meticulous in your feedback and teaching me to try to improve my analysis in new ways.

To Dr. Anne O'Connell, who took the time to help me throughout this doctoral degree with what I needed even though she did not have to: you stepped up when I needed your help. I am so thankful to you. Thank you for being kind to my work and so generous with your words of encouragement.

To the writing center at York for supporting me throughout these years. A special thank you to Keith for being such a strong support and helping me believe that I could finish this thesis.

To my friend Quchitta, who has been my cheerleader in every step of this process and gave me a hand every time academia seemed too hard, your help is quiet and powerful. Thank you for being my post to lean on every time I have needed it. To my friend Maria, who would listen to my rants about life and academia every morning and was always there to answer my calls and offer advice when needed: thank you for sharing your wise words, time, and kindness with me. To my friend Chizuru, who unexpectedly came into my life and did not stop supporting and encouraging me throughout this PhD process: I am extremely thankful to you for your time even when you did not have it and your dedication to helping me whenever I needed it. I am so thankful to have you in my life.

Thank you, Anh for your kindness and always being willing to help me in this process. Thank you, Edwin for offering to help with my thesis so many times without being asked. You have

been so kind to me throughout this thesis project; I am so thankful for that. Thank you, Varainja for being kind to my work and giving me feedback with encouragement; for sticking around for so long and not making me feel that I was lost even when I was. Thank you, Pablo, for sharing your expertise whenever I asked you for help and helping me with the kids when you saw that I needed it. Thank you for being there for Layna and Lacey and thank you for always being there to help me talk through challenging times during this doctoral journey.

Thank you, Alejandro, for your kind words of encouragement and for sharing your experiences writing your thesis with me. Thank you for being part of this journey with me and helping me through it. Most of all, thank you for being such a great uncle to Layna and Lacey. Thank you to all those who were part of this thesis journey at some point. Thank you for your patience and keeping me company on a journey that is very lonely. I appreciate what we shared together. You were the building blocks that helped me get to this point.

Thank you to all those who have stuck with me throughout these times. I have been devoted to this project for years now, leaving little time for others, and you are still around. Thank you for not jumping out of the boat. Thank you, Mariela and Wendy, for still being here and constantly checking in on me. Thank you to all those who were close but can no longer be. Thank you for being there for me during those times. You are part of the footprints in my life.

Dedication

A mi Abuelita que siempre estuvo conmigo en mi corazón, dándome esperanza y amor.

A mi Tío Fernando quien me hizo pensar que podría hacer un doctorado, me enseñó a persistir y cruzar la meta todas las veces que me llevaba a correr.

A mi mamá que es ejemplo de fortaleza y determinación. Enseñándome que una no se da por vencida.

A mis hijes Layna y Lacey quienes me acompañaron durante todo este proceso, me dieron tanto amor y se privaron de mucho para que este sueño se volviera real.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii
Acknowledgements iii
Dedication v
Table of Contents vi
Chapter 1: Introduction 1
Key Concepts 1
Study Questions 19
Rationale 20
First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and Quechua Peoples 21
My Position 23
Chapter 2: Literature Review 26
Conceptualizing Indigenous Identity 27
Kichwa People 29
Indigenous Identity of Quechua People 33
Mestizaje 36
History of Mestizaje 38
Mestize Identity in the Present 41
Coloniality of Power in Latin America 45
Neoliberalism 49
Immigrant Identities 53
Settler Identities 61
Context of Settler Identity 62
Complexities of Settler Identity 63
Settler Colonial Mechanisms and the Impact on Indigenous Peoples in Canada 66
Effects of Settler Colonization 70
Summary of Key Findings 73
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework, Methodology and Methods 76
Theoretical Framework 76
Indigenous Worldviews 77
Quechua Worldviews 79
Frameworks for Collaborative Relationships and Relations to Land 80
Methodology 86

Methods 88
Ethics 89
Participants 92
Data Collection 105
Data Analysis 109
Benefits and Risks 112
Conclusion 114
Chapter 4: Thematic Analysis 115
Connecting Results to Methodology 116
Quechuas' Understanding of Indigenous Populations 118
Understanding Settler Colonialism 119
Understanding of the Government's Role in Settler Colonialism 126
Assimilation as a Mechanism of Settler Colonialism 126
Citizenship as a Toolof Settler Colonialism 132
Poverty as a Tool of Settler Colonialism 139
Religion as a Tool of Settler Colonialism 145
The Educational System as a Tool of Settler Colonialism 155
Immigrant Misconceptions about Indigenous Peoples 161
Trauma as an Effect of Colonization 166
Settler Colonialism and the Perpetuation of Stereotypes 169
Transnational Economies as a New Form of Colonialism 175
Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Practices 179
Part II: Relations with Indigenous Peoples 185
Divisions Between Racialized Immigrants and Indigenous Peoples in Canada 186
Effects of Settler Identity on Indigenous-Settler Relations 189
Forming Relations 191
Lack of Contact with Indigenous Peoples from Canada 194
Relations to Place 198
Conclusion 204
Chapter 5: Results 205
How is Collaboration to Take Place? 209
Collaborative Relations 210
Ways to Strengthen Relationships 213
Establishing Closer Connections 213

Strengthening Indigeneity 219
Acknowledging Settler Identity 226
Creating Spaces for Relations 234
Reflecting on Relationships with Indigenous Peoples 241
Building Collaborative Relationships 245
Conscientization 245
Taking Action Towards Collaboration 251
Advocacy Work 255
Barriers to Forming Relationships 261
Quechua Immigrants Treated as Outsiders 262
Barriers to Collaborative Relationships 272
Effects from the Discrimination of Racialized People 272
Discomfort in Collaboration 277
Systemic Discrimination of First Nations, Métis and Inuit People 281
Life Stressors as Barriers to Collaboration 283
Ways Forward into Collaboration 285
Two Row Wampum Belt 285
Eagle and Condor Prophecy 290
Indigeneity as a Bridge 295
Chapter Summary 300
Chapter 6: Conclusion 303
Implications for Collaboration 316
Limitations 322
References 326
Appendix A: Recruitment Poster 365
Appendix B: Cholo Soy y No Me Compadezcas 367
Appendix C: Sample of Electronic Mail for Recruitment 370
Appendix D: Discussion Prompting Questions 372

Chapter 1: Introduction

Indigenous Peoples across the world have a history of working together to resist contemporary forms of colonization such as imperialism (Aylwin, 2008; Smith, 2012). However, there is no literature on whether similar collaborative relationships exist between First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and *Indigenous immigrants,*[1] [2] specifically within the lands now known as Canada.

This study examines the relationship that Quechua immigrants living in Tkaronto, Ontario, have with Indigenous Peoples in Canada. The objectives are twofold: to explore the engagement of Quechua people with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and to examine how the Indigeneity of Quechua people can help them engage in collaboration. I will begin with a section that defines the key terms used in this dissertation.

Key Concepts

Indigenous Peoples

The concept of Indigenous Peoples has gone through many changes and debates. The Working Group on Indigenous Peoples of the United Nations (UN) identified that the concept of Indigenous Populations needed to be discussed. This conclusion was seen as especially important at a time when the UN was putting together a draft declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Daes, 1996, p. 3). Governments also needed to respect and acknowledge the existence of Indigenous Peoples (p. 14) and a definition helped reinforce these actions. The Working Group on Indigenous Populations of the Sub-Commission on the Protection and Promotion of

[1] In this study, the term ‘Immigrant’ means individuals, or their parents, born outside Canada and who now live in Canada. This includes those with immigrant or citizenship status, as well as refugees or those without status

[2] For the purpose of this paper, ‘Indigenous immigrants’ refers to immigrants who live in Canada and identify as belonging to the Indigenous populations of their country of origin. Indigenous immigrants also include people who identify as Mestize people, unless specified otherwise.

Human Rights was established as part of the UN's effort to attend to Indigenous Peoples' issues. This was done after much advocacy from Indigenous groups to have Indigenous Peoples' rights considered (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2009, p. 2).

The Working Group identified that the concept of Indigeneity needed to be challenged. In the past, the term Indigenous Peoples was used to claim a "deficiency in the physical and intellectual development of Indigenous Peoples" (Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938, in Daes, 1996, p. 7). At that time, it was viewed as important to differentiate who Indigenous Peoples were so they could receive protection from governments. This was also a move to know who needed to integrate into their corresponding state. An elaboration on the concept of Indigenous Peoples was required to challenge these stereotypes. The term Indigenous was also being used to refer to marginalized or "vulnerable ethnic, cultural, linguistic and racial groups in the States" (Daes, 1996, p. 7), without making a differentiation amongst all these populations (Daes, 1996 p. 7). It was important to distinguish who Indigenous Peoples were.

Some of the debates on Indigenous Peoples have revolved around what factors to include as characteristics of Indigenous Peoples: for example, what characteristics should be used to recognize the Indigenous populations in different countries where Indigenous Peoples have diverse histories (Martínez Cobo, 1982, p. 4). As Martínez Cobo explains:

> Each country has approached the problem of definition in its own way, and the criteria of differentiation used in the solutions thus adopted vary very widely, ranging from factors which are exclusively or almost exclusively racial to considerations in which social and cultural criteria predominate. (p. 4)

There was consensus that governments should not be given the role of defining Indigenous Peoples.

A definition of the concept of Indigenous Peoples began to be elaborated in 1972. The UN Sub-Commission of Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities carried out a study against the discrimination of Indigenous Peoples. Martínez Cobo (1986/7) led the project and wrote a report of the study. The study involved developing a working definition of Indigenous Peoples and states:

> Indigenous communities, peoples, and nations are those that, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as Peoples, in accordance with their cultural patterns, social institutions and legal system.
>
> This historical continuity may consist of the continuation, for an extended period reaching into the present of one or more of the following factors:
>
> a. Occupation of ancestral lands, or at least of part of them.
> b. Common ancestry with the original occupants of these lands.
> c. Culture in general, or in specific manifestations (such as religion, living under a tribal system).
> d. Membership of an Indigenous community, dress, means of livelihood, lifestyle, etc.).
> e. Language (whether used as the only language, as mother-tongue, as the habitual means of communication at home or in the family, or as the main, preferred, habitual, general or normal language).

f. Residence in certain parts of the country, or in certain regions of the world.

g. Other relevant factors.

> On an individual basis, an Indigenous person is one who belongs to these Indigenous populations through self-identification as Indigenous (self and group consciousness) and is recognized and accepted by these populations as one of its members (acceptance by the group). This definition preserves for these communities the sovereign right and power to decide who belongs to them, without external interference. (Martínez Cobo, 1986/7, p. 29)

The proposed working definition also addresses some of the debates on who Indigenous Peoples are. In 1996, Erica-Irene A. Daes, the chair of the Working Group, prepared a document which discussed Martínez Cobo's (1986/7) definition and the debates around defining Indigenous Peoples. Daes (1996) discussed the complexity in defining 'Indigenous' from various perspectives, explaining that: "the concept of Indigenous is not capable of a precise, inclusive definition which can be applied in the same manner to all regions of the world" (p. 5). Therefore, there is an agreement that Indigenous People[s] do not need to fulfill every one of these elements of this working definition: "no formal universal definition of the term is necessary, given that a single definition will inevitably be either over- or under inclusive, making sense in some societies but not in others" (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2009, p. 6-7).

One of the challenges of the definition of "Indigenous" is when it is used with territories and not with Peoples. Daes (1996) highlighted that if we refer to Indigenous territories and not Indigenous Peoples, then Peoples outside of the territory may not be considered Indigenous. Another issue with the word 'territory' is that a territory can be mixed with various peoples. Territories can have overlapping claims or may have been populated by multiple Indigenous

Peoples throughout history. Hence “a government cannot represent all the people belonging to the territory" (Daes, 1996, p.8), as if they were all one group. The territories have "race, creed or colour" differences. The use of Peoples then recognizes that a 'number of peoples' are diverse and, therefore, need to exercise their self-determination instead of being grouped as one.

Another point of debate was whether Indigenous Peoples needed to be part of a non-dominant group. The understanding is that being part of a non-dominant group, in this case Indigenous, would lead to discrimination. This statement supports the idea that Indigenous Peoples are discriminated against (Daes, 1996). However, it was agreed that it is not necessary for someone claiming Indigeneity to be part of a non-dominant group. For instance, if Indigenous Peoples’ status changes as their rights are honoured and they no longer are non-dominant, they would not stop being Indigenous (Daes, 1996, p. 10).

There also needs to be consideration for Indigenous Peoples living in independent states. They must also be recognized; recognition should not only be given to the people living in overseas colonies. Along these lines, there have been discussions on the definition of Indigenous Peoples in terms of their connection to ancestral land. These discussions involved recognizing that state boundaries interfere with ancestral lands but do not change Indigenous Peoples’ identity. Taking this into consideration, "Indigenous People[s] are now defined in terms of their distinctiveness, as well as their descent from the inhabitants of their territory at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries" (Daes, 1996, p. 10).

The working definition of Indigenous Peoples has also added the point of self-identification in the sense that Indigenous Peoples "may be classified as ‘Indigenous’ only if [he/she/they] so chooses by perpetuating its own distinctive institutions and identity" (Daes, 1996, p. 11). This point highlights that while there are some characteristics that Indigenous

Peoples share that are captured by these working definitions, there is not one single definition that captures their diversity; therefore, it is essential for Indigenous Peoples to be able to self-identify. In this case, Indigenous Peoples would be those who self-identify as Indigenous and are accepted by the people in the group they are claiming to be a part of. This principle is also used in relation to participation in UN events and forums, particularly the Permanent Forum on Indigenous issues. It is important to respect the self-identification aspect since this recognizes the right that Indigenous Peoples have to decide who they are based on "their own understanding of themselves, rather than being defined by the perception of the value-systems of alien dominant societies" (Martínez Cobo, 1982, p. 5). However, as Daes (1996) explained, it is left unclear what would happen if other criteria for Indigenous Peoples are absent (p 13).

Governments and Indigenous Peoples extensively discussed Martínez Cobo's (1986/7) working definition and its complexities during the first session of the Commission's Working Group in Geneva in 1995. A consensus on a definition was reached in 1996 by the Working Group:

> We categorically reject any attempts by Governments to define Indigenous Peoples. We further endorse the Martínez Cobo report (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1986/7 Add.4) regarding the concept of "Indigenous". Also, we acknowledge the conclusions and recommendations by Chairperson-Rapporteur Madame Erica Daes in her working paper on the concept of Indigenous Peoples. (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2009, p. 4)

In summary, as discussed above, a definition of Indigenous People is needed to ensure their rights are respected by systems such as governments. Yet, the concept remains highly debatable due to the many aspects that must be considered. The Working Group created by the UN addresses these debates and agreed on a working definition for Indigenous Peoples. This

definition is based on Martínez Cobo (1986/7)'s working definition and the additional points recommended by Daes (1996). It outlined several elements that make up Indigenous people. Under the elements to consider is self-identification and acceptance from the community the person claims to be a part of. However, the Working Group agreed that not one of these elements from the definition is a requirement in the concept of Indigenous Peoples, rather it is Indigenous communities who decide who is Indigenous. Defining Indigenous Peoples is complex, partly because Indigenous peoples are very diverse based on their historical and socio-cultural contexts. This diversity needs to be accounted for in the definition.

Quechua Peoples

Quechua peoples are Andean populations that currently live in the Andes of South America and have Quechua and its linguistic variations as their mother tongue. Several populations such as the Chopcca, Chankas, Huancas, Huaylas, Ketanas, Q'ero and Cañaris make up the Quechua communities (Ministry of Culture of Peru, n.d.).

> Quechuas are related to the Incas who were the rulers of the Incan or Tahuantinsuyo empire. The Incas are originally from the Titicaca Lake and come from the Tiwanaku and the Wari civilization (Culturas Pre-Incas, 2022). The Incas conquered the Quechuas making them part of the Tahuantinsuyo. The territories covered by the Tahuantinsuyo extend from Ecuador to Chile and had Cuzco (located in Peru) as its capital. (Universidad Pontificia Católica de Chile, n.d.)

Kichwa

Kichwa people are Indigenous people who share roots with Quechua people and who were part of the Tahuantinsuyo (the Inca Empire). They are originally from the lands now known as Ecuador. Due to the limitations in the length of the study, I focus on Kichwa communities to a

lesser degree. I do not claim that the study focuses on Quechua and Kichwa people because it would be misleading, but the study includes a Kichwa immigrant participant from Ecuador.

Immigrant

For this study, 'immigrant' refers to people or their parents who were born outside of Canada and are in Canada with a residence status (landed immigrant or citizenship) or who are here under a refugee status or with no status.

Racialized

The term racialized refers to: "a person or group of people categorized according to ethnic or racial characteristics [other than white or Caucasian] and subjected to discrimination on that basis" (Government of Canada, 2022, n.p.).

Racialized Immigrant

'Racialized immigrant' is used to refer to an immigrant that experiences racialization as described above. The concept of racialized immigrants includes Indigenous immigrants. Often, I speak of racialized immigrants rather than Indigenous immigrants, simply because I'm discussing literature that speaks of racialized immigrants. The information on racialized immigrants is relevant to my study since Indigenous immigrants are part of the racialized immigrant population in Canada. In some instances, when I use 'racialized immigrants,' I also specify that Indigenous immigrants are included under that term to remind the reader.

Indigenous Immigrant

In this study, 'Indigenous immigrant' refers to an immigrant who lives on these lands now known as Canada and identifies as belonging to the Indigenous populations of their country of origin. Indigenous immigrants include people who identify as Mestize people, unless specified otherwise.

Indigenous Settler

I use the term ‘Indigenous settler’ based on Snelgrove et al.'s (2014) explanation,

> To settle … remains differentiated in terms of race, national origin, religion, class, dis/ability sexuality and gender. All of these differentiations though are underwritten by the dispossession of Indigenous lands and eschewal of Indigenous governance orders. So while all non-Indigenous people residing in settler states may be complicit in settlement, making us all settlers, not all settlers are created equal. (p. 5-6)

At times, I use the term ‘Indigenous settler’ as opposed to Indigenous immigrant to politicize the position that Indigenous immigrants have here. By using ‘Indigenous settler’ rather than ‘Indigenous immigrant,’ my goal is to bring attention to their complicity in settler colonialism and highlight the urgency for settlers to begin to act in ways that respect Indigenous Peoples on these lands. Other times, I use the term ‘Indigenous settler’ to highlight the conflicting position of this population as accomplices to settler colonialism while also being targets of discrimination for being Indigenous and racialized in Canada. Some of the literature on Indigenous immigrants uses the word settler instead of immigrants. For example, authors such as Arraiz Matute and Elgueta (2019), who explore the Indigenous identity of immigrants from Latin America, refer to Indigenous immigrants as settlers of colour.

This study assumes that Quechua immigrants hold a settler position in the Canadian state. Nevertheless, I don’t consistently refer to Quechua immigrants as settlers, since immigrants are more familiar with the term immigrant than settler. The two terms – immigrants and settlers – have different political implications in terms of experience, power and privilege. The question of when to use the terms settler and immigrant is therefore not straightforward due to the complexity of status and positionality of these diverse populations.

Racialized Settler

The literature on settler-Indigenous relations uses the term 'racialized settler.' I therefore use this term when discussing this literature and I include Indigenous settlers under this concept unless stated otherwise. I use the term racialized settler more than Indigenous settler in discussions because there is less literature that considers Indigenous settlers. 'Non-Indigenous settlers' are settlers who are racialized but do not identify as Indigenous, as well as those who are not racialized.

Mestize

I use 'Mestize' with an e[3] [unless I am quoting] for two reasons. In the Spanish language when we use the word Mestizo or Mestiza in its plural form to refer to a mixed group of people, the word becomes masculine, 'Mestizos.' There is no consideration for whether there are women in the group – the word transforms to its masculine form. To oppose this patriarchal aspect of the Spanish language, I use an "e" to include women. The letter "e" is also inclusive of people who are non-binary (Berger, 2019, n.p.). I do the same with other Spanish words I use, such as Chola.

In this thesis, I use the concept of Mestize based on Zea's and De la Cadena's definition. Zea explains the identity of the Mestize by stating that, in Latin America, there is a:

> Culture arising from the union, but not from assimilation of the culture of those people (Indigenous and Spanish). A culture with contrasting expressions . . . far from mixing, from assimilating, they [Indigenous and Spanish components] have become juxtaposed. Juxtaposition of what is supposedly superior [Spanish roots] over what is

[3] "In the United States, it's now common to use "x" or "@" to create a gender-neutral noun: that's why you may have seen "Latinx," or "Latin@," instead of the binary of Latino (male) and Latina (female). The popularized use of this form, however, has angered some Spanish speakers, who see it as a token term imposed on Spanish by American English speakers rather than an inclusive move from within. Enter teens in Argentina, who, as *The Post*'s Samantha Schmidt reported, are leading the charge to eliminate gender in their language" (in Berger, 2019, n.p).

considered inferior [Indigenous roots]. (1977, cited in Vergara Estévez & Vergara del Solar, 2002, p. 88)

It is important to acknowledge that, although I am focusing mainly on the Indigenous and Spanish or European roots of Mestizes, there are people with African descent and Indigenous and Spanish roots, as discussed later in this chapter. When discussing this study's participants, I also add a description of the concept of Mestize based on De la Cadena's description. The literature on mestizaje [4] is now abundant, with attention to historical nuances across the region, resulting in the destabilization of mestizaje ideologies. As explained later in this chapter, De la Cadena (2004) conducted a study where her participants described a different perspective on Mestizes, stating that there are Mestizes who keep their Indigenous beliefs and are referred to as "Indigenous Mestizos" (pp. 47–48). Other Mestizes let go of their Indigenous beliefs and traditions and are referred to as "Mestizos" (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 49). I include this description of the Mestize/Indigenous Mestize only in the context of my study participants and not when discussing the works of other authors using the term Mestize since they are only using the term Mestize and not distinguishing between Mestize and Indigenous Mestize. I provide a more thorough discussion of the concept of Mestize later in this chapter, but I use the concept based on the above definition.

Decolonization

I use the concept of 'decolonization' to refer to ways immigrants can live on these lands in support of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. I use the term as discussed by Indigenous authors such as Ruth Green, Margaret Kovach, Ian Cull and Glen Coulthard. I discuss

[4] Mestizaje refers to the various processes by which the Mestize comes to exist (this will be expanded later on the chapter).

decolonization in terms of land, following Green's (2018) definition. There is a debate about what decolonization means specifically in relation to land. Green discusses her position on decolonization in relation to Tuck and Yang (2012) who discuss decolonization in terms of rematriation/repatriation of the land, including giving the land back to First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. In response, Green (2018) states:

> In reading works such as Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang (2012) and Leanne Simpson (2011), to name a few, I do not believe that such authors are telling every non-Onkwehonwe[5] person to pack their bags and "move back to wherever they came from." There is talk of decolonization and rematriation/ repatriation of the land, but what can that look like in a settler colony. (A space where the colonizers intentionally moved to, without the intent of ever returning to the "mother" land, or planned the creation of a new "mother" land)? Stating we "want to return to pre-contact days" is impossible. I feel that in demanding rematriation of land, we are actually talking about stewardship; speaking of resource protection and sharing in a way that is supportive of Onkwehonwe sovereignty and National determination. (p.172)

According to Green (2018), although Tuck and Yang (2012) discuss rematriation/repatriation of land, the main message is not for people to move back to their original homes but to live with each other in ways that acknowledge the position of Indigenous Peoples as the Original Peoples of these lands. From this perspective, Indigenous Peoples' struggles are recognized and respected and treaties regarding lands and other issues are honoured. This includes the repossession of lands that are owed to Indigenous Peoples through treaties. Green and Tuck and Yang state that discussions on decolonization need to involve land. Therefore, decolonization involves

[5] Onkwehonwe is a Mohawk word that translates to "Original people" (Green, 2016).

discussions on ways that Indigenous Peoples can have the stewardship of these lands formally returned to them, despite the presence of immigrants.

Furthermore, based on Green's (2018) definition of decolonization, Indigenous Peoples and immigrants need to find a way to live respectfully together. Under this premise, people who are not Indigenous to these lands need to see themselves as guests (Green, 2018). Green discusses the responsibilities that guests need to take on and the need for them to reflect on their position as such. In this context, decolonization involves listening to what Indigenous Peoples are asking and demanding. It involves immigrants asking themselves/ourselves how they/we can live on these Indigenous lands in a way that respects Indigenous Peoples and their lands. How can they/we respect the sovereignty and self-determination of Indigenous Peoples?

In my definition of decolonization, I also use Kovach's (2009) principle that Indigenous Peoples need to be allowed to decide what decolonization should look like, as opposed to having non-Indigenous people take the lead. Another principle used in this definition of decolonization is based on Cull et al.'s position:

> On the one hand, decolonization involves dismantling structures that perpetuate the status quo and addressing unbalanced power dynamics. On the other hand, decolonization involves valuing and revitalizing Indigenous knowledge and approaches and weeding out settler biases or assumptions that have impacted Indigenous ways of being. (Cull et al., 2018, p. 7)

In other words, decolonization addresses systemic discrimination and recognizes the teachings and values embedded in Indigenous knowledge by actively looking for ways to revitalize its teachings. In this study, I also use Coulthard's (2014) principle of cultural resurgence to conceptualize decolonization. This process entails developing one's own Indigenous identity

away from those imposed by colonialism. It involves Indigenous Peoples learning who they are and not relying on others' recognition and approval of their identity (p. 18). Based on these principles, I discuss decolonization in the context of how Quechua immigrants can support the decolonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations.

Chole

The concept 'Chole'[6] has various meanings that have transformed over time. Using some of Quijano's (1980) principles, Chole is a person that embodies the cultural identity of an Indigenous person and a person that is influenced by Western culture, based on Peruvians that are white because their parents have Spanish ancestry (Quijano, 1980, p. 63). According to Quijano, Choles started moving away from the peasant life, adopting "elements that make up a new lifestyle, made up of elements as much as from urban-western roots, as those that come from contemporary Indigenous culture" (p. 63). It has been argued that this definition has gone through some changes in the last few decades as the population breakdown has changed. According to La Cruz Bonilla, the word "Chole" has expanded to refer to more populations. La Cruz Bonilla (2010) explains:

> Both intentionally and spontaneously, it is clear that "the Cholo" has increasingly acquired a national character…[it] no longer only represents the transformation of the peasant migrant into a city dweller, but rather an entire image of the national integration that underlies contemporary Peru. In other words, the concept has gone from describing a process of cultural change to becoming a new identity discourse, which towards the end

[6] Chole (the word Chola is feminine, Cholo, masculine, Chole would be gender neutral) with an e is not commonly used. However, I am using it here for the same reasons I am using Mestize, as explained above. Earlier attempts at gender neutral language include Chol@ and Cholx, but Chole is gaining prominence in part due to it being easier to know exactly how to pronounce it at a glance. When I self-identify below, I use the feminine Chola.

> of the century even had the support of the media, which have contributed greatly to the reification of the notion. (p. 112)

Regardless of the expansion of the word Chole to refer to more groups of people, it still carries a negative connotation. The Chole has been the target of "discrimination, exclusion and contempt" for coming from the Andes and having Indigenous roots (Pazos, 2016, p. 18). There is still a stigma attached to having Indigenous roots even if the person lives in Lima. Some people who come from Lima do not want to recognize their Indigenous heritage or have roots in the Andes, which reflects the stigma and discrimination attached to these identities. They do not refer to their Andean roots or call themselves Choles or Andean (person from the Andes) (Pazos, 2016, p. 19).

There has been a change in society where the derogatory meanings of these words are transforming, either to give them a different derogatory meaning or to find other ways to be "inclusive of other cultures" (Pazos, 2016, p. 20). The word Chole is going through some changes that challenge its stigma. Chole can be used to bring attention to the "humiliation against the people from the Andes." Chole has also been used to refer to "being Peruvian and being the best of the country," "it is the Mestize colour from the Andes," or it is a "working person from the Andes" (Pazos, 2016, p. 23). In the first instance, there is a push to call out the humiliation of people from the Andes. The second meaning refers to a feeling of success and pride for being from Peru. The third meaning is simply a description of what Chole meant historically, but without a negative connotation. The last meaning refers to the working spirit of the person coming from the Andes, which could be seen as a shift from previous definitions (Pazos, 2016, p. 23). All these speak to the contested terrain of the meaning of the term Chole.

There is another perspective arguing that the term Chole has been influenced by neoliberalism, which tries to elevate the image of the Chole by presenting the Chole as "an entrepreneur, self-sufficient and individualistic" (Heredia, 2020, p. 227). The Chole is viewed as an entrepreneur who can be part of the "global market." They are no longer seen as a suffering being, but instead are framed by the power that Choles can have, the "Chole power," as an entrepreneur. This image sold in the media promotes the kind of Chole that people should aspire to be. This is in tandem with notions linking development to identity popularized by the Inter-American Development Bank in the 1990s and 2000s. As Heredia (2020) explains, this is a much more subtle form of racism "where the Chole only is visible if it has – by the new codes of the neoliberal subject – the qualities of a profitable "entrepreneur" (p. 228). Only when they are part of the global economy, investing and profitable, are they powerful and worthy.

Coloniality of Power

The concept of 'coloniality of power' is based on Quijano's (2007) theorization. According to Quijano, a Peruvian scholar whose work is focused on Latin America, the coloniality of power has a longer impact than the period of Eurocentred colonialism (p. 171).

The ideas of superiority that were carried by colonizing groups defined the dominated group as inferior compared to the Europeans. In coloniality, this shifted to create categories that were deemed biologically superior and inferior: "Unlike in any other previous experience of colonialism, the old ideas of superiority of the dominant, and the inferiority of dominated under European colonialism were mutated in a relationship of biologically and structurally superior and inferior" (Quijano, 2007, p. 171). This meant that the oppression of people who were previously colonized prolonged even after colonialism.

Racial social classification is an element of the coloniality of power. As a result of colonization, a process of Eurocentrification took place in which racial criteria were attached to

the new social classification of people globally. Although coloniality of power is rooted in this racial social classification of the world population, it is more than a problem of racism within relations. As Quijano (2007) explains, "coloniality of power is not exhausted in the problem of 'racist' social relations. It pervaded and modulated the basic instances of the Eurocentered capitalist colonial/modern world power to become the cornerstone of this coloniality of power" (p. 171). In other words, coloniality of power infiltrates and is an important component of Eurocentred capitalism, which is the modern global power.

Western colonial domination has been closely tied to the emergence of Western modernity and rationality. Colonial powers shaped Western views on what knowledge was recognized and how humans connected to the world, which then became established as a "universal paradigm" (Quijano, 2007, p. 172). This form of rationality/modernity is part of "the process of restructuration of power, on the one hand, in capitalist and urban social relations and nation-states; and, on the other, in the colonization of the rest of the world" (pp. 174–175). This development was based on an understanding that society as a whole followed a natural order. In this way, the superiority of certain groups of people became normalized and the complexities in these dynamics were simplified. Furthermore:

> As is well known, in the Europe of the Enlightenment, the categories of 'humanity' and 'society' did not extend to the non-Western Peoples, or only in a formal way, in the sense that such recognition had no practical effects. In any case, in accord with the organic image of reality, the ruling part, the brain of the total organism, was Europe, and in every colonized part of the world, the Europeans. (Quijano, 2007, p. 176).

Non-Western people were often considered outside of humanity or society or received superficial recognition. It was really the Europeans who were viewed as the ones capable of thinking and holding power.

Under the coloniality of power, society is a 'closed structure" which follows a hierarchical order. It is supposed to be predictable, and its parts follow a particular order (Quijano, 2007, p. 176). This order is established through "the colonial world, i.e. Europe." In this way, "history was conceived as a evolutionary continuum from the primitive to the civilized; from the traditional to the modern; from the savage to the rational; from pro-capitalism to capitalism, etc." (p. 176).

In summary, the concept of coloniality of power bases the inequalities that people experience on biological traits linked to their race. It is also a foundational aspect of capitalism and has been established as the rational or logical form of knowledge, a universal paradigm.

Criollean People

During colonialism, the Criollean people were people born in Latin America whose parents were Spaniards. They carried out roles that contributed to the colonization of Indigenous Peoples.

Nationals or National Settlers

'Nationals' or 'national settlers' refer to non-Indigenous people of Western-European descent living on Indigenous lands. They deny their settler identities and responsibilities towards decolonization and believe in their superiority over First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples and racialized people (Thobani, 2007). Thobani (2007) defines nationals as "exalted above all others . . . the embodiment of the quintessential characteristics of the nation and the personification of its values, ethics, and civilizational mores" (Thobani, 2007, p. 3). All nationals are descended from immigrants and even if they were initially othered, this othering wanes (again, even if over generations). However, not all white immigrants embody the characteristics of nationals.

Now that I have discussed the main concepts used in this thesis, in the next section I will outline its aim and study questions.

Study Aim

This thesis aims to address the tensions that have been identified by Indigenous Peoples in Indigenous-settler relations. A few Indigenous scholars argue that racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, do not recognize their responsibility to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities in decolonization projects (Dhamoon, 2015, p. 21; Lawrence & Dua, 2005, p. 128). Complicating this, however, Snelgrove et al. (2014) argue that the systemic racism that racialized settlers experience creates a barrier to recognizing their privileged position as settlers and the responsibilities attached to their settler identity (p. 7).

This study examines the relationship that Quechua immigrants living in Tkaronto, Ontario, have with Indigenous Peoples on the lands now known as Canada. The objectives are twofold: to explore the engagement of Quechua people with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and to examine how the Indigeneity of Quechua people could help them engage in collaboration.

Study Questions

This research focuses on three overarching questions: 1) What are Quechua people's views and understanding of the Indigeneity of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and what are their relations to these Nations? 2) How can these understandings facilitate their decolonizing collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations? 3) How can their Indigeneity be used as a bridge to facilitate their potential collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples on the lands now known as Canada?

Existing research suggests a failure amongst racialized immigrants to engage with their responsibilities to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (Burnette & Billiot, 2015; Byrd, 2011; Dhamoon, 2015; Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Regan, 2010; Thobani, 2007; Tuck & Yang, 2012). However, there is limited research exploring why this may be. There is also limited literature on the relations between these two populations where collaboration does happen. Therefore, research into existing relationships between these groups can elucidate underlying barriers to collaboration as well as commonalities and shared interest amongst Indigenous immigrants, such as Quechuas, and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations.

Rationale

This research addresses the controversial intersecting identities of Indigenous immigrants as simultaneously Indigenous, settlers and immigrants – bringing more clarity to the complexities that Quechua immigrant populations experience. At the same time, I aim to validate Quechua people's experiences with colonization in their homelands and as racialized immigrants in the lands now known as Canada. While examining the identities of Quechua immigrants, I illustrate how contemporary colonization works locally and globally. Locally, various structures are in place that facilitate immigrants' complicity and participation in the ongoing colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and their lands. In this way, as the lives of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples and their stories are often kept hidden through colonization, immigrants end up unintentionally contributing to their discrimination and marginalization. This process does not excuse Indigenous immigrants from their responsibility to inform themselves, disengage from actively participating in the oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and to, instead, engage in decolonization efforts. Globally, mechanisms of colonization such as the establishment of transnational companies (including Canadian mining companies) on

Indigenous lands are displacing Indigenous Peoples, including Quechua communities, from their lands (Blanco, 2008, p. 14). In cases where Indigenous immigrants move to other colonized countries such as those now known as Canada, their presence in the structures of the Canadian immigration system perpetuates the ongoing colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (Byrd, 2011, p. i).

I explain the mechanisms supporting colonization, including the triad of Black people, white settlers and Indigenous Peoples, where Black people have been historically used by white settlers and the oppressive social structures they created to maintain colonization. Based on this model, I discuss the triad of Indigenous Peoples from these lands, Indigenous settlers and white settlers who maintain settler colonialism. I examine how moves to innocence among Indigenous settlers serve to evade the responsibilities that come with occupying First Nations, Métis and Inuit lands (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 1). This analysis examines the systems and structures that guide such moves to innocence. An investigation of the above topics can be used to inform the disruption of colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples and their lands; this research addresses the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) Calls to Action, particularly 93 and 94, which call on non-Indigenous people living in these lands now known as Canada to take on the responsibility of developing partnerships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (TRCC, 2015).

In the following section, I provide background information on these Indigenous populations.

First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and Quechua Peoples

First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations are Indigenous Peoples from the lands now known as Canada. They experience settler colonialism, which involves a vast number of colonizers

taking over First Nations, Métis and Inuit lands and resources (Wolfe, 2006, pp. 387–388). The colonizers' access to land has depended on reducing and keeping the number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations as low as possible so that they cannot successfully fight back and reclaim their lands (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). Colonizers have attempted to eliminate First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations through genocide, strategies of cultural assimilation and through legislation that creates hurdles to accessing Indigenous status within the state (Lawrence & Dua, 2005). Being denied Indigenous status is one mechanism that prevents First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations from reclaiming their lands (Wolfe, 2006, p. 400). Tuck and Yang (2012) call attention to the expropriation of Indigenous Peoples from their lands as a driving force in settler colonization (p. 1). Furthermore, settler colonial racism is institutionalized within child welfare, legal justice, education, health care, social welfare and other systems that operate in subtle ways (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005; Dion et al., 2010).

Quechua people are relatively new to the lands now known as Canada. The wave of legal and undocumented immigrants from the Andes peaked in the mid-1970s (Mata & Simmons, in Eckhardt et al., 2009, pp. 23–24). The total number of Indigenous immigrants from Central and South America (excluding Mayas), including Quechuas, account for 12,865 of the Canadian population as of 2009 (Statistics Canada, 2009). In their homelands, Quechua people lived through exploitative colonialism from roughly the late 1400s to the 1830s, a process that involved a relatively small number of Spanish colonists eliminating the Inca leaders and stealing resources to export to Spain (Noejovich, 2020, p. 40, 57, Salazar-Soler, 2020, p. 170). In order to keep colonization flourishing, Spaniards created divisions amongst Indigenous and Mestize and positioned Indigenous identities as naturally inferior to their own (Montoya, 1975, p. 30). The ramifications of colonization involve a conflicting relationship of Quechuas and Mestizes with

their Indigenous heritage, which sometimes involves hatred. This conflict continued beyond Latin America's independence from Spain in the 1830s (Rodríguez Mir, 2008).

To discuss the ongoing colonization in both Latin and North America, I need to position myself in relation to this research. I identify as Chola, for I have Quechua and European ancestry. My positionality influenced my choice of research topic and guided my views and discussions. I will elaborate on my identity in relation to this study in the following section.

My Position

I was borne on the coast of Lima, the capital city of Peru. I was raised by my mother, grandmother and uncle. The three of them migrated from Arequipa to Lima looking for financial opportunities. Our family is from the province of Arequipa, located in the central region of the Andes, part of the department of Arequipa. We travel to Arequipa often, as that is where our immediate family lives. While my family has gone through the process of migrating to the big city and I have not, having been borne in Lima, my identity is shaped by their migration experiences and the coming together of Indigenous and Western cultures that takes place in Lima. I identify as Chola, a word that is mainly used on the streets and tends to carry a negative connotation. At the same time, it is known to be used as a term of endearment in the family context (Paz Campuzano, 2022, p. 24).

As stated earlier, there is still a stigma attached to the people living in Lima who come from the province and have Indigenous roots (Pazos, 2016, p. 18). Such attitudes have led my family to distance themselves from identifying with their Indigenous heritage. They do not talk about it and instead embrace their European heritage. I choose the term Chola because this term acknowledges my mixed race, with its challenges and privileges, and it is a way of reclaiming

my Indigenous roots within my mixed heritage. It is also a term that is used in the context of Lima and describes the complexities that exist in the capital.

Before pursuing my doctoral degree, I lived and worked in small towns in Northern Ontario where there is a high number of Indigenous Peoples who are severely discriminated against. I began working with Indigenous agencies in the city and reserves around Thunder Bay as a social worker in medical settings and as a case manager and health policy analyst. Here I learned more about Indigenous Peoples, their cultures, histories and the contemporary issues they face. I began forming relationships with the communities and these experiences also helped me further connect with my Quechua heritage.

I began to question what it means to be Chola after migrating outside my country of origin. I also became interested in how sharing an Indigenous identity with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations could facilitate building a collaborative relationship between Quechua immigrants and Indigenous Peoples on these lands. Furthermore, I am personally invested in this topic as I have two First Nations children. I witness their invisibility in various white and racialized settler systems.

As I engage with this research, my positionality is unsettling. My worldviews are shaped by my experiences of colonization in my homelands and my immigration to a colonized country where I have found myself in an accomplice-settler position. I have lived in Canada for many years and have lost aspects of my Chola roots. The Chole identity is controversial and closely linked to its geographical location in Lima. No longer living in Lima takes away some of the aspects associated with my Chola identity. Therefore, I consider myself an insider/outsider researcher within Quechua communities. This in-between positionality influences how I have conducted this study. It informed my research question because I am able to see the resonant

experiences that Quechua[7] immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations may have. At the same time, it may have prevented me from providing a full critique of Quechua peoples' comments when it comes to collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations because I identify with them.

One of the study participants was Kichwa, Indigenous Peoples from Ecuador who share a common Quechua heritage with the Quechua people. I hold more of an outsider researcher position with Kichwa people as I am from Peru and have never lived in Ecuador. Still, I have an emotional bond with Kichwa immigrants. My bond with Kichwa people is related to shared cultural aspects and emotional bonds for sharing Quechua roots. Consequently, during our discussions I may have been particularly careful to try not to offend or raise issues that may be uncomfortable. On issues concerning First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities, I clearly have an outsider's perspective. As I engaged in this research, I reminded myself of my insider/outsider positions based on who I am and how these positions inform my views. To both incorporate my identity and account for my outsider status, I relied on Indigenous worldviews to guide my literature review and analysis, which are covered in the next chapters.

---

[7] I have personal knowledge of Quechua immigrants in Peru as that is also part of my background. I do not have personal knowledge of Kichwa people from Ecuador because I have not lived in Ecuador.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

There are different identities within Quechua populations living in the lands now known as Canada that need to be negotiated in order to discuss their potential collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. In this literature review, I analyze the identity of Quechua immigrants as Indigenous and inseparably as immigrants living as settlers on Indigenous lands. There is limited literature on the settler identity of Indigenous immigrants; hence, I do not discuss it in-depth in this section — instead, I provide a fuller discussion of this in my results chapter based on participant accounts of their settler identity. I review the literature on these three intersecting identities on their own and then in connection with one another. This information is meant to provide a better understanding of Quechua peoples' Indigenous identities; the transitions they go through after immigration; and their position as settlers living on these lands. My assumption is that learning how Quechua people experience these identities will provide insight into their commitment to engage in collaborative relationships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. Secondly, I explore the mechanisms of settler colonialism and its impacts on Indigenous Peoples on these lands in order to inform collaboration, which is a key goal of the dissertation.

As I expand upon below, this literature review is guided by Indigenous worldviews, specifically First Nations, Métis and Inuit as well as Quechua worldviews. I chose to focus on Quechua worldviews and not Kichwa worldviews. Although there are similarities between the two there are also some clear differences due to historic and geographic influences, including that Kichwa people come from Ecuador and Quechua people come from Peru. As discussed below, some Indigenous Peoples from Ecuador with various Indigenous roots were conquered by the Incas who were trying to expand their empire, thereby imposing Quechua culture on them.

Due to the limitations of this study, I decided to focus on Quechua worldviews as most of the participants were Quechua. However, I also included information on Kichwa people and their histories as there was one Kichwa participant.

Involving Indigenous worldviews in research with Indigenous Peoples is necessary for decolonizing research (Kovach, 2021, p. 53). I analyze the literature in connection to Indigenous worldviews and the Quechua Eagle and Condor prophecy (Cameron et al., 2021; Hart, 2010) as they offer ways to understand Indigenous Peoples in relation to the cosmos. I utilize the Two Row Wampum Belt, a treaty created by the Haudenosaunee to guide their relationship with the Dutch, as well as the Eagle and Condor prophecy, a Quechua prophecy about establishing a decolonizing relationship between Indigenous Peoples of the North and South. Both teachings centre on collaboration and offer guidance for the relations between Indigenous Peoples from the South and the North. I also use Tuck and McKenzie's (2014) critical place inquiry model to analyze Quechua people's connection to the land, which they note is a significant component of Indigeneity.

Conceptualizing Indigenous Identity

Before engaging in a discussion of the multiple identities of Quechua immigrants, I begin with how the concept of identity is operationalized in this research. Indigenous scholar Frideres (2008) conceptualizes Indigenous identity based on three theories. The psychiatric /psychoanalytic theory states that the racism inherent in colonization affects the essence of the colonized person, creating a fragmented sense of self. To reverse the effects of colonization, colonized people need to re-create their "collective identity" as a group "by producing a self-affirming culture of their own" (Frideres, 2008, p. 315).

Frideres' second theory of identity is based on later definitions of primordialism, which state that there is a "sense of oneness" and a shared consciousness that comes from sharing "common geographical space, common ancestors, common culture and common language" (Frideres, 2008, p. 315). The third theory is symbolic interaction, which states that as social beings our identity develops in relation to "a larger group of which we are a part," and is shaped by the people we are involved with in a direct or indirect manner and our social interactions with them (Frideres, 2008, p. 316). Drawing on these three theories, identity is defined as "dynamic, not static; multiple not monolithic or homogenous and is a social construction not all naturally inherited" (Frideres, 2008, p. 316). As reiterated by Frideres, identities are complex in the case of colonized people due to the effects of colonization.

Reflecting on Frideres' (2008) conceptualization of identity, I find his analysis particularly useful for my research topic as it not only considers the effects of colonization but also the strength that exists among Indigenous Peoples as they form a sense of "oneness." This does not infer that all Indigenous Peoples get along with each other, but rather that a shared Indigenous identity may bring about a deep connection, as is the case with a global Indigenous identity[8] (Niezen, 2003, p. 5). Frideres' (2008) concept of identity is also dynamic and connected to relationships that change and evolve. These perceptions of identity are aligned with Indigenous worldviews, which emphasize the dynamic nature of all the elements of the universe,

[8] Niezen talks about the discussions that take place in international forums with Indigenous participants from all parts of the world. A global Indigenous identity has been discussed as: "an attachment that all . . . Indigenous People[s] share to some form of subsistence economy, to a territory or homeland that predates the arrival of settlers and surveyors, to a spiritual system that predates the arrival of missionaries, and to a language that expresses everything that is important and distinct about their place in the universe. Most importantly, they share the destruction and loss of these things. Their cultural markers gain self-conscious significance the more they are diminished by outside forces. They also share the corresponding commitment to find stability and restorative justice…" (Niezen, 2003, p. 23).

including humans, and the importance of people's relationships in shaping their identity (Wilson, 2008, p. 176).

In the following section, I review the literature on the Indigenous identities of Quechua people in general. My discussion of the Quechua identity involves Mestize identity as well. Before I begin discussing Quechua people, I provide a brief introduction to the Kichwa people.

Kichwa People

Ecuador is considered a "pluricultural and multi-ethnic" society based on the constitution of 1998 (Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016, p. 1). As a result, Kichwa cultures are "a fusion and integration of unknown and well-known elements that come to form something different and new" (Esch-Jakob, 1994, p. 8 in Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016, p. 4). According to the 2010 census, "the Kichwa population in Ecuador has the highest percentage of Indigenous People (85.87%) with a population of 800 000 people approximately" (Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos INEC Ecuador 2022, in Ortiz, 2022, n.p.). Kichwa people are mainly located in the Andes of Ecuador but have also migrated to other regions such as the Amazons (Confederación wde Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador, n.d.). Indigenous cultures in the Amazons include the "Quijos, Sumacos, Sabelas, Yumbos, Napo, Canelos, Lamas, Tabacosa, Suchinchi, Pandule and Panyaso" (Soria, 2020, n.p.). Some of these cultures consist of Kichwa populations with varying traditions and cultures. In their efforts to expand the Tahuantinsuyo, the Incas tried to occupy territories in what is now known as Ecuador. Today, these Kichwa populations consider themselves the Kichwa people of the Amazons (Soria, 2020, n.p.).

The Andes also has a large population of Kichwas. In the Andes, "the province with the most Indigenous population in 2010 was Chimborazo, with 161 190. Other provinces with a high number of Indigenous populations were Imbabura and Cotopaxi, which had an average of 84

500" (Ortiz., 2022, n.p.). Benítez Bastidas et al. (2016) studied Imbabura's Kichwa people by focusing on Imbabura's three Kichwa Towns: Otavalo, Karanki and Natabuela.

Benítez Bastidas et al. (2016) argued that Kichwa cultures in places such as Otavalo need to be brought back to their roots and to Kichwa worldviews, time and space. Currently, Kichwa cultures and their people are being influenced by the Western world. Similarly, the Karankis and Natabuelas (Kayambis) are being influenced by the Mestizes, who are growing in numbers. This increase in the Mestize populations and Catholicism has led to relying less on Kichwa traditional practices in the younger generations. That said, Benítez Bastidas (2017) argues that Kichwas' oral traditions are still present despite the influence of the Catholic religion (p. 89).

According to Benítez and Garcés (2014 in Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016, p. 7), the origins of the Kichwa in Imbabura date back to before the Incas and Spanish colonization. Benítez Bastidas et al. (2016) state that: "Among the theories analyzed, most authors agree that the first settlements in the current province of Imbabura have a Central American, Caribbean, Chibcha [Indigenous Peoples from Colombia] and Inca origin and influence" (p.7). There were also some Aymara people located in these regions (Ontaneada, 2014, in Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016). Before the Incas, these towns had their language, cultural practice, knowledge and government. The Kichwa cultures became part of what is now known as Ecuador due to the conquest led by the Inca Huayna Capac.[9]

The Inca Invasion. The invasion of the Incas did not last long but had a detrimental impact on some of the towns. In response, the Cayambes and Karankis from the Northern parts of the Andes formed a strong resistance to this invasion and became known for it. With the coming of the Incas, Kichwa became one of the local languages before the Spanish language was

[9] Huayna Capac was one of the Incas the governed the Inca empire and conquered Quito. This happened in the late 1400s and lasted until the coming of the Spaniards (Enciclopedia del Ecuador , n.d.).

introduced (Benítez Bastidas et al. 2016). The Kichwa language was also brought to Ecuador by the missionaries who arrived with the Spanish colonization from other places in the Tahuantinsuyo. They used Kichwa to evangelize the Indigenous Peoples from Ecuador. Some theorists state that the Kichwa language was spoken before the Inca invasion (Moya, 2006 in Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016). Moya (2006 in Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016) suggests that people learned Kichwa through the market and business transactions between the Tawantinsuyo and the people in these towns who came to speak Kichwa after the invasion of the Incas. There was an overlap between when the Incas came to expand the Tahuantinsuyo and the Spanish conquest.

The Spanish Conquest. In the 1530s, the Spanish conquest attempted to destroy Indigenous Peoples through the exploitation of their natural resources and Indigenous labour and the extinguishment of the Indigenous languages. As a result, there was the formation of the White State and the Indigenous state (Ribadeneira, 2001). Before the Spaniards, the Kichwa people developed a culture based on principles of collectivity and reciprocity. In their living arrangements, Kichwa lived in communities and had collective ownership of the lands to protect their culture (Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador, n.d.). These principles and organizational structures were violated when the Spaniards invaded Latin America. Indigenous Peoples had to learn and adapt to a new form of life, where the land which belonged to the towns came to be the property of the monarchy and elite Spanish people. This process involved being forced to evacuate their lands and be divided based on the best interests of the Spaniards. In this way, the Spaniards could prevent the formation of rebellions. Kichwa people, usually men, were forced to work in mining and construction amongst other labour they did under inhumane conditions. They were alsp forced to work in the fields doing farming for very

little or no remuneration. Similarly, Kichwa women were forced into textile work under inhumane conditions.

Independence from the Spanish took place during the 1820s, but the exploitation of the Indigenous populations continued. The Criollean people became the new colonizers and continued the oppression imposed by the Spaniards (Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016). As part of the discrimination and forced assimilation, people were forced to speak the Spanish language. As this was happening, Indigenous movements from Ecuador continued to fight against the unfair treatment they were receiving. They received a lot of backlash from the government for speaking up. Rebellions such as those led by Fernando Daquilema Hatun-Apak in the province of Chimborazo "were condemned by the Ecuadorean army with the support from president Gabriel Garcia Moreno" (Cachiguango, 2008, p. 5, in Benítez Bastidas et al., 2016, p. 10).

A liberation revolution took place on July 5th, 1895, led by the Indigenous Peoples in Ecuador. This uprising brought changes in the state legislature concerning the land and position of Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous Peoples were able to abolish "free or minimal labour, imprisonment for debts . . . the state eliminated the church's intervention in state affairs and the large estates owned by the church were expropriated to convert them into a public property" (Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador, n.d, n.p.). Overall, their geographic proximity and shared history of Spanish colonization resulted in Kichwa people having over-lapping current realities with Quechua people. Next, I will discuss Quechua identities and the various elements that influence these identities, such as nature, Indigenous teachings and colonization.

Indigenous Identity of Quechua People

Following Rivera Cusicanqui's (2012) argument that Indigenous Peoples are affected by colonization but are more than simply colonized people, I review the literature on Indigenous identity by balancing aspects of Indigenous cultures and beliefs with colonizing factors. Rivera Cusicanqui (2012) suggests that hyper-focusing on the power of colonization with respect to Indigenous identities becomes problematic as it minimizes the many strengths and knowledges that Indigenous identities carry (pp.106–107). At the same time, colonization has clearly shaped Indigenous cultures. I therefore discuss Indigenous identities as being shaped by Indigenous beliefs and worldviews, as well as colonization and neoliberalism.

The Indigenous identities of Quechua peoples are shaped by beliefs derived from Quechua mythology. For example, explanations of how the world is conceived are based on beliefs that the world is made up of living beings (humans, animals and plants), the 'above' world (the spirits) and the underworld (the world below the earth or water level for humans who have passed away or were never born) (Ministry of Culture of Peru, n.d.). These worlds are connected in sacred places with doors that allow access from one world to another, and animals such as the serpent, the bull and the frog can move from one world to another (Ministry of Culture of Peru, n.d.). According to Quechua mythology, there are supernatural beings such as Mother Earth which provide fertility and well-being and, in return, people attend to Mother Earth through offerings (Ministry of Culture of Peru, n.d.). Other supernatural beings are the mountains, which are considered individual beings with consciousness and power to act upon matters concerning the earth, human beings and cattle. Individuals can communicate with the hills and make pacts with them with the help of elders (Ministry of Culture of Peru, n.d.). These beliefs show us the power that elders have to communicate with the natural world, the power that

natural elements have to influence matters concerning the earth and the human-like characteristics that natural elements can have. They also illustrate that Quechua peoples have a sacred connection with the land and animals.

Indigenous beliefs are very different from those imported from European and white settler colonies (Molinari Morales, 2008). Colonial interpretations suggest they are conflicting worldviews, where Indigenous worldviews are considered against modernity. However, Indigenous worldviews do not oppose modernity as long as it does not disregard Indigenous ways of life (Robyn, 2002, p. 199). Rivera Cusicanqui (2012) notes that the beliefs and ways of life that shape the Indigenous identities of Quechua peoples have experienced many shifts and are best explained by non-essentialist frameworks (pp. 100–101). Indigenous Peoples' identities are dynamic and constantly changing (Larraín, 1994; Montoya, 1975; Zea, 1985) rather than essentialist and stagnant (Rivera Cusanqui, 2012). From an essentialist viewpoint, Indigenous identities were stable and well-grounded prior to Spanish colonization and require a return to pre-contact conditions in order to revitalize Indigenous identity. However, I take a non-essentialist position that understands Indigenous identities as dynamic and changing with historical events, both pre- and post-contact, conquest and colonization (Larraín, 1994).

Colonization has posed a critical threat to the Indigenous identities of Quechua peoples (Blanco, 2008). The colonization of Indigenous Peoples in Latin America, including Quechuas, has led to the segregation of, and paternalistic behaviours towards, Indigenous Peoples as well as forced assimilation into colonial societies (Montoya, 1975; Soria Choque, 2009; Vergara Estévez & Vergara del Solar, 2002). Under colonization, the doctrine of discovery was imposed by religious institutions such as the Catholic Church. The doctrine of discovery dates to the Crusades in the Holy Land in approximately 1095 when Europeans began to invent laws to

"justify the domination and consciousness colonization exercised over non-Christian nations" (Espinoza Sauceda, 2020, n.p.). Within this justification was the idea that Indigenous Peoples did not have souls, essentially undermining their humanity (Espinoza Sauceda, 2020, n.p.). In this way, "a legal framework of domination was created through which they [Indigenous Nations] were enslaved and dispossessed of their land and their culture." Their colonization was justified by labelling them as "pagans," "gentiles" and "infidels" (Espinoza Sauceda, 2020, n.p). The Spaniards used Catholicism to justify colonizing acts, arguing that: "[colonizers] were dominating with the purpose of bringing true faith to Indigenous People[s]" (Soria Choque, 2009, p. 86). Colonizers prohibited Indigenous spiritual practices, claiming that they were rooted in evil beliefs (Soria Choque, 2009), undermining Indigenous spirituality, which is essential for Indigenous identities to flourish, in an attempt to dehumanize Indigenous Nations (Soria Choque, 2009, p. 88).

Rivera Cusicanqui (2012) argues that colonization also influenced Indigenous identities by shifting the role of Indigenous women from one of power to one of inferiority. With the minimization of their role, women's knowledge and influence in shaping Indigenous identities was diminished. Indigenous women were sexualized and demeaned by the Spaniards who referred to them as animals for being women as well as insulted them for being Indigenous (Peredo Beltrán, 2004, p. 14). The subjugation and political marginalization of Indigenous women created a division between men and women that continues [10] (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012, p. 106).

The imposition of European patriarchy also imposed a binary understanding of gender. There is evidence that, pre-colonization, there were other ways of viewing gender and sex

[10] At the same time, Indigenous women also experienced repression within the Incan Empire (Peredo Beltrán, 2004, p. 14).

identities; some writers have talked about a third gender (Horswell, 2003). According to Cañamar Maldonado (2019), the term Chawpi, a Quechua word that includes non-binary people, is used to "break with the heterosexual parameters imposed by the modern-western colonial system; it is present in the memories (chronicles and figurines) of our pre-Hispanic Andean cultures" (n.p.). Horswell talks about non-binary gender in connection to *transculturation:*

> both the Andean culture[s], its practices and its Chawpi subjectivities were subjugated by the dominant Iberian culture, therefore the former enters a transition process in which it suffers an uprooting and loses some of its culture, to acquire meanings and values of the new culture. (in Cañamar Maldonado, 2019, n.p.)

Another way Spaniards problematized Indigenous identities was through acts of sexual violence towards Indigenous women, giving birth to Mestize populations, which will be discussed next.

Mestizaje

The original mestizaje dated back to the early periods of colonization in the 1500s (Rodríguez García, 2011, pp. 147–148; Vela Belarde, 2014, pp. 72–73, 81). Mestizaje had a crucial impact on people's lives and the way racism was viewed (or ignored). Rivera Cusicanqui (2012) expands on the convoluted Indigenous and Spanish identity of the Mestize through the analogy of the motley mix in the Aymara language. The 'motley mix' is the "juxtaposition of contrasting dots placed beside the other" (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012, p.105). According to Rivera Cusicanqui, this image represents the contrasting identities of Indigenous and Spanish that exist within the Mestizes in very complex ways. Within this identity, there is a "parallel co-existence of multiple cultures that do not extinguish but antagonize and complement each other" (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012, p. 105). Rivera Cusicanqui portrays the conflicting relations between

Indigenous and Spanish people during and after colonization as well as the ways that Indigeneity lives on.

The creation of the Mestize identity carries many complications and pervasive responses and is one of the biggest problems in Latin America (Zea, 1985). As Indigenous women were raped by Spanish men, "Indigenous women became victims and instruments of pleasure for the Spaniards, sought through robbery, outrage and humiliation" (Barboza, 1994, n.p.). As a result of this violence, many of "the children of those rapists turn their hatred to their Indigenous identity" (in conversation with Ruth Green, May 25, 2022). This self-hatred was perpetuated by the colonial systems in place that allowed for these abuses to take place and established regulations that encouraged women to blame themselves. Mestizaje became increasingly relevant as the Mestize population grew, and for some, their denial and hatred of their Indigenous roots continue (Pineda, 2017; Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012). However, this point cannot be generalized across the Americas.

Authors such as Zea discuss how Indigenous Peoples, including Mestize, internalize their hatred towards their Indigenous heritages (1977, in Vergara Estévez & Vergara del Solar, 2002, p. 88), creating a juxtaposing sense of self. Zea has gone as far as claiming that Latin America became a culture of juxtapositions and not mestizaje as understood by the cultural mixing of Indigenous and Spanish. Zea explains the identity of the Mestize by stating that, in Latin America, there is a

> Culture arising from the union, but not from assimilation of the culture of those people (Indigenous and Spanish). A culture with contrasting expressions . . . far from mixing, from assimilating, they [Indigenous and Spanish components] have become

juxtaposed. Juxtaposition of what is supposedly superior over what is considered inferior. (1977, cited in Vergara Estévez & Jorge Vergara del Solar, 2002, p. 88)

In this way, people in Latin America end up colonizing each other (Soria Choque, 2009, pp. 88–9), giving birth to colonization without colonies. Colonization without colonies can be partly attributed to the concept of divide and conquer, used as a tool of colonization (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012). The divisions amongst Mestizes, Quechua and Spaniards favour the elite groups within Latin America as well as countries in the Global North.

There is an established hierarchy of power based on the various levels of mestizaje and elite populations that followed the structures put in place during the colonial years. In this way, the identity of Mestize embodies an ideology of the nation-state and an ideology of mestizaje as it will be discussed in the next section. As I elaborate on the challenges encapsulated by mestizaje, it is important to keep in mind that Indigenous communities in Latin America have experienced so much struggle throughout history that they are also resilient and resourceful in the face of adversity (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012).

History of Mestizaje

The Mestize population increased towards the end of the Spanish colonial period in the 1830s and formed a culture of their own (Rodríguez Garcia, 2011, p. 147-148). According to De La Cadena (2005), the process of mestizaje was used by organized religion and the Enlightenment era institutions to maintain colonization (p. 262). During colonization, Christianity was used to support the superiority of Spaniards. It was believed that, as Indigenous Peoples became more religious, specifically Christian, in South America, they became purified from the Indigenous race and corruption. Under these beliefs, the fewer Indigenous roots people had, the purer they were considered. Mixtures with Spanish heritage ranked higher than some

pure lineage Indigenous Peoples; in effect, a noble Inka woman who married a Spaniard and increased her status that way, ranked higher than an Indigenous woman with a pure lineage but who was not married to a Spaniard.

In contrast, some Spanish people argued that Mestizes were corrupted by nature, symbolizing the disturbance of the "social order by mixing or intermingling with individuals outside of one's categorical status" (De La Cadena, 2005, p. 266). In this view, the impurity in the Mestize stemmed from their refusal to keep to their pure heritage, which they exchanged for rights that they would not have otherwise enjoyed if they claimed pure Indigenous ancestry (p. 267). It was thought that religion could bring pureness to the impurity of the Mestize race because Christianity brought about purification.

The other influence on mestizaje came later with the Enlightenment era. This was based on the idea of "scientific reason" that still persists (De La Cadena, 2005, p. 262). According to Enlightenment views, educating Indigenous Peoples would make them more civilized since Indigenous knowledge had little to no value. Some Indigenous intellectuals have opted to silence their Indigenous identity to recover dignity and move away from discrimination, as Indigeneity is viewed as subaltern. From a position of claiming a Mestize identity, they have been able to engage with their Indigenous roots, which are so devalued under their Indigenous identities (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 344).

De la Cadena (2004) expands on the influence of education on the Mestize identity. In the 1930s, there was an increased rejection of race as a biological phenomenon and a move to connect it to culture instead. However, this did not result in less discrimination as Europeans imposed a cultural hierarchy as well. Culture in Latin America was linked to tradition; tradition was seen as something opposite to education. In this way, people from Peru that were educated

did not go through the scrutiny of being classified based on their race. In their case, they were "whitened" as their identity was mainly linked to their "knowledge" (Frankenberg, 1993, Williams, 1989, in De la Cadena, 2004, p. 46). According to De la Cadena, the racial Mestize category is based less on skin colour and more on class and education. Based on where they fall in this Mestize category, people are considered decent people or the opposite (2004, p. 28).

Mestizaje was shaped in the 1950s by classification types that considered Western cultures as more advanced than Latin American cultures. As a result, Indigenous Peoples were classified as farmers who lacked education. Mestizes possessed some colonial knowledge that worked in their favour. According to De la Cadena (2004), the Mestizes were categorized as coming originally from the Andes, which meant belonging to a lower social class, but they lived in the main cities and were businesspeople, which placed them in a higher class than people in the mountains. They lacked education but they had more education than the Indigenous Peoples. Still, Indigenous Peoples and Mestizes were categorized as not having the appropriate education to be a part of the educated class, thus, they were viewed as inferior. In this context, mestizaje was "the process through which Indigenous Peoples became educated and slowly acquired the urban abilities. In the process they got rid of their original culture" (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 46).

As a result of Christian religion and the Enlightenment era, Mestize are still categorized as an inferior "race." Some people from South America criticized the process of mestizaje and argued that it represented a degradation. De la Cadena (2004) explains that in Peru, just as in Mexico and Central America, the mixture of European and Indigenous roots was viewed as a "human degradation and was rejected by nature" (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 29). From a different perspective, some people viewed this mixture positively, describing Lima as a "multicolored

garden" and linking "this characteristic to the progressive nature of the city"[11] (Poole, 1997, in De la Cadena, 2004, p. 31). Under these views, mestizaje was considered the salvation for Indigenous "races." It was believed that pure races that did not carry Western heritage were underdeveloped (p. 31).

The Mestize and Indigenous identities that people adopted depended on the beliefs of dominant societies at the time and what people needed to do to survive best in that society. In this way, Mestize identities carried hybridities that had to endure the influence of Catholicism and then, the Enlightenment era, without getting rid of the first (De la Cadena, 2005, p. 263). As De La Cadena states, "Mestizes cannot be contained by the notion of empirical hybrids, a plain result of the biological or cultural 'mixture' of two (formerly discrete) entities" (2005, p. 262). The mestizaje identity is a very complex hybridity, based on the "complex notion of Mestiz[e] itself" (De La Cadena, 2005, p. 262).

Mestize Identity in the Present

De la Cadena (2004) argues that there is a national project of homogenization happening, in which everyone is identified as Mestize by the government. This is happening in other parts of Latin America as well. According to Knight (in Moreno Figueroa, 2010), racism is denied in Mexico as a political elite strategy. As Moreno Figueroa explains, the denial of racism serves to "homogenize a sense of nation in a rather complex and heterogenous society since the Revolution of 1910" (Moreno Figueora, 2010, p. 389). Mestizaje thus becomes a tool for the government to claim that there is no racism since there are no differences. In Mexico and most of Latin America, racism is denied under the Mestize umbrella and people do not see themselves as "racialized" (Moreno Figueroa, 2010, p. 388). The state has conceptualized mestizaje as being

[11] Mestizaje was prevalent in Lima.

based on “ideas of an inherent ‘racial’ superiority that normalize control, domination and exclusion of one group over others, while legitimating privilege and oppression” (Moreno Figueroa, 2010, p. 389). In this way, mestizaje is used to give out privilege to some and exclude others.

Scholars, such as Wade (2001) and Moreno Figueroa (2010), have also discussed mestizaje as an ideology that serves to uplift whiteness and oppress marginalized identities. According to Wade, mestizaje as an ideology has:

> A democratic inclusive aspect . . . which holds out the promise of improvement through race mixture for individuals and for the nation: everyone can be a candidate for mixture and hence moral and social uplifting. At the same time, of course, it is a deeply discriminatory ideology and practice, since it is based on the idea of the inferiority of Blacks and Indigenous Peoples and, in practice, of discrimination against them. (2001, p. 849)

These underlying beliefs in mestizaje uplift whiteness and the values it stands for. Moreno Figueroa (2010) explains that as people become homogenized in this mestizaje project, they are whitened as individuals and as nations (p. 390).

Although Mestize can hold a negative connotation in society, it is generally viewed as a better option than remaining of “darker skin colour.” According to Moreno Figueroa (2010), mestizaje is the process that allows for that improvement (p. 395) while still holding an “ambiguous whiteness” (p. 396). However, as De la Cadena (2004) points out, whiteness is not only about phenotype, but also about class and education (p. 14). Both Moreno Figueroa and De la Cadena argue that mestizaje proposes a “flexible inclusion” as people can become Mestizes through class and education while tolerating everyday racism. Race also intersects with gender

(Moreno Figueroa, 2010, p. 398); Indigenous cisgendered women are the victims of racism for being Indigenous, as well as sexism for identifying as women.

According to Moreno Figueroa (2010), talking about race is limited to "cultural differences" (p. 391). Moreno Figueroa explains that in Mexico, mestizaje has allowed racism to be normalized in everyday life. Racism has become unnoticed because it has "lost its explicit links with its processes of formation and has therefore gone unrecognized" (p. 389). In general, the mestizaje project ends up supporting racism as it "continues to privilege processes of whitening alongside notions of whiteness and uses the national discourse, such as a 'Mexican' identity, to cover up and render invisible processes of discrimination and social exclusion" (p. 399).

Similar to De La Cadena (2004), Moreno Figueroa (2010) discusses Mestize ideology in connection to "inclusion and belonging to the nation" (p. 388). Mestizaje has been the dominant ideology when it comes to race in countries such as Mexico (Moreno Figueroa, 2010, p. 387), as well as a political ideology that shape the national identity. Figueroa explains how mestizaje has been used "as a hegemonic political ideology, a social and racial promise of equality, and a racialized experience, or racist logic that distributes privilege and exclusion within everyday life" (p. 389). It is used by the government to homogenize race and place whiteness as a core-structure while claiming equality since everyone is racially the same. In this way, a Mestize population gives birth to the "ethnically homogenized and racially undifferentiated society" (p. 390).

In spite of these national efforts to impose mestizaje as a way of erasing other marginalized identities, mestizaje has also been reclaimed and redefined by the working classes who argue that mestizaje does not reject Indigenous culture or imply getting rid of Indigenous identities (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 16). It conveys a distance from Indigenous identities that are

specifically depicted as inferior by colonization (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 29). De la Cadena makes visible a way of being Mestize that makes space for Indigeneity (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 16): she conducted a study to better understand the Mestize identity amongst people from Cusco and her study showed the various meanings that people held for mestizaje. One of the interviewees stated that mestizaje involved the combining of Western and Andean knowledge. This process moves away from the academic process that is usually linked to regional ethnicity (p. 48). Similarly, another view acknowledged a change happening in places such as Cusco and in the rest of the country that values "education and intelligence" beyond "race" (De la Cadena, 2004, p. 48). Participants holding these beliefs also argued that there is a difference within Mestizes. According to the participants, they are no longer considered Indigenous because they are educated within dominant educational systems, but they still adhere to their cultural beliefs. De la Cadena (2004) quotes one of her study participants:

> You [De la Cadena] may say you are mestiza because of your race, we are all mestizos [mestizes] in Cuzco. Nobody is pure anymore. But some mestizos [mestizes] like us are also Indigenous, aborigines, oriundos, because of our beliefs. Others are only mestizos like you Indigenous. (p. 33)

The participant in De la Cadena's study is alluding to the fact that De la Cadena does not live by Indigenous traditions and cultures, it is not a way of life for her. In this study, the participants are also explaining that Indigeneity is seen with inferiority whereas being Mestize assumes having some education. This idea was introduced at the beginning of my thesis to operationalize the concept of Mestize with my study participants. Based on this analysis, some participants are considered Indigenous Mestizes, meaning they identify more with their Indigenous roots compared to those Mestizes who do not have a strong connection with their Indigenous roots.

In summary, I presented the shifts in mestizaje and the politics behind mestizaje. As explained earlier, there is a movement that is trying to show a different side of mestizaje, one that is not manipulated by the state, where people are Mestizes but still want to be linked to their Indigenous roots and are trying to reclaim their Indigeneity while they are also Mestizes. This identity is referred to as Indigenous Mestizes by de la Cadena (2004). On the other hand, in many spaces, mestizaje is still seen as either a superior or an inferior ethnicity. It carries some privileges depending on what kind of Mestize someone is. People who are Mestize and well-educated in Western knowledge may be able to enjoy more privileges than Indigenous Peoples who do not hold these forms of knowledge. There is also the idea that one can become Mestize by becoming more educated in Western knowledge and living in the larger cities. Overall, the state uses mestizaje as a way of homogenizing the population to form one nation. In this way racism can be made invisible and the state can keep its inherently racist structures and maintain control. In the next section, I will expand on how colonization continues today through a coloniality of power.

Coloniality of Power in Latin America

As explained earlier, according to Quijano (2007, colonial power means that:

> In spite of the fact that political colonialism has been eliminated, the relationship between the European also called 'Western' culture, and the others, continues to be one of colonial domination...we have also to do with a colonization of the other cultures, albeit in differing intensities and depths. This relationship consists, in the first place, of a colonization of the imagination of the dominated; that is, it acts in the interior of that imagination, in a sense, it is a part of it (p. 169).

In this manner, colonial power works in various ways beyond those described by traditional forms of colonialism to assert power. Expanding on the above definition of colonial power, Mignolo (2009) explains that today we see a coloniality of power in Latin America, colonialism carried out under the disguise of modernity. Mignolo argues that modernity, although it does not present as such, encompasses coloniality. There is a modernity discourse that continues to shift between "salvation, progress, development and happiness" (2009, p. 49), created by "agents and institutions" made up of Western Europeans (2009, p. 49). Western values and ideals continue to be acted out in non-European worlds even after colonization (Mignolo, 2009, p. 39). Giddens (1991) identifies two components in modernity: the nation-state and systematic capitalist production (p. 174). The nation-state allows for control and authority over the nations. The nation-state assumes that all the nations are homogenous, so it is easier to control them. A systematic capitalist production allows for "control of economy grounded on the historical foundation of imperial Europe" (Mignolo, 2009, p. 44). Furthermore, as modernity is globally expanded, it relies on "global colonialities" (Mignolo, 2009, p. 39).

The coloniality of power is imposed on Indigenous Peoples, including Mestize populations and other marginalized peoples in Latin America. One strategy used to impose the coloniality of power is through the colonization of the mind. As mentioned above, after the independence of Latin America during the 1830s, most of the colonizers left, however, the colonial structures that taught Indigenous Peoples to believe in their inferiority remained, leading to the continued support of these beliefs through what has sometimes been referred to as "colonial mentalities" (Quijano, 2014, p. 788; Soria Choque, 2009, p. 88). For example, colonial mentality structures the state, which continues to criticize Indigenous roots and force the assimilation of its people (Thorp & Paredes, 2011, p. 136). At the same time, the state continues

to form a colonial mentality with its supporters who may be Mestizes, elite Peruvians, or white people living in Peru. In this way, colonial power leads to inequities and violences that shape who people are, how they understand themselves and one another and how they understand the world. In response to the coloniality of power, Quijano (2014) discusses de/coloniality based on the concept of “Good Living” (p. 847). I will not involve the concept of decoloniality when discussing decolonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people since decoloniality as discussed by Quijano originated from the context in the South and it differs from the concept of decolonization. I engage with decolonization as it is defined and used in North America. However, I will still discuss what de/coloniality is as per Quijano’s definition to give an idea of the ways of thinking and philosophies discussed to combat the colonial powers mentioned above.

According to Quijano (2014), decoloniality is discussed in terms of the concept “Good Living” (this is a Quechua concept, “sumak kawsay”). “Good Living”:

> can only be a complexity of social practices oriented to the democratic production and reproduction of a democratic society. This is another mode of social existence, with its specific historical context, radically different to the Global Coloniality of Power. “Good Living,” today, can only make sense as an alternative social existence, as a De/Coloniality of Power” (pp. 847–848).

From this perspective, since coloniality of power extends globally, decoloniality is a matter that needs to be addressed at a global level (Quijano, 2014, pp. 856–7). Based on the concept of Good Living, developing the de/coloniality of power would involve practices based on:

a. the social equality among heterogeneous and diverse individuals against the unequal racial/sexual/social classification and identification within the world population;

b. therefore, neither differences nor identities would be the basis or argument for social inequality among individuals;

c. group affiliations, belonging and identities would be products of the free and autonomous choices of individuals;

d. reciprocity among socially equal groups and individuals in work organization and product distribution;

e. the equal redistribution of the world's resources and products, tangible and intangible, of the world, among the world population;

f. the trend of communal associations within the global population, whether on a local, regional or global scale, as the means of direct production and management of collective authority and, in that sense, the most effective distribution and redistribution of rights, obligations, responsibilities, resources, and products among groups and individuals. (Quijano, 2014, p. 857)

Quijano offers these strategies at the local and global levels to address the coloniality of power. Because Quijano advocates for decoloniality at a global level, it could certainly be argued that solidarity works with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples fall within the Good Living he discusses, but my focus in my research interviews was decolonization as defined by First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples.

Quijano’s (2014) definition of decoloniality relates to Coulthard's (2014) concept of Resurgence. Quijano (2014) argues that under decoloniality, Indigenous Peoples should have the freedom to decide on their identities without others imposing these criteria. This concept is similar to Coulthard's (2014) views, which argue that Indigenous communities should be responsible for developing their own Indigenous identities and cultures instead of having

dominant societies take over these matters. Furthermore, Quijano (2014) states that Indigenous communities at the local and global level can collaborate and organize through communal associations. Similarly, Coulthard (2014) claims that a resurgence of culture can empower Indigenous Peoples. Thus, Indigenous people worldwide could use their cultural teachings and knowledge to govern themselves and each other through a collective authority. However, under the present colonial settings in Latin America, other mechanisms such as neoliberalism exert their hegemonic power.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is another mechanism supporting the coloniality of power present in Latin American societies and it plays a key role in the future and identities of Quechua peoples. In Altamirano-Jiménez's (2013) view, neoliberalism is powerful today because the market is the most important aspect of society transforming practices and ways of living in the world (p. 5, p. 75). The market has taken over the previously central role played by the Catholic Church and the European-derived legal and education systems, which also coincided with the early impositions of capitalism. In Central America, neoliberalism has a negative impact through decentralization and the decrease of state involvement in the trade market. However, Altamirano-Jiménez (2013) explains that neoliberalism is more complicated than that: "neoliberalism has usually been treated exclusively as an economic project involving deregulation, privatization, individualization, and transformation of the state-citizen relationship" (p. 5), but "the recognition of cultural difference and the 'compensatory measure' of granting collective rights to 'disadvantaged' social groups are integral to neoliberalism" (p. 70). As it supports "cultural difference" and grants "compensatory rights to "disadvantaged" people, neoliberalism appears to support basic human rights and the development of collective communities (Altamirano-

Jiménez, 2013, p. 70). Altamirano-Jiménez explains how neoliberal politics strategically respond to vulnerable groups such as Indigenous Peoples (2013, p. 88). This is a neoliberal tactic that allows it to garner support and approval as an ideology. These moves translate to more freedom to manipulate the market. Indeed, neoliberalism has become the contemporary form of global colonization (Altamirano-Jiménez, 2013, p. 209).

Hale (2005) conducted a study of neoliberalism in Central America to see the effects of its shift towards a "limited recognition of cultural rights, the strengthening of civil society and endorsement of the principle of intercultural equality" (p. 11). Hale claims that neoliberalism also supports rights granted to "disadvantaged cultural groups" (p. 12) for the oppression that they experience. Hale uses the term *neoliberal multiculturalism* to refer to the relationship between "these new cultural rights and neoliberal political economic reforms" (p. 12). According to Hale, there is a move from assimilation that was pushed more through mestizaje to accepting and recognizing cultural differences (p. 13). However, the recognition that takes place is still controlled by "multilateral institutions" (p. 13) as opposed to the people involved. Therefore, these shifts end up benefiting neoliberalism as people become less oppositional to its ideologies, and sometimes, even turn into its supporters.

Altamirano-Jiménez' (2013) analysis of neoliberalism applies to the situation in which Quechua populations live. For example, in countries such as Peru, their governance is based on neoliberal ideologies that provide minimal regulations for transnational mining corporations, including Canadian companies. Canadian mining companies benefit tremendously from "trade agreements [that offer companies] very strong protections . . ." (Bulowski, 2022, n.p.). Canadian mining companies take advantage of these protections. For example, they may: "sue developing countries for environmental policies that affect their profitability and often win huge payouts"

(Bulowski, 2022, n.p.). Indigenous Peoples have minimal rights and protections in this arrangement. For example, when corporations force Quechua people to relocate, they also have to help them in their relocation process and cause the least disruption possible to their lives (Eckhardt et al., 2009). These relocations and the standard for "least disruption possible" are based on neoliberal politics and fail to account for Quechua worldviews and the connection of Quechua identities to land and culture (Bury, 2007, pp. 31-33).

A few scholars (Bury, 2007; Peredo Beltrán, 2004; Romero & Vera Colina, 2014; Soria Choque, 2009;) elaborate on the role of neoliberalism in the weakening of Indigenous identities, in particular Quechuas and Aymara populations in South America. Often neoliberalism forces Indigenous Peoples to move from rural to urban locations where there are fewer Indigenous people and higher numbers of Mestizes[12] (Peredo Beltrán, 2004; Romero &Vera Colina, 2014; Soria Choque, 2009). Soria Choque (2009) argues that Quechua people are constantly placed in conflicting situations where they have to decide whether to accept and adapt to the changes in their places of residence caused by transnational companies, which may contradict their Indigenous identities, or to migrate. The stress that these constant negotiations of identities cause, together with the disconnection from their traditional lands, may lead to a fragmented sense of self (Soria Choque, 2009, p. 85).

As it is argued by Goeman, land is much more than "a location that accumulates history" (Goeman, 2008, p. 24), it is what makes up culture. Yupiaq scholar Oscar Kawagley states that, "we know that Mother Nature has a culture, and it is a Native culture" (2010, p. xiii). This is

[12] In this context, Mestize describes the union of the Spanish and the Quechua people. However, there is a distinction between Indigenous and Mestize made here to recognize that there are different pressures, privileges and disadvantages that they experience. For example, Mestize may have the benefit of having European heritage and, therefore, not be discriminated against as much as people with stronger Indigenous roots do. Still, they may not escape the discrimination they are subject to by whiter populations depending on their skin colour and how much they can pass as mixed and white and hide their Indigenous roots.

partly why Tuck and Yang (2012) highlight the importance of speaking about lands when we talk about decolonization (Tuck and Yang, 2012, p. 19). When people are dispossessed, besides losing wealth, they are having their culture and identity altered. Gilmore (2002) and Tuck and Mckenzie (2014) discuss how identity, culture and land are connected to the displacement of lands. Indigenous Peoples are displaced based on this concept of difference and the hierarchies within it based on which difference one embodies (Gilmore, 2002, p. 16; Tuck and Mckenzie, 2014, p. 32). Certain differences are characterized as non-human and deserving of less and thereby are dispossessed of their lands (Gilmore, 2002, p. 16).

Transnational and multinational companies engage in the dispossession of Indigenous lands. For example, As LaDuke (1999) explains, Indigenous Peoples are forced to become dependent on transnational companies for survival while transnational companies take advantage of Indigenous lands and their raw materials to expand production. As transnational companies work towards development and production, in the process, they end up violating and taking away the lands of Indigenous Peoples and their right to govern themselves (LaDuke, 1999, p. 30). In response to some of these land dispossessions, some transnational Indigenous communities across the Americas have joined forces to keep their cultures alive (I expand on this point further in the next section). For example, Kearney (2000) discusses his work with transnational Indigenous migrants to keep their Indigenous identity after they migrate to the US. Their efforts to keep their Indigenous identity has helped them unite and fight to gain “human and labor rights among Indigenous Mexican migrants laboring outside their traditional homelands” (Rivera-Salgado, 2014, p. 29). Kearney (2000) discusses the political work of Oaxacans: “they construct novel forms of political organization and elaborate cultural expressions of themselves as Indigenous Peoples that are distinct from the standard definitions and expressions of Indigenous

identity in Mexico" (pp. 174–175).[13] Similar to Kearney (2000), Rivera-Salgado (2014) points out how Mixtec transnational migrants maintain their relationship to their homelands after they migrate to other lands (p. 30).

As I describe the ways Indigenous identities have been shaped by historical and contemporary trends, these processes may appear to happen as a linear sequence of events. Rivera Cusicanqui (2012) argues that Indigenous worldviews do not support a view of history that follows this idea of 'pre- and post-contact.' Instead, it follows a spiral model where the past, present and future are intrinsically connected. Indigenous Peoples "move and cycle and spiral and set out in a course without neglecting to return to the same point" (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012, p. 96). They may experience life in the present but are also guided by the past and "the seeds of the future" that originate from the past (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012, p. 96). Within this concept of time, Indigenous identity may be affected by what is happening in the present as well as the past through blood memory,[14] and may also be affected by the future, through revelations of what may come. With this understanding of Quechua worldviews and the factors influencing the Indigenous and Mestize identities, I turn the discussion to Quechua (including Mestize) immigrants living in Canada.

Immigrant Identities

Large-scale immigration of people from Latin America to Canada is fairly recent (Bonnici & Bayley, 2010), only starting in the 1960s (Mata, 2021, p. 4). The immigration wave

[13] In this context, transnationalism is "the process by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement . . . phenomena such as migration, commerce, and communication … cross national borders" (Rivera-Salgado, 2014, p. 30).

[14] "Indigenous elders often say that memory is in the blood and bone, that our stories are passed not just verbally but through a kind of genetic memory." (Deerchild, 2015, n.p.). I learned about this term when learning about First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples, but it is also used in South America in reference to Indigenous populations (Manríquez & Sánchez, 2003).

involving Quechua people, identified as the Andean wave, took place in the 1970s (Mata, 2021, p. 5), and consisted of Colombian, Ecuadorian and Peruvian immigrants. More specific demographic information on Quechua people is missing, as they are usually grouped under the Latine umbrella by the Canadian government. Immigrant identities of Quechua peoples in the lands now known as Canada are shaped by the process of othering, the exaltation of nationals,[15] and borders. Ahmed (2000; 2010; 2013) and Thobani (2007) analyze the immigrant identities of racialized people living in North America and Western countries. Ahmed is a key theorist in analyzing the immigrant identity as the Other. In this context, the Other refers to any marginalized group who is perceived as stranger or alien and who has also taken on that identity (Ahmed, 2000, p. 21). They are fetishized for their characteristics that are treated as almost human but not quite (Ahmed, 2000, p. 1, 5). This almost human identity incites curiosity and longing to be in this unique position. In this way, racialized immigrants[16] become exoticized (p. 82). Ahmed discusses how the Other in its alien or stranger characterization is viewed as dangerous: "The projection of danger onto the figure of the stranger allows violence to be figured as exceptional and extraordinary – as coming from outside the protective walls of the [white citizen] home, family, community or nation" (2000, p. 36). Ahmed (2000) explains the fear of racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, as dangerous to the nation.

Ahmed (2000) argues that the alien could be allowed around humans and have a place amongst them, but as an "outsider within" (p. 3). They will always stay within the alien group

[15] Nationals or national settlers refer to non-Indigenous people with Western-European heritage. They do not see themselves as settlers and reject any responsibilities related to decolonization. They consider themselves above First Nations, Métis, Inuit Peoples, and racialized individuals (Thobani, 2007). Only a portion of white settlers hold the characteristics of nationals.

[16] I speak here of racialized immigrants as opposed to Indigenous immigrants, which is the specific population that I am working with because 'racialized immigrants' is the term Sara Ahmed uses in her discussion. Otherwise, I would refer to Indigenous immigrants specifically. The information is still relevant to my study since Indigenous immigrants are part of the racialized immigrant population.

(Ahmed, 2000). According to Ahmed's analysis, when Others or aliens are racialized immigrants, boundaries are placed to keep them at a distance from citizens (p. 13, 34). Placing boundaries around the Other immigrant keeps them distant and allows for the perpetuation of a homogenous citizen identity (p. 25). In this way, the citizen identity excludes racialized people and other Others. This homogenization and centring of the white citizen is partly enabled by racialized othering (Thobani, 2007, p. 52). From the beginning of colonial contact, Europeans created laws that "built themselves a new world and made themselves into a new people" (Thobani, 2007, p. 51). For example, they created the Indian Act which was about controlling Indigenous Peoples which gives Europeans more power over these lands now known as Canada. Through legislative acts such as this, European settlers were able to dispossess Indigenous Peoples of their lands, then newcomers who migrated within the settler-imposed legislation conformed to these acts (Ahmed, 2000, p.51).

There is also a dangerous homogenization of Others by dominant society. Ahmed (2000) argues against this homogenization and critiques views espoused by authors such as Bulent Diken (1998) who uses the word stranger to identify someone: "who is excluded from forms of belonging and identity, particularly within the context of discourses of nationhood" (p. 5). According to Diken (1998), the immigrant is referred to as an 'outsider' (p. 2) and 'stranger' (p. 26). However, there is no distinction made amongst immigrants and their experiences as strangers.[17] Ahmed claims that by erasing the differences amongst these various types of immigrants, (e.g., refugees, landed immigrants), one is disregarding the "different forms of displacement" that they experience (Ahmed, 2000, pp. 5–6).

---

[17] Diken uses the term stranger while Ahmed more often uses the term Other (and sometimes uses Other and stranger interchangeably) to discuss populations that are excluded.

Ahmed analyzes the Other identity by highlighting its uniqueness and the dangers of normalization. Although immigrants are all othered and share some traits of the Other group in one way or another, this does not make every immigrant part of the Other group. According to Ahmed, these views normalize the Others' identity. Therefore, the dangers that the Others face are taken away and placed to the side. Such normalization of the Other identity "serves to dismiss the political processes whereby some Others are designated as stranger than other Others" (Ahmed, 2000, p. 6). The normalization of the Other immigrant results in all immigrants belonging to the Other group in one way or another. This practice erases the fact that some immigrants, such as Indigenous immigrants, are discriminated against more than other immigrants.

In contrast to the Other identity of immigrants is the national identity. Thobani (2007) describes the discrimination of the Other by nationals. The national's power is naturalized and exercised in various realms based on "inherently superior qualities of national subjects" (p. 9). In this process, immigrants no longer belong to their place of origin nor are they part of their new place of residence (Ahmed, 2000, p. 5).

Factors shaping the immigrant identity of Indigenous people include feelings of compassion from non-racialized immigrants and structural racism. For example, non-racialized immigrants may feel compelled to 'help' racialized immigrants and refugees, including Indigenous immigrants,[18] and engage in acts of compassion and giving (Government of Canada, 2017, n.p.). Acts of kindness towards the Other may help more privileged people feel good about themselves because they are doing the "right thing" as responsible beings. However, in the

[18] Non-racialized immigrants may not recognize that there are Indigenous immigrants amongst racialized immigrants. When using the literature to discuss this topic, I use 'racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants,' because the literature rarely mentions Indigenous immigrants specifically.

process, they may contribute to structural racism and the oppressive structures that serve to marginalize vulnerable populations. For example, they may engage in "trespasses," a term used by Orlie (1997, p. 23) to mean:

> harm brought to others by our participation in the governing ways of envisioning and making the world. . . . Trespassers are not the active hands-on instruments of wrongdoing, but the "responsible," well-behaved predictable subjects of social order who reinforce and extend its patterns of rule. (p. 23 in Rossiter, 2001, p. 1)

By engaging in acts of compassion, the privileged individual is gratified while the oppressive structures that contribute to the formation of the Others are left unaddressed (Rossiter, 2001, pp. 2–4). For example, the "kindness" in the help offered to racialized immigrants by non-racialized people becomes questionable if we consider the benefits Westernized societies receive from the exploitation of Indigenous Peoples overseas and within these lands now known as Canada (Altamirano-Jiménez, 2013; Canadian Council for Refugees, 2016). In this way, the status quo that allows for the discrimination of Indigenous immigrants continues and is maintained by non-racialized immigrants. The status quo is supported by two "levels" of reality. Kindness may well be the intention or the earnestly believed experience on an individual level. However, on a structural level, we can see the complicity and violence. These are some of the complexities shaping Indigenous immigrant identities.

The combined identity of the Indigenous and Latine immigrant has been researched in the US. According to Blackwell et al. (2017), Indigenous immigrants from Mexico and Central America experience intra-Latine racism once they move to the US (p. 129). Perez-Frausto (2012), Reierson (2007) and Rensink (2010) have conducted studies involving Maya, Zapotec and Nahuatl communities in the US. The studies focused on how these populations try to

maintain their Indigenous roots, including Indigenous languages. Interview data from these qualitative studies found that Indigenous Latine immigrants attempt to keep close to their cultural roots through frequent visits to their countries of origin, speaking their Indigenous languages and continuing their cultural practices, and they use Indigenous teachings to overcome the discrimination experienced as immigrants (Perez-Frausto, 2012, pp. 106–107, 112, 123; Reierson, 2007, pp. 109–10)

Blackwell et al. (2017) and Urrieta Jr. (2016) have also studied the Indigenous immigrant identity in the US and argued that through the immigration process, the Indigenous identities of immigrants from Latin America are in danger of eroding and becoming invisible. According to Blackwell et al. (2017): "Indigenous education initiatives by nation states such as bilingual education, multi/inter/pluricultural education often function under neoliberal multicultural processes, where Native and Indigenous People[s] [migrating from other parts of the world] are culturally minimally recognized" (p. 170). The results of these studies also apply to the experiences of Indigenous Latine populations in Canada (Bonnici & Bayley, 2010).

For the Quechua immigrant population in these lands now known as Canada, their Indigenous and immigrant identities may interact in a few ways. As stated earlier, the Indigenous identity of Quechua people is complex due to systemic discrimination and internalized hatred towards Indigenous heritage established through colonization (Molinari Morales, 2008; Vergara Estévez & Vergara del Solar, 2002). This internalized hatred often leads to a divide within Quechua populations in their countries of origin in the form of people with mixed Quechua roots discriminating against people with more Indigenous Quechua roots or white Latin American people discriminating against Indigenous populations (Soria Choque, 2009, p. 93). According to Blackwell et al. (2017), immigrants experience "entrenched anti-Indian hatred enacted by

Mestizes and Latines as they migrate from Southern Mexico and Central America through Mexico, as well as once they arrive in the United States" (Blackwell et al., p. 127). It has been shown that Indigenous immigrants from Latin America also experience these divides when they migrate to Canada (Cahuas, 2020, p. 213). Divides based on anti-Indigenous hatred could be partly due to the forced homogeneity that occurs with the Latin label imposed on Latin American people by the state or other racialized people themselves: "at times 'Latin[e] or other forms of cultural expression can be exclusionary to Indigenous, Black and transgender people from Latin America" (Cahuas, 2020, p. 213).

In response to this assumed homogeneity amongst Latin American people, the LAHC (Latin America History Collective in Toronto) has asked for the state and dominant Canadian society to pay attention to the various identities of people coming from Latin America and to bring visibility to Indigenous and Black identities from Latin America (Cahuas, 2020, p. 223). People from Latin America have raised their voices to call out the injustices that Indigenous Peoples from Latin America experience as "Indigenous, Afro-Latine, migrant and racialized first- and second-generation Latin[e] peoples…[the] internalized racism and historical amnesia within Latin American communities" in Canadian society (p. 221). The discrimination that Indigenous immigrants experience from other immigrants from Latin America can influence their connection to their Indigenous heritage.

It has been observed that there is a lack of discussion of Indigenous identities by people from Latin America, including people that claim an (or self-identify as) Indigenous identity (Arraiz Matute, 2018). Arraiz Matute made this observation during a program she offered to people from Latin America at the Working Women Center in Toronto. Arraiz Matute noted that they:

> "avoided talking about race or tended to defer to ethnic categories (Latina/o/x, Hispanic, Spanish), or national ones (Salvadorian) instead of racial ones. In addition, the focus of their narratives was often on their family's experiences of migration, or discrimination by the Canadian Anglo-white mainstream; but there was no mention of Indigenous lands or Indigeneity in their stories. These silences provoked Alexandra [Arraiz Matute]'s interest in questions of identity and Indigeneity among settlers of colour in Canada" (Arraiz Matute, 2018, in Arraiz Matute & Elgueta, 2019, p. 56).

These observations led her to design another program that provided a space for participants to "make connections to their own heritage, complicate notions of latinidad and mestizaje" (Arraiz Matute & Elgueta, 2019, p. 66). The program participants discussed the discrimination they faced back home and how it impacted their Indigeneity once they migrate to Canada.

Cahuas and Arraiz Matute (2020) also discuss the discrimination against Indigenous identities after migration within Latin American communities. Beliefs such as that mestizaje means "improving the race" are promoted back home and transferred to Canada: "when migrants from Latin America arrive to the U.S. or Canada, they bring these understandings of race and racial hierarchy" (Cahuas & Arraiz Matute, p. 272).

Similarly, Julia Gómez Ixmatá (2015), who is Maya K'ichee' from Nahualá, Guatemala, discusses the discrimination she faces from the Latin American community living in the North for being Indigenous:

> They [Latin American people living in North America] know that I am not Latina or Hispanic when they criticize the imperfections of the Spanish that I speak. They knew it, when such criticisms don't offend me, and they knew it when I taught them the Indigenous history of the Spanish language of America. They know I'm not Latina when

they ask me if I come from Otavalo, Oaxaca, or San Juan Chamula. And they know it when they say that I should not learn English, but Spanish. (2015, p. 2)

Gómez Ixmatá's (2015) testimony illustrates various forms of discrimination that Indigenous immigrants experience from Latin American immigrants.

My research draws on previous research that bring to light the inter-group racism among the diaspora from Latin America. As I demonstrate in Chapter 5, the participants in my study also noted a similar experience of stereotypes and discrimination due to their Indigenous identity from people from Latin America living in Canada. This research contributes to a deeper understanding of how Indigenous identities are consistently shaped and shifted by transnational politics of migration, race and colonialism.

From Mignolo's (2009) perspective, the colonized mentality amongst colonized people persists. Besides examining the Indigenous and immigrant identities of Quechua immigrants, an examination of their settler identity is needed in order to understand their stance on the colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. However, there is very limited information of the settler identity of Indigenous immigrants.

Settler Identities

There are few studies that specifically examine the settler status of racialized immigrants, and even fewer that focus on Indigenous immigrants. For this reason, in discussing this topic, I rely mainly on literature that addresses racialized immigrants in general. As discussed in the results chapters, First Nations, Métis and Inuit scholars note that immigrants perpetuate the colonization of Indigenous Peoples by remaining silent in the face of injustices committed towards them, ignoring the problems First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations are facing, and at times actively supporting discriminatory acts against First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations

(Blackwell et al., 2017; Green, 2016; Kuokkanen, 2008; Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Wolfe, 2006). A step towards ending these forms of oppression involves settlers recognizing their settler identity (Regan, 2010). In the following section, I explore the context in which settler identities develop.

Context of Settler Identity

Settler identities are created in a context where colonization has led to high suicide rates amongst First Nations, Métis and Inuit youth on reserves (Government of Canada, 2013), the overrepresentation of First Nations, Métis and Inuit children in child welfare (Statistics Canada, 2016) and the overrepresentation of First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples in prisons (Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2013). These crises ripple out beyond First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities to affect society as a whole (Leenaars et al., 2007).

The settler identities of racialized immigrants are partly shaped by the ongoing legacy of narratives told and re-told by white settlers who are nationals (Thobani, 2007). Narratives of "a new people building a new land" was common among early nationals (Thobani, 2007, p.19). These beliefs conveniently eclipse that land was already 'built' before their arrival (Wolfe, 2006). In addition, nationals tend to adopt a peacemaker role in which settlers portray themselves as compassionate people "who negotiate treaties and implement Indian policy intended to bestow upon Indigenous Peoples the generous benefits or gifts of peace, order, good government, and Western education" (Regan, 2010, p. 83). Under the peacemaker role, nationals enforce and reinforce everyday mechanisms of colonization. Furthermore, by focusing on reconciliation in relation to events from the past, nationals evade the need to reconcile with what is happening today and their role in it (Regan, 2010, p. 42, p. 22). Nationals' self-portrayal as peacemakers also contributes to a positive image of themselves, which is key to maintaining their superior

position within colonization (Thobani, 2007). Morgensen (2014) has suggested that nationals try to make allies out of newcomers in order to support their goals as a white nation (n.p).

The positions that racialized settlers take in terms of the nationals' peacemaker identity is unknown. Whether or not racialized immigrants join nationals in their position as peacemaker and, in this way, mask their contributions to colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations needs to be studied further. However, Regan (2010) states that settlers in general tend to take on a neutral position on Indigenous-settler relations (p. 235). By assuming neutrality, racialized settlers absolve themselves of their role in the colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (Dhamoon, 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Hence, as nationals ignore the violence within Indigenous-settler relations and keep their peacemaker identity, racialized immigrants who seek their support in their settlement in Canada may be unaware of — or perhaps sometimes intentionally avoid — these discussions. In summary, the beliefs that Canada is a new nation built by settlers, that nationals are peacemakers and that Canada helps Indigenous Peoples, erases the injustices and atrocities against First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations committed during the ongoing colonial project. These discourses of colonization feed into the settler identities of Indigenous settlers.

Complexities of Settler Identity

In an effort to understand the position of Indigenous settlers on settler colonialism, I start with the privileged position as a settler in lands now known as Canada given to racialized people, as compared to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (Green, 2016; Tuck & Yang, 2012). This positioning from a place of privilege is intentional as Tuck and Yang (2012) argue that racialized immigrants take on a colonized/oppressed position without acknowledging their colonizer/oppressor position, thereby contributing to the perpetuation of colonization (p. 10). In

other words, due to binary models of colonizer/colonized, racialized immigrants do not consider themselves nationals or identify as part of the oppressor group; instead, they identify with the 'Other' who is oppressed. They do not recognize their own complicity in the ongoing colonization of these lands and inadvertently become part of the oppressor group this way (Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Bishop (1994) elaborates on the co-existing identities of colonized and colonizer by identifying them as part of the same system. Racialized settlers are oppressed at the hands of national settlers and may internalize these oppressive experiences, resulting in feelings of helplessness, hurt and worthlessness (Bishop, 1994). Racialized immigrants can manifest these painful emotions by seeking to gain power within existing systems of inequity and violence, and hence participate in the oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (Bishop, 1994, p. 57). Meanwhile the oppressive structures are left unchallenged.

As discussed above, Arraiz Matute and Elgueta (2019) examined the tensions that arose when Indigenous immigrants examined their implication in settler colonialism. They state: "Given participants' social locations, their identification as "other" from the Anglo, white, Canadian norm; there was a tension with thinking of themselves as implicated in the oppression of others" (Arraiz Matute & Elgueta, 2019, p. 63). They looked at the processes of immigration and their connection with Indigeneity, either as an Indigenous or Mestiza person or because Indigeneity is a major part of their homelands. Arraiz Matute and Elgueta (2019) examined how these components:

> came into tension with the Canadian state – such as in the process of seeking documentation to remain in Canada, applying for permanent residency or even citizenship. We [researchers] did not aim to resolve the tensions and contradictions

within one workshop, but in opening up the conversation, we tried to make the implicit more visible within the group. (p. 63)

Some of their findings pointed to how people struggled with their Indigenous identities and their lives as immigrants in Canada. Having deeper conversations about these areas helped them to empathize with the struggles of Indigenous Peoples from these lands and have a better understanding of their complex position as "settlers of colours" (p. 67).

Understanding the complexities of the settler identity of Indigenous immigrants involves considering the various identities they embody. At times, Indigenous settlers might align themselves with Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada based on their resonant shared experiences with oppression without being aware that Indigenous Peoples in Canada continue to be affected by colonization. At other times, Indigenous settlers might distance themselves from the struggles of Indigenous Peoples. Bishop (1994) explains the challenges in moving away from colonizing practices. These challenges stem from "the system [which] teaches people to not be able to identify with the oppressed . . . to make it impersonal which again makes it possible" (p. 92). For instance, the state perpetuates negative stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples as opposed to adequately educating non-Indigenous people about Indigenous Peoples, their histories and their contemporary realities. As explained in the next chapters, although there is a shift in education about Indigenous cultures, the education system continues to minimize the extent and pervasive consequences of colonization. Similarly, immigration programs that prepare people for their citizenship exam offer information about First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations that is very limited. Therefore, structures of colonization such as academia and immigration can prevent Indigenous immigrants from identifying or learning about

the pervasive effects of colonization. Consequently, these systems that continue to support colonization maintain the ongoing colonizing acts and complicity of Indigenous immigrants.

I have discussed the Indigenous and immigrant identities of Quechua people to gain a better understanding of their settler identity in Canada. Since there is very limited information on the settler identity of Indigenous settlers, I have focused on the context in which this settler identity develops, including the transitions they experience through immigration. I utilize this information to examine methods that appropriately support the collaboration of Quechua immigrants with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (Davis 2010; Thobani, 2007; Waters, 2010). Collaboration refers to decolonization projects that support First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. In the following section, I examine some of the contributing factors to the potential collaboration of Quechuas with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. With this aim in mind, I analyze the mechanisms supporting settler colonization and its impact on First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations.

Settler Colonial Mechanisms and the Impact on Indigenous Peoples in Canada

Settler colonization is the root cause of oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. Tuck and Yang (2012) analyze the way settler colonization operates in North America (excluding Mexico). Tuck and Yang suggest that settler colonization works through "triad structures" (2012, p.1), which are composed of three groups exercising unequal power and domination in their relationships with each other. The triad set is a way of understanding these relationships in the past and present. It helps to explain the unequal power in settler colonial relationships, which violates all principles of relationship development encouraged by Indigenous worldviews. Although there is a common belief amongst non-Indigenous people that these kinds of settler colonial relationships are a part of an outrageous past, King (2003) reminds

non-Indigenous people that they are part of the past and a present that keeps on repeating itself. King calls on people to reflect on and learn from the history of settler colonization so that ongoing colonial power imbalances do not continue.

Wolfe (2006) identifies one triad that helps maintain settler colonization in the US: Indigenous land, Black labour and white settlers. Wolfe explains that enslaved Black people increased the riches of their owners and therefore their reproduction was beneficial to white people and societies. Anyone with any African heritage was declared Black and was enslaved. However, the reproduction of Native American people meant more resistance to land appropriation, which threatened the wealth of white settlers. Therefore, the colonial government introduced very “restrictive racial classification” (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388) systems that limited who could be legally recognized as Native American. Settler colonization relied on European domination of the land and people. Although there were places where Indigenous sovereignty was recognized, Europeans held the “ultimate dominion over the territory” (Wolfe, 2006, p. 391) by invoking the designation of terra nullius (Wolfe, 2006). The doctrine of terra nullius was used to justify the dispossession of Indigenous lands and is based on the principle that if “there’s no people here, it’s ours” (Watson, 2014, p. 509). Although international human rights law has “condemned doctrines of superiority,” (Assembly of First Nations, 2018, p. 1), they are still part of Canadian law. Doctrines of discovery and terra nullius have been used to abolish Indigenous rights throughout history (Assembly of First Nations, 2018, p.2). These doctrines continue to be used in judicial rulings: “As recently as 2012, the BC Court of Appeal not only validated such destructive acts but also attempted to extinguish Indigenous rights through judicial ruling” (Assembly of First Nations, 2018, p.3).

Tuck (2016) also discuss the complex structures that allowed settler colonization to happen through the settler-native-slave triad, clarifying that in settler colonization, Settler-Indigenous-Chattel Slave "are not analogs. They are not uniform units that are just a little different from each other. Indigeneity precedes and supersedes settler colonization, chattel slavery is not an identity – is not a stand in for blackness" (Tuck, 2016, n.p.). Tuck shares that in the triad set of Black people, settlers and Indigenous Peoples, Black people are positioned as a source of exploited labour. However, "this singular analysis both obscures the issue of black fungibility and reduces blackness to a mere tool of settlement . . . rather than a constitutive element of settler colonization" (Tuck, 2016). Tuck argues that simplistic views on the position of Black people in these triad sets downplay the suffering that Black people have experienced. Similar to Tuck's (2016) argument, Wilderson (2010) highlights the deeply rooted violence enacted against Black people. The Slave is not a "laborer but an anti-Human, a position against which Humanity establishes, maintains, and renews its coherence, its corporeal integrity" (Wilderson, 2010, p. 11). Tuck explains that this triad set is one of many such sets that maintain settler colonialism.

Furthermore, Tuck and Yang's (2012) analysis on the mechanisms of settler colonization identifies the 'efforts' of non-Indigenous[19] people engaging in social justice projects as one form of colonization. Tuck and Yang explain that as settlers fight for their social justice projects, their desires are: "entangled in resettlement, reoccupation, re-habitation that actually further settler colonization" (2012, p. 1). Indigenous Peoples in the North are combating colonization by

[19] Indigenous/non-Indigenous are terms used by Tuck and Yang (2012) to specifically designate Indigenous Peoples from North America, excluding Mexico. In this context, non-Indigenous means everyone outside of these parameters, unless stated otherwise.

engaging in decolonization as “the repatriation of Indigenous land and life” (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p.1) which is foreign and incommensurable (Tuck & Yang, 2012) to social justice.

Based on Tuck and Yang’s (2012) model, the triad set that I am starting to address in this dissertation is that of Indigenous settlers, First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and white settlers. I am specifically exploring this triad set in relation to Indigenous settlers from South America, rather than any settler who identifies as Indigenous. I recognize that this is exclusive of non-Indigenous racialized setters, including Black people, but it is meant to be one of many triad sets used to study particular relations. Under this triad set, the structural forces established by white settlers continue to feed the colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, as well as establish processes that keep Indigenous settlers marginalized (Thobani, 2007). Simultaneously, I propose that the structures of white settler colonization work to keep a distance between Indigenous immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (based on Thobani’s discussion of racialized immigrants) and most white settlers may be actively participating in these divisions individually or may be complicit in the structures of white settler colonization that do this work. Furthermore, Indigenous immigrants cooperate with the colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations through complicity or denial of their settler identities and responsibilities that come with these identities (Tuck & Yang, 2012). I elaborate on this triad set based on the results of my interviews in the last chapter. In my concluding chapter, I used this triad set to address Chickasaw scholar Byrd’s (2011) question: “how do arrivants[20] . . . forced to move through empire use Indigeneity as a transit to redress, grieve, and fill the fractures and

[20] Arrivant is used by Byrd (2011) to “signal that racialized non-natives inhabit Indigenous lands while experiencing colonial and racial subjugation, and that their accounts of their participation in colonization and their responsibilities to Indigenous decolonization call for a term distinct from white people” (Morgensen, 2014, n.p.).

ruptures created through diaspora and exclusion?" (p. 39). I also elaborate on how to use the triad set model to move forward in relations of solidarity and collaboration.

The Indigenous settler, First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and white settler triad set that I propose is meant to contribute to understanding the mechanisms present in settler colonialism and add to the knowledge of how triad sets function. In this way, we can also understand the roles of Indigenous settlers and discuss what can be done to move forward. In the following section, I expand on the effects of settler colonialism on First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations.

Effects of Settler Colonization

According to Coulthard (2014), settler colonialism has dominated First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations through a process of colonizing the mind. For example, settler colonialism has relied on mechanisms that make Indigenous youth believe in the benefits of capitalism and their inferiority to nationals; distance themselves from their Indigenous roots; and transform their minds so they no longer fit into their communities (Coulthard, 2014). All these tactics of colonization aim to cause a divide within First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultures that benefit the hegemony of nationals (Coulthard, 2014). The constant attacks[21] on the Indigenous identities of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations have forced some people to turn to a politics of recognition to re-establish the value of their identities. Under recognition politics, the state acknowledges Indigenous Peoples and their histories based on the nationals' terms (Coulthard, 2014).

In Coulthard's (2014) view, a politics of recognition only selectively recognizes certain Indigenous Peoples' histories and supports Indigenous struggles for decolonization. Recognizing Indigenous Peoples' histories and current situations shows an effort on the part of nationals to 'reconcile' with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. However, these actions help support settlers' rights in disputes with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations by painting an image of acceptance and collaboration (Coulthard, 2014). Under a politics of recognition, First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations end up existing to please and be recognized by others, particularly nationals, living under terms imposed by nationals (Coulthard, 2014).

Coulthard's (2014) argument can be linked to Bishop's (1994) views on how colonialism works by instilling fear and uncertainty in the areas that give people strength and power. In this case, the strength within Indigenous identities is constantly under attack. Connecting Bishop's and Coulthard's arguments, some First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations may choose a politics of recognition to recover the strength they attach to their Indigenous identity. Coulthard argues that, although a politics of recognition may appear less harmful than those that ignore the presence of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations in Indigenous lands altogether, the main concern of a politics of recognition is to reduce the power of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. Instead, as will be discussed in the next chapters, Coulthard proposes a model of resurgence that focuses on relying on culture and Indigenous worldviews to strengthen Indigenous communities.

Another devastating effect that settler colonialism has on Indigenous Nationhood is the disproportionately high number of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls and two-spirited people (MMIWG2S). Indigenous Peoples and families have faced numerous struggles with the criminal justice system due to the disappearance or murder of their family and community members (Karlenzig, 2021). According to the RCMP, there are "1,200 MMIWG2S

cases, but activists and families say that number is closer to 4,000 since the 1970s" (Karlenzig, 2021). After the final report of the MMIWG2S National Inquiry came out, 231 Calls for Justice followed: "they are legal imperatives and not optional. They represent important ways to end the genocide and to transform systemic and societal values that have worked to maintain colonial violence" (Karlenzig, 2021). In response to these calls for justice, families and allies are demanding that there be more action on how to address these calls and for the government not to take so long to come up with a plan of action.[22] The impact that such violence causes Indigenous Peoples is long lasting and has colonial roots. Kuokkanen (2008) explains how settler colonialism supports gendered-based violence:

> displaced from their traditional livelihoods or their communities, Indigenous women worldwide are forced to migrate to urban areas, either making them vulnerable to various forms of violence or reproducing the violent circumstances they have fled. For many women escaping poverty, violence or both, the only option is to engage in 'survival sex trade on the stroll' – a space where violence can be committed without much public attention or police investigation and where the superiority of the white masculine identity can be expressed and reinforced through and as violence. (p. 220)

In addition to the gender-based violence, there is a critique in the concept of culture loss. There is a narrative that describes a "mode of thinking, identifiable in language use, that frames Aboriginal identity in a narrative of negativity, deficiency and disempowerment" (Fforde et al., 2013 p. 162). Consequently, there is a push to abandon these beliefs and adopt an approach to culture that sees it as a strength (p. 163). MacDonald and Steenbeek (2015) propose a focus on the effects and impact of colonialism without describing Indigenous Peoples as "dysfunctional

---

[22] "Ruby Ahthnne McDonald was murdered in 1999 in Edmonton. As of yet, the Edmonton Police Service (EPS) has not charged anyone" (Narine, 2022).

and pathologic" (p. 33). Kuokkanen (2012) calls on non-Indigenous people to see what is happening to Indigenous Peoples as a result of colonization and recognize the urgency of a decolonizing project that involves individual and collective self-determination (p. 228). Later on, I examine the kind of relationships that First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and Indigenous immigrants currently tend to develop, as this is a major contributing factor to shaping the collaboration between these two groups.

Summary of Key Findings

My literature review presents an entryway into understanding the complex identities that Quechua immigrants hold as Indigenous immigrants living in foreign Indigenous lands where settler societies continue to impose violent forms of colonization. Learning more about the complexities that shape their identities in these lands now known as Canada helps to frame Quechua people's perspectives on settler colonialism and their role in it. I then presented a review of the mechanisms supporting settler colonialism and its impact on Indigenous groups.

Some of the key findings in terms of the multiple identities of Quechua people are: 1) Quechua Indigenous peoples have and continue to struggle with structural racism, transnational mining displacement, the immigration process and accepting their Indigenous roots as a result of colonization in Latin America (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012; Soria Choque, 2009). Notwithstanding this, the Indigenous roots of Quechua people also offer many teachings and ways of life that strengthen their Indigenous identities (Andean Project of Farming Technologies, 2008, p. 2; Blanco, 2008). 2) Indigenous immigrants not only face the regular obstacles that non-Indigenous racialized immigrants face, but they experience oppression based on their Indigeneity (Bautista Mamani, 2008). Furthermore, effects of colonization such as discrimination against Indigenous heritage continue as they immigrate. Little is known about how their experiences are entangled

in folk stories and connections with the cosmos to provide them guidance in their migratory and settlement journey. There are some participants that discussed their connection to nature as a way of connecting to their culture and helping them in their settlement process. 3) As immigrants, Quechua are also able to exercise considerable agency in leaving their homelands, where they were experiencing dislocation and oppression, to move to another state where their status is increased in some ways (finances, safety) but lowered in other ways (credentials are difficult to validate, discrimination, isolation). Agency helps immigrants manage the barriers of settling in a new country where they have to learn a new language, are discriminated against for being Indigenous and racialized immigrants (i.e. suffer discrimination from the dominant population for being racialized people), must leave their lives and family members behind and adjust to the various changes that comes with immigration. 4) The responsibilities of racialized immigrants (including Indigenous immigrants) towards First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations most likely go unrecognized, in part due to their marginalized position and binary thinking which does not allow them to accept that they could be simultaneously oppressed and oppressors (Thobani, 2007).

The second goal of this literature review was to analyze the mechanisms of settler colonialism. Some of the key findings are: 1) The triad set of white settler, Black people and Indigenous Peoples is one of the mechanisms that has helped establish and maintain settler colonialism. 2) Some mechanisms in settler colonialism involve nationals supporting structures that place racialized people at odds with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. 3) The effects of settler colonial mechanisms include stressors placed on First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities, family structures and cultural practices, and attacks on their identities through diminishing the value of First Nations, Métis and Inuit culture (Kuokkanen, 2008). 4) As a way

of collaborating, non-Indigenous people have engaged in a politics of recognition which attempts to recognize the experiences of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations through terms set by non-Indigenous people (Coulthard, 2014). According to Coulthard (2014), a politics of recognition continues to support the "colonial power" exercised at the beginning of colonization which sought "the dispossession of Indigenous Peoples of their lands and self-determining authority" (p. 25). At the same time, racialized people tend to engage in social justice projects that cater to the needs of racialized people and ignore the specific needs and demands of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

Indigenous immigrants are involved in a complex relationship with settler colonialism based on their settler, Indigenous and immigrant identities. Settler colonialism utilizes various groups of vulnerable people to exercise its colonial goals. A non-Indigenous group's role as an oppressed minority can enable them to distance themselves from their complicity in settler colonialism, which also serves to strengthen it. Moving forward to collaboration, there are a few already existing teachings and approaches based on Indigenous worldviews that could provide a starting point for Quechua immigrants. Starting with knowledge of Quechua identities, Indigenous-based approaches could help facilitate engagement in decolonizing collaboration by Quechua immigrants. Further analysis takes place in the following chapters. First, however, in the following chapter, I discuss the theoretical frameworks, methodologies and methods used in this study.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework, Methodology and Methods

This section elaborates on the theoretical framework, methodologies and method guiding my research. The theoretical framework is based on multiple Indigenous worldviews. I focus on Quechua worldviews, as the majority of participants I interviewed are Quechua. I also draw upon Indigenous worldviews from North America, specifically the Two Row Wampum Belt and Tuck and Mckenzie's (2014) critical place and land enquiry. I use these teachings to discuss collaboration between First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and the connection of Quechuas to these lands now known as Canada. I use an Indigenous methodology based on both Kovach's (2009) and Wilson's (2008) conceptualizations. I also combine aspects of Western methodology following Kovach's (2009) approach. Lastly, I describe the methods used for recruitment, data collection and analysis.

Indigenous knowledge is often undermined by dominant cultures. I use a decolonizing lens throughout the stages of research to address the discriminatory barriers that Indigenous knowledge faces (Kovach, 2009, p. 13). Further, the use of a decolonizing lens is critical for speaking out against the various forms of colonization discussed in this research at the individual, community and systemic levels.

Theoretical Framework

My theoretical framework acknowledges that Indigenous-settler relations are rooted in colonization. According to Kovach (2009), we need a *decolonizing* analysis to address colonization in research (p. 81). Kovach discusses decolonization in Indigenous theoretical frameworks and argues for "the integration of a decolonizing theoretical lens that positions Indigenous inquiry as resistance research" (p. 82). A decolonizing lens acknowledges the impact of colonialism within 'Western educative and research processes' where Indigenous knowledge

is viewed as less valuable than Western knowledge (Graham Smith, 1997 in Kovach, 2009, p. 18). It also examines how settler colonialism influences the experiences of Indigenous Peoples. A decolonizing lens could mean analyzing: "power differences [i.e., between settler and Indigenous Peoples from the lands now called Canada]; … it provides hope for transformation; …. [and] there is a role for both structural change and personal agency in resistance" (Kovach, 2009, p. 80). The theoretical framework used in this study is based on Indigenous worldviews.

Indigenous Worldviews

Kovach (2009) describes an Indigenous worldview as: "interactional and interrelational, broad-based, whole, inclusive, animate, cyclical, fluid, and spiritual . . . It is pragmatic and ceremonial, physical and metaphysical" (p. 56). Similarly, Baskin (2006) describes Indigenous worldviews as:

> inclusive of spirit, blood memory, respect, interconnectedness, storytelling, feelings, experiences and guidance . . . They reinforce the sense that it is perfectly acceptable and appropriate to believe that there is much that I am aware of, but that I cannot explain. (p. 1)

Indigenous worldviews involve a strong belief in the spiritual world. Principles of Indigenous worldviews, particularly Indigenous epistemologies (understandings of how knowledge comes to be), assert that it is necessary to engage in an inner journey to understand the world we live in. According to Ermine (1995), Indigenous knowledges stem from knowing what comes from the inside and outside: "the outer space is the physical world, and inner space is where metaphysical knowing resides" (p. 57). Indigenous knowledges also have a holistic nature. They include dreams, visions, the subconscious and blood memory. The interactions of these various forms and sources of knowledge and knowing make up Indigenous worldviews (Ermine, 1995, p. 57).

Overall, Indigenous knowledge refers to how we make sense of the world embedded in relationships, community practices and rituals.

There are many Indigenous Peoples within the colonial Canadian nation state and, therefore, there are many Indigenous worldviews. There are more than 630 First Nations communities in Canada, which represent more than 50 Nations and 50 Indigenous languages (Government of Canada, 2021). Although Indigenous worldviews share many aspects in common, they also differ in many aspects from community to community (Wilson, 2008). It is crucial to contextualize the sources of Indigenous knowledges, as they are shaped by the societies they are from (Lavallée, 2009, p. 22).

Indigenous worldviews from Peoples indigenous to the lands now known as Canada share an emphasis on spirit and spirituality and, in turn, a sense of community and respect for the individual (Hart, 2010; Weaver, 1997). They share a relational knowing; they are dependent on relationships and interconnections with the various components of the cosmos (Hart, 2010). Indigenous worldviews share a belief in the power of creating a shared mind with all of creation. Power is to be exercised as "power with," as opposed to "power over" (Canadian Council on Learning, 2009). According to Restoule (n.d.), Indigenous worldviews are essential because they carry teachings that "offer a counter-narrative to the story that led us to the brink of extinction. Changing the ways we relate to our natural relations offers the kind of philosophical shift needed to get off the path of assured destruction" (n.p.). Lastly, relating to one's own culture beyond colonization can lead to resilience and empowerment (Coulthard, 2014, p. 23). Indigenous worldviews in general, and Indigenous worldviews from these lands now known as Canada, share many similarities with Quechua worldviews. I also use Quechua worldviews to guide this dissertation since Quechua people are the focus of my research.

Quechua Worldviews

Not all Quechua experience life events in similar ways; therefore, it is vital to acknowledge the contexts shaping them. Quechua worldviews are made up of "myths, rituals and short stories, as collective representations . . . [They are] the expression of the mythic thought and the knowledge that Andean communities have about the objective reality" (Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 56). Quechua worldviews stem from humans, nature and deities and the living and non-living elements surrounding them (Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 57; Andean Project of Farming Technologies, 2008, n.p.). The relationships amongst all these elements of the cosmos form the basis of Quechua worldviews and knowledge.

Within Quechua worldviews, and specifically within Andean worldviews (views that originally come from Indigenous Peoples, including Quechua, in the Andean mountains), knowledge is a complex concept made up of elements such as the *yachay*, *musyay* and *ruway*. Yachay is a process involving "knowledge, learning and teaching" (Mujica as cited in Martínez Rojas, 2005, p. 57). We not only know through our minds but through any part of our bodies, depending on who we are and what surrounds us. Musyay is a "sensorial form of knowledge used to interpret different signs of nature, the spiritual worlds or other humans" (Mujica as cited in Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 59). Ruway is the first step towards connecting with "nature and what exists" (Mujica as cited in Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 59). This knowledge comes to exist through the process of doing. This concept of knowledge is discussed in the concluding chapter in connection to the knowledge presented from the discussions with participants.

In summary, I use Indigenous worldviews as the overarching framework for this research. Below I discuss the frameworks that can be mobilized to guide the collaborative relationship of Quechua with First Nations, Métis and Inuit, and their relations to these lands.

Frameworks for Collaborative Relationships and Relations to Land

To address collaboration between Quechuas and Indigenous Peoples from the lands now known as Canada, I have chosen to use the Two Row Wampum Belt teaching from the Haudenosaunee, a First Nation on lands now known as Canada and the US, because it teaches about the relations between settlers and Indigenous Peoples. The Two Row Wampum Belt is a treaty agreement initially used to guide relations between two nations, the Haudenosaunee and the Dutch, when the Dutch first arrived and began to occupy Indigenous lands in the 1660s (Onondaga Nation, People of the Hills, n.d.). I also draw upon the Quechua prophecy of the Eagle and Condor, as it discusses the coming together of Indigenous Peoples from the South and the North.

This research also follows Indigenous scholars Tuck and McKenzie's (2014) research on 'place' and its importance in research, in that it examines place and land in the context of colonization. I use their critical place and land inquiry model to interrogate Quechuas' connection with land and place in the Canadian state. As I speak of Indigenous worldviews from First Nations and Quechua philosophies, I recognize that as an outsider to First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities and an immigrant, the knowledge that I provide is incomplete. My knowledge of Indigenous worldviews from First Nations, Métis and Inuit philosophies come from a review of the literature as well as my work in Indigenous communities. Similarly, although I have a mixed heritage, I recognize that part of me is also an outsider to the Quechua culture, as I have not lived in Peru for years. As I speak of Indigenous worldviews from Quechua philosophies, the information comes from participants who I interviewed, learned from and who shared knowledge with me. The first teaching on collaboration that I will discuss is the Two Row Wampum Belt.

The Two Row Wampum Belt. The Two Row Wampum Belt, also known as Guswhenta, is a visual presentation of the first agreement between the Six Nations Confederacy and the Dutch settlers (Green, 2016, pp. 31–32). The Two Row Wampum Belt speaks to the relations between First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and all people who have entered Indigenous territories since this belt was created around 400 years ago. Green (2016) offers the following interpretation of the Two Row Wampum Belt:

> the belt comprises three rows of white beads separated by two rows of purple beads. It is said that purple beads run parallel to each other. The purple beads represent two vessels (one canoe and the other a ship) that travel the same river without interfering with each other. (p. 30)

This belt advocates relationships based on peace, friendship and mutual respect (Green, 2016, personal communication with Elders Sakoieta and Tewantahawitha, September 22, 2013). Before fully living the values outlined in this agreement, Indigenous Peoples and settlers "need to be practicing these values within their communities" (Green, 2016, p. 33). Today, the Two Row Wampum Belt continues to be an agreement to "live together in peace; that each nation will respect the ways of the other as they meet to discuss solutions to the issues that come before them" (Onondaga Nation, People of the Hills, n.d.). Discussions of the Guswhenta suggest that settler allies need to examine the effects of oppression on Indigenous Peoples.

This agreement outlines how First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and settlers can live together, separate and distinct, while sharing the land. Although the Guswhenta highlights the importance of not interfering with each other, it does not exclude the opportunity to interact and form relationships. As stated by Green (2018), the underlying message of the Two Row Wampum Belt is to have "peaceful interactions that respect the autonomy of both Onkwehonwe

and Guests" (p. 169). Green defines a guest as "someone who is in relationship to the Land in a way that supports stewardship and not ownership. A guest is an individual who is in relationship with Onkwehonwe communities and who respects reciprocal engagement" (2018, p. 175). In my work, I refer to settlers rather than guests because their/our behaviour and the relationship they/we impose is not reflective of being a guest. There are some that aspire to become allies and collaborators, however, settlers as a whole continue to act in ways that denote ownership over the lands and people and disregard the rights and wishes of Indigenous Peoples. At times, I use the term settler to bring attention to our complicity in settler colonialism, aiming for settlers to begin to act as guests, as discussed by Green (2018). As Green (2018) explains, being a guest means having rights and responsibilities. For instance, it gives guests the right "to be on the territory" and the responsibilities of "centering and supporting the traditional (pre-contact) and contemporary (post-contact) treaties" (p. 175). As guests, they are responsible for knowing the history of colonization and being an ally to Indigenous Peoples. Green explains that being a guest goes beyond words claiming allyship to necessitate actions that support Indigenous movements and struggles.

Based on the way that immigrants act in these lands now known as Canada, I use the term settler with the intent to bring change. As Tuck and Yang (2012) state: "settler describes a set of behaviors, as well as a structural location, but is eschewed as an identity" (p. 7). People avoid this identity even though it exists, regardless of whether people accept it or not. Therefore, in my case, to use it is an attempt to make a political move: talking about the immigrant as settler is a way of calling attention to immigrants, so they/we act like guests and stop supporting settler colonialism. It is also a way to remind immigrants that these lands were taken without consent and, therefore, we hold responsibilities towards Indigenous Peoples and the lands. Both terms

aim to motivate immigrants to care for the lands they are occupying and respect Indigenous autonomy. There are people who do not want to use the term settler when describing racialized immigrants. Others, such as Indigenous Peoples, claim that the term settler should refer to anyone who is non-Indigenous to these lands. From her own position, Green (2018) states: "'Settlers' and 'colonizers' sound adversarial when I speak of them as an Onkwehonwe person" (p. 1 69). At the same time, Green concedes that, "there are quite a few scholars, activists and allies that refer to themselves as settlers" (p. 169).

Green (2016) has done extensive work discussing the settler Indigenous relationship, which she refers to as a guest-host relationship. She explains her work between Onkwehonwe and non-Onkwehonwe people through a teaching passed to her by an Indigenous helper, Hilton King. The teaching is based on how trees grow in various ways to make space for other trees to grow. Green's work is focused on finding ways in which Onkwehonwe and non-Onkwehonwe people can work together despite the tensions between them and the difficulties this work involves. As Green explains it, "in the natural environment, plants and animals find ways to be resilient and flourish even under questionable circumstances. Onkwehonwe people and guests can find ways to flourish when we work together" (2016, p. 171, citing H. King, personal communication, October 9th, 2013). Green argues that despite the problematic relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, there are many benefits to working with each other. Green's work provides a guide on the numerous ways in which non-Indigenous people and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations can form relationships, including ways non-Indigenous people can collaborate with Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada. Despite the injustices that Indigenous Peoples face because of settler colonization, the majority continue to desire to work together with settlers.

As an immigrant, I have a different relation to the term. From my position as a Chola with Indigenous and European roots I enjoy a lot of privileges for having mixed European heritage, being raised in the capital, Lima, and having a Western education. Therefore, my use of the settler identity to refer to Indigenous immigrants may be critiqued. My main intention for using it is to bring awareness of the ways that Indigenous immigrants have supported settler colonialism, hence, why I use the term even if it may bring some adversarial emotions within Indigenous immigrants. I think the term settler better depicts the complicity that immigrants have in this issue and the urgency to do something about it more than the term guest does. Further, as a racialized settler speaking to other racialized settlers, I may be perceived as less adversarial when using the term "settler" than someone who is not a racialized settler.

In this research, I use the Two Row Wampum Belt combined with the Quechua prophecy of the Eagle and Condor as guides to the potential relations between non-Indigenous and Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada. As discussed next, the Quechua prophecy of the Eagle and Condor foresees the coming together of the Original people from the North and the South to overcome the suffering they are both experiencing.

Eagle and Condor Prophecy. Based on the Quechua version of this prophecy, the Eagle and Condor came together when life began. They joined their tears and created Central America, bringing together the North and South (Real People's Media, 2016). The lesson is that we need the powers of both the Eagle and the Condor. According to some, the Eagle has the "power of the mind, including the gift of science and technology and the power of the Condor is the gift of the heart, including feelings and connection to natural elements" (Noriega Rivera, 2010, p. 121). Quechua elders believe that when the Condor reunites with the Eagle they will "give birth to a new spirit . . . This new spirit will unite once again the red nations of North, and South parts of

the hemisphere" (Real People's Media, 2016). According to Quechua cultures, we are entering the cycle of the Pachacuti. The Quechua prophecy states that the Pachacuti has been interpreted as the "radical change of the cosmos or return to mother earth." (Quispe, 2012). . Each Pachacuti cycle is 500 years long (Mattié, n.p.). Every five centuries there are significant transformations, and we are entering a new cycle now (Real People's Media, 2016). Transformation is said to happen around this time, bringing about the union of the Eagle and Condor (Real People's Media, 2016). This prophecy is meant to guide the future relations between the North and the South. A reunion between the Eagle and Condor people will bring about a new era shaped by collaboration and transformation (Cameron et al., 2021).

Critical Place (Land) Inquiry. It is necessary to talk about Quechua immigrants' connection with Indigenous lands in the North if they are to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. As such, I use a critical place (land) inquiry model by Tuck and McKenzie (2014) to discuss the relations of Quechua people with place once they migrate to these lands now known as Canada. I use their model because through it, an analysis of place implicates an analysis of the relations amongst all living and non-living beings, spirits and the entire universe, and the accountability that people have to place (Tuck & McKenzie, 2014, p. 635). Place happens in a particular space and time (Tuck & McKenzie, 2014, p. 34), and it can symbolize a particular emotion and meaning attached to that space and time. The place is a mobile and fluid concept because it changes through time and space and is influenced by people and all other species and social interactions at the individual and community levels and vice versa. In my discussion with participants, I inquire about their relationship to place, including land. In this context, land involves the "interwoven aspects of land (origin) stories, claims, and identity" (Tuck & McKenzie, 2014, p. 65). I use a critical inquiry of place in connection to land to help

Quechua participants situate themselves in relation to the lands upon which they are now residing. These theoretical frameworks based on the Two Row Wampum Belt, the Eagle and Condor Prophecy and critical place (land) enquiry model inform all aspects of the study, including the methodology.

Methodology

Using a decolonizing lens, methodologies must also explore the process by which Indigenous knowledge is generated (Kovach, 2009, p. 93). A decolonizing methodology therefore involves self-reflection or 'critical reflexivity.' Decolonizing methodologies "demand [a] critical reflexive lens that acknowledges the politics of representation within Indigenous research" (Kovach, 2009, p. 33). This requires a critical reflection on representation, i.e., who is doing the representation of the participants and how are they represented. Further, Kovach (2009) notes that decolonizing methodologies require the experiences of researchers to be explicitly named in connection to the research (p. 81). Within Indigenous methodologies, researchers work towards conducting research that is decolonizing "without 'othering' their research participants, exploiting them, or leaving them voiceless in the telling of their own stories" (Liamputtong, cited in Kovach, 2009, p. 81). Indigenous methodologies challenge the assumption that the researcher possesses all power in the research. Instead, they attempt to give power back to the participants: "methodologically, this means gathering knowledge that allows for voice and representational involvement in interpreting findings" (Kovach, 2009, p. 82). One way of giving more voice to participants is through "the use of story, life history, oral history, unstructured interviews, and other processes that allow participants to share their experiences on their terms" (Kovach, 2009, p. 82). In this study, I used unstructured interviews that encouraged

participants to tell stories and their life histories to the extent that they felt comfortable sharing them. They were not encouraged to share experiences that they did not feel comfortable sharing.

This study also draws upon on Wilson's (2008) Indigenous methodology. Indigenous methodology places relations and relational accountability at the centre of the study. The researcher is accountable for their relations with the participants and the other individuals involved. The researcher is also accountable for engaging with Indigenous practices and knowledge. Indigenous worldviews are used when establishing relations with participants to honour and acknowledge their values. Similarly, the study participants are accountable for their relations within the research (Wilson, 2008). The relationships formed in the study are guided by the "4 Rs": respect, reciprocity, relevance, and responsibility towards the Indigenous communities being researched (Wilson, 2008). The 4 Rs, created by Kirkness and Barnhardt (1991) originally aimed to address the barriers that First Nations, Métis and Inuit students were facing in post-secondary schooling. In this context, *respect* addresses the need to make space for Indigenous knowledge in academic environments; *reciprocity* means that researcher and participant knowledge are equally important, and the researcher is also to learn from the participant. This approach is in line with Indigenous views of relationships where we are both recipients and holders of knowledge. *Responsibility* refers to having the educational system exercise their responsibility to improve academic settings for First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and build an environment that is inclusive of their lifestyles (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991, pp. 15–17). *Relevance* means having knowledge that represents Indigenous cultures and communities and giving the same legitimization to this knowledge (pp. 9–12). The 4Rs have also been used when conducting research projects.

When interviewing participants, I tried to make sure that the questions and my comments were respectful of the participants, and that there was an exchange in information, so the participants were not the only ones sharing. I shared relevant information about Indigenous communities in case they did not know it. Also, I made sure that the study was relevant to the lives of Quechua people. In this case, the study also explored the Indigenous identity of the participants as they moved to these lands now known as Canada while examining how they could engage in collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. Lastly, I followed my responsibilities as a researcher to ensure that their stories were analyzed within the context of their lives. In this way, their experiences were not taken out of context.

Finally, my methodology also draws upon Tuck and McKenzie's (2014) critical place (land) inquiry based on Indigenous principles. This model is distinguished from dominant 'critical place inquiry' by its commitment to the principles of refusal (in this case, refusing the status quo), Indigenous sovereignty and no extraction of land (Tuck & McKenzie, 2014). In research, refusal can refer to refusing to make the participant a "speaking subaltern" (Simpson, 2007, as cited in Tuck & McKenzie, 2014, p. 147). I took measures to avoid certain colonial practices, such as by omitting sensational questions in favour of substantive ones and reminding participants that they could refuse to respond to any questions and were welcome to disagree with my opinions. This study also supported Indigenous sovereignty principles and no land extraction by focusing on a decolonizing collaboration that encourages participants to support Indigenous struggles regarding land and sovereignty amongst other forms of settler colonialism.

Methods

When considering methods to gather and present information, it is crucial to consider how to represent the participants and their voice in research (Kovach, 2009). Wilson's (2008)

Indigenous methodology argues for worldviews and methodologies where people are meant to give back to the community. This Indigenous methodology also leads to methods where knowledge is contextualized and there is accountability to the participants and community (Wilson, 2008). The methods used to conduct the research are meant to give back to the community by offering the space to discuss how to engage in collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and brainstorming together ways to connect more as Quechua people living in these lands now known as Canada. As I describe below, I followed these guidelines while carrying out the research.

Ethics

As I carried out this research, I followed the ethics protocols established by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research that apply to research with Indigenous Peoples and the York University Research Ethics Board. Ethics in Indigenous research is key to working with Indigenous Peoples, particularly with the history of harmful research conducted *on* Indigenous Peoples *by* outsider researchers (Kovach, 2021, p. 236). Ethics has become a central component in all stages of Indigenous research, "from forming the research question to involving the community, participant consent, collection of data, analysis, presenting the findings, and giving back" (p. 236). I followed the Tri-Council Policy Statement Chapter Nine guidelines on research involving Indigenous populations (Government of Canada, 2018).).

When forming the research question, I was unsure who my population of study was going to be. I was unsure if it was going to be Quechua, referring to people with Quechua and European heritage, and/or Quechua Indigenous only, or people who had Quechua roots and were connected to their Indigenous roots or people with Mestize identity but who did not feel a connection with their Quechua roots. This process led to some ethical questions regarding what

terms to use for people with Quechua roots. As I explain above, there is a controversy around self-identification if the person has Quechua roots, around whether they would be considered Quechua or Mestize. I thought it was ethically correct to refer to Quechua people to include people with mainly Quechua heritage and also people with Quechua and European roots. The participants were comfortable with this choice for the name of the study. There were times in the study when we talked about issues pertaining mainly to Mestize people and at those times I use the term Mestize instead.

Part of the recruitment criteria was that people identified with their Quechua identities even if they were Mestize. Some participants connected with aspects of their Quechua culture, but only partly. As described in the introductory chapter, Martínez Cobo's (1986/7) definition of Indigenous Peoples is flexible and does not require individuals or groups to meet a specific list of characteristics. Instead, it provides a working definition with a list of characteristics that describe Indigenous Peoples, recognizing that not all these traits will apply to each Indigenous group or individual. Participants either felt a sense of identification with all or part of their Indigenous heritage. An important aspect of this working definition is that Indigenous Peoples need to self-identify as having an Indigenous identity, and their community must also recognize them as part of that community. Some participants had visible Indigenous features, presumably leading other Quechua people to recognize them as Quechuas. However, in Toronto, gaining acceptance from the Quechua community is challenging since there is no formal Quechua community.

The selected participants identified as either Indigenous or Mestize with Quechua roots. Some were recognized as Indigenous by other Indigenous individuals from Latin America or by other Quechua people. Due to this networking, I was able to recruit participants. The Mestize participants identified with their Quechua roots, similar to those described in De La Cadena's

(2004) study, where the participants practiced their cultural beliefs and/or their lives were shaped by their Indigenous heritage. There were a few ethical issues that I needed to take into account since I had to consider how to ethically conduct research with my participants who had Quechua roots, and, at the same time consider how to conduct research that discussed First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations even if I was not interviewing people from these communities. I had to make sure that all the steps were done in an ethical way for both Indigenous populations and to consider their conflicting interests. When engaging in ethical representation of Indigenous Peoples, in this case, of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, and Quechua immigrants, it is important to examine the ways Indigenous Peoples have been portrayed and utilized in research so that the offences committed against them are not repeated (Kovach, 2021, p. 237). I engaged in ethical representation by speaking with Quechua participants about First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, about the existing negative stereotypes that exist about them and addressing the purpose that stereotypes serve within colonialism. However, many participants wanted to discuss the stereotypes and not the structural problems feeding the stereotypes.

To address these issues, Kovach (2021) argues that when carrying out Indigenous methodologies, we need to be aware of the "theoretical lens" used to analyze the experiences that Indigenous Peoples share. This way, researchers will not fall into the trap of deficit theorizing when understanding the lives of Indigenous Peoples. According to Kovach,

> deficit theorizing sees only individual not systemic deficits, blames only individuals not social systems. Born of a neo-liberal and victim-blaming sentiment and raised to a theorizing level in research, deficit assumptions employ theory in research representation to strategically diminish marginalized peoples. The result is deficit theorizing. (p. 238)

There is a history of misrepresentation of Indigenous Peoples in research that has aimed to keep the relationships of power established through settler colonialism. Therefore, to challenge these dominant relationships, Indigenous methodology requires researchers “to decolonize their thinking and research practices” (Davis, 2004, p. 5 in Kovach, 2021, p. 239). These practices can be achieved following the outline of decolonizing methodologies explained above.

Participants

I recruited 17 participants; one dropped out after the first interview because he could not commit to a second interview due to family matters and therefore his data was not included. The participants were 18 years old or older, and identified as Quechua or Indigenous Mestize. They spoke Spanish and have been living in the Canadian state for a minimum of five years. Before moving to the Canadian state, they lived in their homelands or other countries where Quechua people originate. The exclusion criteria were: younger than 18 years of age, do not have Quechua heritage, have lived in the Canadian state for less than five years before moving to Canada, have not lived in countries where Quechua people are originally from, are Indigenous from South America but are not Quechua, or have Quechua roots but do not consider themselves Quechuas. Participants were included if they do not consider themselves Quechuas but state that they have Quechua roots and are connected with their Indigenous heritage; they may not call themselves Quechuas but prefer the term Peruvian or Latin American.

I used a snowball technique to recruit participants. I contacted Latin American and Abya Ayala agencies to recruit participants and key informants who were Latin American living in Tkaronto who may know of possible appropriate participants. Specifically, I contacted the following organizations: Working Women’s Centre, The Centre for Spanish Speaking People, St. Lorenzo Church, Señor de Los Milagros Church, Casa Cultural Peruana non-profit organization

and the Centre for Research Studies of Latin American and Caribbean People (CERLAC) at York University. I contacted the service coordinators from these agencies and institutions and asked them if they knew anyone who might be interested in participating in this study. I verbally explained the criteria and purpose of the research. I used a script and also sent emails with the same information for them to review at their own pace when they expressed interest in supporting the research. Interested organizations also received a recruitment poster that they could share at their locations (see Appendix A).

Agencies were asked to approach potential participants to determine if they were interested in participating in the research. Through these agencies, I obtained contact information for potential participants with their permission beforehand. Participants were offered an inducement of $10 per person for their time, I provided a meal with each of the interviews and I offered TTC tokens to cover transportation costs. I recruited families, couples and friend couples to interview together as long as they felt comfortable doing so. Following is a brief description of the participants.

Jennifer has lived here for years. She was born in Venezuela and lived between Venezuela and Peru. She came to Canada in her late adolescent years and connects to Quechua culture through her grandfather, who lives in Cuzco. Jennifer has wanted to reach out to her Quechua heritage by going back and forth to Peru. However, she has a difficult time connecting because her relatives make fun of her for wanting to do so. She is now searching for spirituality through her Indigenous roots. She identifies as Mestiza and feels a strong connection to her culture through her spirituality. She has immigrated to many places, and this has made her feel disconnected at times. However, she has reached out and searched for her Indigenous heritage as an adult.

Jennifer is very interested in collaborating with Indigenous Peoples. She has been involved in some Indigenous spiritual practices as a guest. She would like to be an ally but is not sure how we can engage in collaborative work individually or as a community. She agrees that this is Indigenous land and that change needs to happen, that decolonization (as defined in the key concepts at the beginning of the dissertation) needs to take place and is necessary. Jennifer thinks that relations need to be formed with Indigenous Peoples for this collaboration to take place but understands that Indigenous Peoples are having a difficult time trusting non-Indigenous people and forming relations with them.

Samay was born in Canada but has moved back and forth from Ecuador to Canada. She feels a strong connection with her roots and her family is very connected with their Indigenous roots. They have always taught her about Kishwa cultures and traditions and for her it is a way of life. Samay has many stories to tell about her town and how it developed. She discussed at length the trading that is the base of the economy for the Indigenous Peoples in her community. She believes in the union of Indigenous Peoples from the North and from the South. However, she also sees a lot of divisions between both groups and is looking for ways to strengthen this union. Samay believes there needs to be more collaboration with Indigenous Peoples here and that people not born here need to take on the struggles of Indigenous Peoples here as their responsibility.

Martin is from Lima and is very proud to be from Peru. He has strong Quechua roots and feels a connection to them, but he also identifies more closely with his Mestize culture due to his upbringing in Lima, which has a high Mestize population. By Mestize culture he means the union of Indigenous and Spanish cultures. The working definition of Indigenous Peoples recognizes that there is no prescriptive definition that applies to all Indigenous Peoples. This

identity changes depending on the specific Indigenous population and the geographical context we are discussing.

In Martin's case, he identifies with his Indigenous heritage and is somewhat connected to these roots while also practicing his Mestize culture. He finds it more challenging to practice Quechua traditions in Canada since Quechua gatherings are not well-known. If there was an Indigenous Quechua group, Martin feels he would like to connect with them and be part of this community. Martin has strong Indigenous roots and features that reflect his heritage. He embodies the complexities of having Indigenous heritage and experiencing discrimination because of it, while also growing up in a Mestize culture and later migrating to another country. As stated earlier, this conflicted connection to his Indigenous identity is common in Latin America and is directly linked to the impacts of colonization.

Martin did not move around much except to migrate to Canada. He came alone and had a difficult time with the transition. He has not heard much about First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples. However, he strongly believes that Indigenous Peoples in Canada should be prioritized, and immigrants should support them. Martin would like to know more about what Indigenous peoples here need and their history. He is very aware of the abuses faced by Indigenous Peoples in Peru for being Indigenous. Martin is aware that he is easily recognized as Indigenous rather than Mestizo in Peru and embraces this aspect of himself but feels the discrimination that Indigenous Peoples experience in Peru at a personal level. He is particularly concerned about the negative impacts that transnational companies, such as mining companies, have on Indigenous Peoples in Peru.

Sonia was born in Ayacucho, which is mainly populated by Indigenous Peoples. This town was greatly affected by the Shining Path. The Shining Path is an extremist Communist

Party organization: “an organization subversive and terrorist, which in May 1980 triggered an armed conflict against the State and Peruvian society” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2003, p. 13). It punished anyone who protested their actions (Degregori, 1991, p. 25). Similarly, the military took harsh measures against any public supporters of this extremist group (Degregori, 1991, p. 25; Mantilla Falcón, 2006, p. 335). Sonia is very aware of the class divisions that exist amongst Andean people, between the groups that are peasants and those that are landowners. Sonia migrated multiple times, from province to city and then city to town and did not feel discriminated against for being from the province but also stated that she did not let that get to her and she ignored it if it happened. These divisions meant that she moved away from her Indigenous roots and does not practice much of the traditions, but she maintains strong ties to her town.

Sonia does not feel the need to participate in Indigenous Quechua groups but would like to help Quechua people in Peru. She has adapted to the way of life here in Canada. Her parents were not encouraged to learn their Quechua language because this was used as a basis for discrimination. Sonia lived in Peru during the times of the Shining Path and knew the effects that it had on the people there. She did not state whether it touched her family or not. Sonia left home because of her studies, which caused her to suffer a lot for leaving her family at a very young age. This taught her to be practical and try to adjust to wherever she moved.

In terms of Indigenous Peoples in Canada, Sonia has not had many relations. Through her work in the medical sector, she has had some, but only professionally. She sees how Indigenous Peoples in Canada are judged for drinking without any analysis of why that is the case. Sonia sees the need to collaborate with them but is not sure how because she does not know many people from their cultures.

Esperanza has a very strong connection with the folk music in Peru and this is her way of connecting to Quechua culture here in Canada. She feels that her connection with her culture has not changed much since she moved here. She has been very busy passing on Quechua culture here through her involvement with a dancing group. When she lived in Peru, she moved from a city to a small town and found it difficult to connect with Indigenous culture in the town. Although she came from a smaller city, she was not so embedded in it. Once she moved to a small town by Cuzco, she felt much more connected and able to appreciate it. She was also able to learn the language a bit because of her work as a teacher.

Esperanza feels a strong connection with Indigenous Peoples in Canada through dance but has not shared much with them. She agrees that they should be getting more resources and support than they currently are. She also wonders how Quechua people or Latines in general can help. Esperanza thinks it is unfair that immigrants and refugees get help, but Indigenous Peoples do not.

Hugo is from Cuzco and identifies as an Indigenous person but does not see the need now to claim his roots through groups. He does see how they are necessary for others. He thinks that focusing so much on Quechua people only brings more division amongst Latines. He moved from Cuzco to go to university and did not feel discrimination for being Indigenous as he thinks that he is privileged for being from Cuzco. He is aware that being from Cuzco places him in a privileged position with other Indigenous Peoples because Cuzco is more accepted but does see the marginalization that Indigenous Peoples experience in Cuzco. In terms of Indigenous Peoples in Canada, Hugo believes that they should receive more and get our support because they are the original people here. However, he thinks that they should get support not only from us, but from everyone. He has integrated completely into the mainstream culture here. Hugo does think that

immigrants are not treated so well here, despite being the ones who built this country. Hugo thinks that people need to be more spiritual and less focused on making money. He does not feel the need to continue practicing his traditions, but he also sees them as part of him, who he is, so in reality he is not disconnecting from them either. Hugo understands Quechua but does not speak it often.

Maria Rosa feels a strong connection with her Indigenous roots, however she has very few chances to explore them in Canada as there is a lack of community here. She tried to form groups when she moved to Hamilton (Ontario) but when she was not able to find Peruvian people to form groups with, she gave up and tried to form Latin American groups instead. She lived in small towns in the Andes and had a strong connection to her Indigenous heritage thanks to her parents. Her father had many stories of what it meant to be Indigenous in the past; the lack of schools that they had and the low education. He also spoke to her about the poverty that he experienced but these memories were mixed with a lot of magical stories. This showed her that money was not everything. Maria Rosa also learned that she appreciated her Indigenous roots more when she was here in Canada than when she lived there. When she moved to Lima, she saw Indigenous Peoples fight to get a portion of land and make it livable. Maria Rosa discussed the influence of the Shining Path on the people in Peru and how Indigenous Peoples were taken advantage of. She also spoke about how people from Peru were allowed to come here as fugitives during these times.

Maria Rosa was very interested in trying to form relations with Indigenous Peoples here but felt that language got in the way. She wants to go to powwows and places where she could meet Indigenous Peoples, but has not been able to do so because she does not drive. She sees the need to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples but also just as important she sees the need to build

relations with them. Now that she is older, she would like to live life more fully, as she has more time. However, she does not know how she could get closer to Indigenous Peoples because of the logistics of transportation and language. Maria Rosa lives on her own now and has financial independence from her family.

Rebecca lives by herself and is in her late 60s. She is from a place close to Cuzco. She is very connected to her Indigenous roots. This was the case also when she lived back home. Rebecca identifies with her roots through dance, song, food, plants and language. She speaks Quechua fluently. Rebecca wants to continue practicing her traditions here and she finds a way to do so by bringing herbs from the south to cook her typical dishes. Rebecca lived the life of an Andean person and celebrated the festivities that they had for the crops. She feels the need to preserve the language and the culture here in Canada.

Rebecca has not had much exposure to Indigenous Peoples here except through the dance gatherings and powwows. She would like to know more about them and tries to empathize with the experiences they have had with colonization. Rebecca agrees that as Indigenous Peoples they need to be a priority and that they should be supported. Rebecca would like to see how she could support Indigenous communities in Canada. Rebecca tries to understand some of their history, but language has made it hard when trying to relate to them. As an immigrant, she has had a hard time trying to make it here in Canada and has had to do a lot of manual jobs that were hard for her. Rebecca was interviewed with Mary.

Mary is very connected to her Indigenous roots and maintains this connection through her dancing, food, and traditions. Back home she moved quite a bit and felt some of the discrimination experienced living in a bigger city. Still these experiences did not stop her from connecting with her Indigenous roots. Mary had a difficult life in Peru as her family experienced

a lot of poverty. She also lived with the effects of the Shining Path and had to move to another province because of the killings that were taking place; Mary came to Canada as an older person.

Mary is very empathetic towards the Indigenous Peoples that live here. She thinks that their needs need to be looked after much more, and everyone needs to protest the injustices they suffer. She has had very little exposure to Indigenous Peoples here in Canada. The little exposure she has had is seeing them under the influence of alcohol. She has had little introduction to the history of how alcohol was used as a tool of colonization.

Mary would like to have more connection with Indigenous Peoples here. She lives with her daughter and helps out with the family caregiving of the children. She tries to attend groups, particularly the senior groups and those that involve dancing. Mary speaks Quechua and recommends that Quechua should be learned and taught.

Isabel came here by herself and worked a lot to try to move her family here. She had a hard time adjusting and suffered from poverty here. Isabel feels very connected to her Indigenous roots. She comes from a family of musicians and has family that live in the Andes as well as in the capital. From a young age she learned to value her culture. She lives her culture by organizing musical events that involve Indigenous music and traditions. Isabel feels that there is a need to continue to teach new generations of Quechua/Mestize people their roots and she has a lot of knowledge of various Indigenous traditions. She sees the discrimination that Quechua people face here in Canada by other Latines/Peruvians who are lighter skinned. She regrets her family not teaching her Quechua. They did not do so because of the discrimination that existed against people who spoke the language. She has witnessed a change in terms of the acceptance of Quechua culture amongst newer generations and feels that Peruvians are appreciating more Indigenous Quechua roots here and back in Peru but there is still a lot of discrimination.

Isabel is aware of the history that Indigenous Peoples from Canada have experienced. She understands the social problems colonization has brought to Indigenous communities. Isabel thinks that Indigenous Peoples would benefit from immigrants knowing more about Indigenous cultures. Isabel and Amelia were interviewed together.

Amelia is very close to her Indigenous culture. She lived in a bigger city in Peru but not the capital. She has learned some words in Quechua and is very connected to her traditions. In her move to Canada, she found some cultural traditions practiced here that she was not used to back home. In this way, she continues to learn about her culture even when she is not in her hometown anymore. She believes the people are less respectful here and she is still trying to adjust. Amelia believes that we represent our culture and therefore we need to teach others about who Quechuas are. Amelia believes that Peruvians all have Indigenous roots.

Amelia has not had much opportunity to learn about First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultures. However, she feels that she can understand what these communities mean when they feel resentful to immigrants living in Canada. In Peru there is a lot of immigration from Venezuelan people and Amelia feels that there are a lot of positive things about helping another country but that there are also other topics to consider when the people coming in are not respecting the culture of the host. Amelia is in agreement that we need to help. She offered the analogy of the guest and host and talked about how this relationship could become more reciprocal and helpful. She agrees with collaboration, but a lot of communication needs to happen for this to take place. She has not had much exposure to Indigenous Peoples and would like to do so. She was brought by her son to Canada and came in her later years and she helped her family raise their children here.

Clorinda was interviewed with Miguel (husband) and Elliana (child) as a family. Clorinda was really affected by the terrorism enacted by the Shining Path. People were being killed and her family lived in fear. She had to separate from her family because of it and it broke the family apart. She had to leave to the capital and was discriminated against. As a result, she distanced herself from her Indigenous roots to a degree. However, she later came to terms with this and reconnected with her roots. She is able to connect to an extent to her Indigenous roots here in Canada. However, she is very busy and sometimes her schedule does not allow her to do so. She tries to get her children engaged in their cultural practices and believes strongly that the Quechua language needs to continue to be taught. She would like to teach herself Quechua here and also believes that parents here should teach their children Spanish as well as English. Clorinda is also connected to her Indigenous roots because of her husband, who is an Arpa musician. She spoke about the difference in language between towns in Peru and disagrees with the focus that people put on learning Spanish.

Clorinda is very empathetic about what Indigenous Peoples here in Canada are going through and would like to know how she can help. However, she feels that her knowledge here is not very valuable. She feels that what she could do back home, which was more manual labour and was appreciated more, is not possible to do here and therefore feels that she has not much to offer.

Elliana came here in her adolescent years and is very connected to her Quechua culture. She tries to get involved in the folk dances. Elliana has a difficult time understanding youth here. She thinks that the music that they listen to makes little sense. She finds a lot of value in her culture. Elliana is thankful and aware of all the sacrifices that her family makes for her. She tries to keep her Indigenous culture here and to teach her siblings as well. She feels the responsibility

to teach them. Elliana is proud of the knowledge that her father, as a musician of Andean music, carries. She has moved from town to city in Peru and experienced discrimination for being Indigenous. She would like her parents to teach Quechua as this is valuable knowledge.

Elliana is trying to learn more about Indigenous Peoples here in Canada and tries to make friends with Indigenous Peoples. She agrees that we need to do more and empathizes with the issues that Indigenous Peoples experience. Elliana tries to teach her parents more about history.

Miguel is very connected to his Indigenous culture. He also suffered a lot because of the Shining Path. He had to leave home and ended up with very little education as his family was very poor; consequently, he had to start working at a very early age. Miguel is a very talented musician; he learned to play the harp and travelled around the world. He played Andean music professionally for years and was very devoted to it. He is very close to his Andean roots. He speaks Quechua and tries to teach his children Quechua culture and language. He was discriminated against for being Quechua in Lima. However, he was able to form his group of Quechua people where he comes from in Lima and played soccer with them. Miguel was also able to form a club with this group so they could send money back to their town. He has not been able to be so integrated with Quechua people here because of lack of time, but his children participate in the folk-dance classes.

Miguel is in total agreement that Indigenous Peoples here should be respected, and we should collaborate with them. He believes that people should also respect Quechuas in Canada and back home. Quechuas are disrespected in Peru. He understands that Indigenous Peoples in Canada may not want to establish relationships with immigrants so much because of issues of trust. He does not have much awareness of the abuses that Indigenous Peoples here in Canada are going through.

Elli is from a small town in the Andes. He moved to a bigger town to attend school but felt the discrimination in that bigger town from other Indigenous Peoples against his classmates who came from smaller towns. His family did not want to teach him Quechua because this is a language that is not considered valuable. Elli understands Indigenous words to a degree but has a difficult time speaking it. He sees the discrimination that Indigenous Peoples back home experience, especially when it comes to education and lack of opportunities for education. He feels a sense of commitment to support the people back in his home and wishes to do so when he is able. He has not tried to find Quechua groups in Canada but would be interested if it was a group that he liked.

Elli understands the realities that people who are Indigenous in Canada face. He has had little relations with them but wishes to have more. He has only met people who are Indigenous who are drinking on the streets and Indigenous Peoples living in shelters but places no judgement on them because of the situation that they are in. Elli thinks that collaboration can start by raising consciousness with people who are Quechua about Indigenous Peoples here. Elli and Jessica are in a relationship and were interviewed together.

Jessica is from a small town in Peru and was discriminated against when she moved to a bigger town to get her education. She feels a strong connection with her Indigenous heritage and disagrees with the stereotypes that there are in Peru about who an Indigenous person is, how they should look and what status they have. She does not agree that an accurate representation of Indigenous Peoples in Lima is the person on the streets selling candy to earn some money. Jessica moved to the capital to go to university and found more of a community in these settings because there were so many people from the Andes at San Marcos University (the State University). She believes that if you are discriminated against then it is up to you to let it affect

you or ignore it. She feels very connected with her Indigenous culture and now that she is here, she would like to learn Quechua. She feels more of a need to learn about her language than she did back home and has learned to value it more here.

Jessica is in complete agreement that Indigenous Peoples here should be supported, and she understands why they may be resentful that their land is being taken. She would like to help more here and back home but feels she is fighting with her own struggles right now, so this is difficult to do. She tries to learn more about Indigenous Peoples' cultures and connect with them but is not sure if they would want to connect with her.

Data Collection

I met with participants for two discussion sessions and gathered data through an open-ended interview process that gave room for storytelling. As Kovach (2009) explains, when relying on people's stories to gather knowledge, there needs to be flexibility in collecting data. When using interview questions, the structures of the questions need to be open enough to allow for this flexibility and for the "fluidity of the story" (Kovach, 2009, p. 125). According to Kovach, conversations based on open-ended structures align with Indigenous methodologies because they allow for Indigenous oral traditions. An open-ended structure shows "respect for the participant's story and allows research participants greater control over what they want to share with respect to the research question" (p. 124). Because of the nature of this type of method, the interview may take longer. In these forms of conversations, research participants still follow the questions asked, but the conversation is about "the participants sharing their stories in relation to the question" (p. 125).

The discussion sessions with participants took place at two different times. The first discussion session is not addressed in this dissertation due to the large amount of data collected

from the two sessions. The sessions were carried out at St. Lorenzo's Church, or at participants' homes when requested. Each discussion session lasted approximately 1.5 hours. I used a traditional song to introduce the discussion on Indigenous identity. The song, "Cholo Soy y No Me Compadezcas," which translates to "Cholo I am and do not pity me," (see Appendix B) depicts the connection of Indigenous Peoples with nature as well as how their life and identity are shaped by the abuses that they have endured from the Spanish Conquest to the present. The version of "Cholo soy" that I am using is the old version of the song sung by Luis Abanto Morales.[23] I chose this Peruvian waltz because it is known by most Peruvians and it one of the songs from Peru that best depicts the story of Indigenous Peoples, their origins, their experiences with racism and classism rooted in colonization, their connection to the lands and their strength. I played this song to all of the participants from Peru. I did not play this song for the one participant from Ecuador because it would not be relevant for her. The reactions of the participants were positive. They all identified a connection to some aspects of this song. It was constructive to play the song before opening a discussion about their Indigenous identity.

Most of the sessions were done individually. Some participants attended the sessions with friends, partners or relatives. There were three groups of two, one of three, and six individual sessions. The sessions were conducted in Spanish, and some participants spoke in Spanish and English. (I am fluent in Spanish and English but not Quechua). I also have experience conducting discussion interviews in Spanish. Many of the participants did not speak Quechua but

[23] Bernal Heredia (2020), argues that the second version is written in a multicultural neoliberal context, as discussed in the introductory chapter of this dissertation.' (2020, p. 227).

knew some words in the language. During the sessions, participants were reminded of confidentiality and their right to withdraw consent and leave the study if they chose.

The first discussion session explored the topics of immigration and what happens to Indigeneity once Quechua people leave their countries of origin and migrate to these lands now known as Canada. Some of the themes discussed in this session repeated themselves in the second discussion sessions; for example, themes such as connection to one's Indigenous culture and Indigeneity after migration. These discussions will be addressed in the results sections. The second discussion session, which is the focus of this dissertation, addressed the following overarching questions:

1) What are Quechua people's views and understanding of the Indigeneity of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, and their relations to these populations?
2) How can these understandings facilitate their potential collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations?
3) How can Indigeneity be used as a bridge to facilitate the potential collaboration of Quechua people with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations in Canada?

The first question involves understanding participants' knowledge of and relationship to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. I drew from Green's (2016) teaching on the Two Row Wampum Belt to explore the first question on how Quechua people relate to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. I used the Eagle and Condor Prophecy to address the second and third questions to discuss the potential collaboration of Quechua people with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, i.e. the bringing together of the forces of the Eagle and the Condor.

Indigenous scholars such as Green (2016) have discussed the importance of gatherings and meal sharing to formalize relationships. Therefore, I offered participants a homemade

Peruvian dish to show respect for the disclosure of their experiences and their knowledge. Most participants ate during our conversations, and I brought a portion for myself and had a meal with them on occasions. They were all surprised by and appreciative of the meal. Discussions used a conversational format because this method has more flexibility than formal interview sessions. The guided discussions encouraged oral storytelling to engage with the questions (Appendix C includes details in the form of the discussions).

As I conducted this research, I wrote informal reflexive journal entries. Reflexivity in research has been used as a tool, particularly by outsiders to Indigenous communities, to inform their analysis of the findings from the discussion sessions (Russell-Mundine, 2012). This is particularly helpful to try to understand what the person said in the context of their life story. Since it is difficult to present the entirety of each participant's story in the dissertation, this step helps to situate their answers. It also provides an opportunity to examine individual stories in connection to overarching themes, as well as identifying the higher structures connected to individual stories.

Transcription Process. With the consent of all participants, sessions were audio-recorded. I transcribed the conversation sessions verbatim in Spanish using abbreviations and translated them from Spanish to English myself. To transcribe the material, I listened to the material multiple times. Listening to the recordings repeatedly allowed me to transcribe what I was listening to and build a greater understanding of participants' stories. As I transcribed, I added subheadings to the transcriptions based on the topics brought up by the participants. After transcribing them, I coded them using manual coding. Listening to the recordings a few times helped me identify themes and codes. This process also helped me mitigate researcher bias by looking at the frequency of specific ideas.

I followed Kovach's (2009) caution that research transcription cannot capture a story. The knowledge gathered from an oral story occurs in a "specific spiritual, physical, and emotional place" (p 102). Knowledge takes place in that relation: "to make visible the holistic, relational meaning requires a reflexive narrative by the researcher" (Kovach, p. 102). With this concern in mind, I contextualize the participants' testimonials in relation to the literature and to their personal stories when discussing the results presented in the next chapters.

Data Analysis

After the interviews were transcribed, translated and coded, I carried out a thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing and interpreting data (Clarke & Braun, 2017, p. 297). I applied thematic analysis by using the data to create themes. This "data driven" process is one technique used for data analysis. According to Kovach (2009),

> thematic analysis through a coding process is a common approach for many Indigenous qualitative researchers. . . When one bases research on Indigenous theorizing (philosophy), a thematic analysis, even though it is an established academic tradition, can be consistent with an Indigenous conceptual framing. (p. 206)

Thematic analysis can be applied to many theoretical frameworks and modified according to the theoretical framework (Clarke & Braun, 2017, p. 297). Since I collected extensive data from the interviews, it helped to use thematic analysis. It allowed me to organize the data into themes and subthemes facilitating a more in-depth analysis of the information placed in categories. Concordant with thematic analysis, I wrote memos and notes in the margin with my comments/reactions in the transcripts. The purpose was to highlight points, understand the data and summarize essential ideas into condensed and straightforward notions. It is essential to document these observations about the participants and researchers (Birks et al., 2008, p. 69).

Memos are “primarily conceptual in intent. They don’t just report data; they tie together different pieces of data into a recognizable cluster” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 72). Memos are used in Indigenous methodologies to record “intangible knowledge” and/or “inward knowing” (Kovach, 2021, p. 218). As Kovach explains, “documenting inward knowing requires reflexivity methods” (p. 218) including memos and journaling. This step helped form codes and served as the preliminary process to creating themes for the data analysis.

The researcher creates codes and themes based on the data collected in thematic analysis. Codes are “the smallest units of analysis that contain interesting features of the data relevant to the research question,” and themes are “patterns of meaning, underpinned by a central organizing concept – a shared core idea” (Clarke & Braun, 2017, p. 297). I then collected codes from the interviews and organized them in a table using Microsoft Excel. In this table, I included the information shared by participants relating to each code. I colour-coded this information to develop other codes and/or themes across codes. I used this information to form several themes. In the first stage of analysis, I used conceptual open coding. Conceptual open coding refers to “identifying the main ideas or concepts, that arise from data” (Kovach, 2021, p. 213). Through this process, “transcripts of stories are reviewed keeping Indigenous theory touchstones in mind” (Kovach, 2021, p. 208).

In the second level of analysis, I engaged in relational analysis, which focuses on finding meaning in what we read from the transcripts and forming relationships based on the codes from the first step. As Kovach (2021) explains, in this step: “the researcher moves back and forth between transcripts, initial findings, Indigenous theorizing, field notes, and emerging patterns. If the researcher is using a coding process, this step is called axial coding” (p. 217).

Based on Wilson's (2008) principle that relations hold the sources of knowledge, I focused on participants' relations with their Indigenous, immigrant and settler identities, and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, and their relations to these lands when creating themes. From the themes, I created subthemes that were linked to other relationships. In this way, a web of relationships was created. In the process, I asked myself "how the analysis of these ideas will help to build relationships? What relationships help to hold the ideas together?" (Wilson, 2008, p. 119). In the interest of collaboration, I focused on developing thematic relationships between First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and Quechua immigrants.

Following Wilson's (2008) principle that relational accountability needs to be present throughout all study steps, I attempted to address my accountability to the relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. For example, I tried to provide the participants with accurate information on First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, and I brought up discussions that were difficult, such as the complicity of settlers—including Indigenous immigrants—in settler colonialism. However, I did so because I believe it is my responsibility within the framework of talking about ways to engage in collaboration. I thought that discussions about collaboration needed to also involve a discussion of our role as settlers in settler colonialism. I also held accountability to my relations with Quechua participants by sharing knowledge that many were unaware of. Quechua participants received information on the history and current reality of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations that is often kept hidden. For example, we spoke about residential schools, the child welfare system and its involvement with First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities, the murder and disappearance of First Nations, Métis and Inuit women and the resistance of Indigenous Peoples against land dispossession. At times, my accountability to these two different Nations and communities came in conflict with each other. Some of my

analysis of what the participants shared may have made them feel uncomfortable or offended. At those points I re-assessed the purpose of providing this analysis and whether it was necessary, as well as how to do so in a way that was most respectful.

Data Storage and Disposal. All the data collected, including recordings, transcripts, and documents, are stored in a confidential manner on my password-protected personal computer in a password-protected file. I minimized the collection of personally identifiable information throughout the research, and I also limited my use of personal identifiers in my field notes. At all times, identifiable data have been kept secure. I am the only one with access to the database, and access to the database has been regulated and limited using encryption processes.

Participants are aware of and consented to the use of research recordings. For confidentiality, participants' names have been kept anonymous, and pseudonyms are used. After the data were collected and transcribed, I attempted to provide the participants with access to their interview transcripts for member checking. I attempted to contact all participants by their preferred method of communication, either telephone or email. In this way, the participants were provided with the opportunity to review their interviews to identify and redact information in part or in whole from the research. However, I could not reach most of the participants. For the people who provided their email, their original Spanish transcripts were sent for their review. Most participants did not reply; when I received no reply to the email, I followed up with a phone call. I tried rigorously to get their feedback on the transcripts; however, I did not receive responses.

Benefits and Risks

This research posed minor benefits and risks to the participants, which were taken into consideration and attended to. As stated earlier, Indigenous identities are widely ignored by the

general Latin American immigrant populations (Perez-Frausto, 2012; Reierson & Celedón-Pattichis, 2014); this study offered the participants a space to discuss their relation to their own Quechua identities. Participants may have also benefited from exploring their relations with Indigenous Peoples in the Canadian state. Participating in this study may have helped Quechua people feel more connected to these lands and develop a greater sense of belonging. Most importantly, by discussing the responsibilities of settlers, Quechua participants contribute to opposing colonialism. These decolonizing acts resonate with Indigenous principles. Consequently, they may feel more connected to their Indigenous heritage.

One of the risks involved was that the participants could have felt threatened by the ideas in this study. The research questions assumed that Quechua immigrants hold a settler identity in the Canadian state and, therefore, have responsibilities to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and their lands. Participants who reject or are unaware of their settler identities and corresponding responsibilities may have felt at odds with these views, which may have caused distress. The settler identity is an identity that exists whether the person is aware of it or not or wants to accept it or not. Talking about the settler identity may be something that participants did not want to engage with because they may have felt that they were being held responsible for the ongoing colonization of Indigenous Peoples, which may have felt uncomfortable and like something they are not responsible for. To mitigate these risks, the research addresses and validates the experiences that Quechua people have with oppression, such as their own experiences with colonization. I reiterated that taking responsibility for their role as settlers did not take away from their own experiences as colonized people in their homelands and as Indigenous immigrants in the Canadian state. Also, when participants appeared to be experiencing psychological or emotional distress or confusion, they were offered validation and

emotional support. I also offered to link them to support services, but all participants refused these supports.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the theoretical frameworks, methodologies, and methods used in the research. I have used Indigenous approaches to better serve the participants' needs and understand the stories involving Indigenous Peoples from South and North America. I also used Western approaches in combination with Indigenous approaches to analyze the data gathered. I have elaborated on Quechua worldviews and aspects of Indigenous worldviews related to Indigenous Peoples in North America. I have explained the connection of Indigenous worldviews to colonization and resilience. Using a decolonizing lens was necessary to acknowledge Indigenous Peoples' struggles and break the cycle of colonization of Indigenous knowledges.

Chapter 4: Thematic Analysis

In this chapter, I present themes based on the participants' understanding of Indigenous Peoples and how it has shaped their relations with Indigenous Peoples and their lands. These themes were developed from the discussions I held with participants, which contribute to one of the study's main goals: To find out how Quechua immigrants can collaborate with Indigenous Peoples in these lands now known as Canada. To develop a collaborative process, it is necessary to first understand pre-existing beliefs and relationships between the populations. This dissertation focuses on the pre-existing beliefs and existing relationships of Quechua immigrants with Indigenous Peoples. The overarching questions that I analyze in this chapter are:

1) What are Quechua people's views and understanding of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples and settler colonialism?
2) What are Quechua people's relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit populations and their lands?

In the first section of this chapter, I discuss participants' understanding of Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism in the Canadian state as well as my analysis of how participants came to their understandings. The main topics presented include Quechuas' understanding of Indigenous Peoples; understanding of settler colonialism; transnational economies as the new form of colonialism; and Indigenous cultural and wellness practices. In the second section, I discuss participant relations and contact with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and Indigenous lands. The questions below guided my discussion sessions with participants:

1) What are Quechua people's views and understanding of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples, and their relations to these populations? What is your understanding of First

Nations, Métis and Inuit people, the original people who have been living here and caring for these lands?

2) What are some of your relations to First Nations, Métis and Inuit populations?
3) As an Indigenous person, how do you view your place here in these lands that have been cared for by First Nations, Métis and Inuit people?
    a. People who are coming to Indigenous lands are often referred to as settlers. In this way, we become settlers and, consciously or not, end up supporting settler colonization.
4) What are some of your thoughts about this settler identity we take on when coming here, considering that we also have Indigenous heritage and have fought colonization at various levels back home?
5) What are your relations to these lands?

Connecting Results to Methodology

When conducting discussions with participants, I used a conversational approach that aimed at learning about where the participant stood on colonization and their understanding of how they contributed to settler colonialism. There was an educational component to the discussions from both parties. I learned from the participants, and the participants received some information on settler colonialism and its pervasive roots from me. This approach differs from an interview wherein "a researcher asks questions about someone's life experience, opinions, dreams, fears and hopes, and the interview participant answers the questions" (Knott et al., 2022, p. 2).

As I learned from Indigenous research scholars Wilson (2008) and Kovach (2009), research also involves a reciprocal knowledge transmission between participant and researcher. I did not go into the research expecting to take on the teaching role that I had to assume in order to engage in conversations on topics that this research aimed to address. There were times when some participants said things that did not align with my thinking. Still, after analyzing the interviews, I realized that there was a great deal of wisdom in what they were saying, from which I learned, as you will see throughout the dissertation.

Following Indigenous methods, I discuss the testimonies of the participants. Based on this approach, it is crucial to consider how I represent participants in the research (Kovach, 2009), particularly because they are Indigenous Peoples with a history of colonization. I aim to present the participants' testimonies transparently and contextually.

The methodology also avoided excluding or undermining participant knowledge and experiences. Instead, it aimed to build communication with the participants, allowing for an exchange of knowledge. Freire (1970a) says we must "seek to live with others in solidarity. One cannot impose oneself, nor even merely co-exist with one's students. Solidarity requires true communication" (pp. 76–77). This idea can be translated into the relationship between researcher and participant; in research that seeks to improve collaboration and relationships, it is necessary to build solidarity between researcher and participant, as they must work together to co-create knowledge. In this study, as a researcher, I was also sharing information with participants about First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and cultures, and settler colonialism, and the participants were sharing valuable information with me about their experiences and knowledge. According to Freire (1970a), proper communication is necessary to be able to question pre-existing

knowledge. Therefore, both researcher and participant are engaged in listening, questioning, and discussion to build understanding and incorporate new knowledge with pre-existing beliefs.

Quechuas' Understanding of Indigenous Populations

Participants' knowledge of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit ranged from comprehensive to very limited. Participants came to know about Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism through sources they accessed on their own, our conversations, their own experiences with colonialism and the stereotypes they heard. As stated in Chapter One, Indigenous knowledge is holistic. It involves dreams, visions, the subconscious, and blood memory (Ermine, 1995, p. 57). Overall, Indigenous knowledge refers to how we make sense of the world embedded in relationships, community practices and rituals. Under First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultures, knowledge comes from the ancestors passing on the knowledge they obtain from their understanding of themselves and their inner journey. The ancestors pass on their teachings to the community and, in this way, strengthen and help the community's development. Communities receive their ancestors' various forms of knowledge and manifest them through "custom and culture" (Ermine, 1995, p. 105). In this way, knowledge is based on relationships with ourselves, our ancestors and our current relationships. Many Indigenous cultures, including Quechua cultures, share these aspects of Indigenous knowledge (Ermine, 1995; Hart, 2010; Martínez Rojas, 2015).

Based on these various ways of knowing, participants discussed their understanding of settler colonialism, the involvement of the government in settler colonialism through assimilation processes including the institutions of citizenship, religion, and systemic poverty. Participants discussed the trauma brought about by settler colonialism. To better understand settler colonialism here, they compared it to colonialism in their homelands, particularly when

discussing the TRCC and the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and their histories in the educational systems. Participants and I also discussed issues that many were unaware of, such as discrimination and stereotypes about Indigenous populations. Lastly, we discussed other forms of colonialism involving transnational economies and the resilience of Indigenous Peoples against all forms of colonialism.

Understanding Settler Colonialism

During discussion groups, participants shared their understanding of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and settler colonialism. Some participants learned about the histories and present oppressions that Indigenous Peoples experience through our conversation sessions. Except for a few, most of the participants had minimal information about Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism and how it impacts First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. For most participants, at least part of their knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism involved misconceptions based on stereotypes. One way to dismantle these misconceptions is by establishing relations with Indigenous Peoples. In Indigenous worldviews, knowledge is formed in relationships, and most participants wanted to form relationships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people to learn about their cultures. However, learning through relationship-building can be more complicated, as Indigenous immigrants are also settlers on Indigenous lands. These complications are addressed in the second section of this chapter. Scholars such as Davis et al. (2017), emphasize the lack of education about Indigenous Peoples within settler-colonial societies (p. 400). Lack of information serves to maintain settler colonialism. In his book, *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon (1967) also points to the lack of information available on the effects of colonialization and, consequently, the arguments that are used to justify it. Fanon is critical of

views that in subtle ways blame Indigenous Peoples for being colonized to justify colonialization. Fanon critiques scholars such as Mannoni (in Fanon, 1967), who state:

> Not all peoples can be colonized; only those who experience this need [for dependency] . . . Wherever Europeans have founded colonies of the type we are considering, it can safely be said that their coming was unconsciously expected— even desired—by the future subject peoples. Everywhere there existed legends foretelling the arrival of strangers from the sea, bearing wondrous gifts with them. (p. 73)

Fanon (1967) critiques discourses that claim Indigenous Peoples were waiting for an outside leader or that they were continuously invoking the "awaking master" (p. 75). In this critique of Mannoni, Fanon exposes how Indigenous Peoples are blamed for their colonization. Mannoni suggests that Indigenous Peoples were asking to be colonized when they were invoking a higher power. In contrast to Mannoni's statement, a decolonization perspective would hold that colonizing practices based on violence and abuse are at the roots of Indigenous-settler relations (Simpson, 2011, pp. 18–19, 22–23) and that Mannoni's views are a product of colonialism rather than an analysis of it. As Fanon (1967) explains, this is a method used by colonizers to avoid responsibility towards Indigenous Peoples and to minimize their own culpability, and I would add, excuse their barbaric policies and actions in the process of colonization.

When talking to participants, most did not know about resistance to settler colonialism and ongoing abuses committed by the settler state. Amelia stated:

> Indigenous Peoples [from Canada] did not know how to stop others [settlers] and explain to them this . . . the same as when you are at home. Anyone cannot enter your home and demand shelter by saying, now I am going to enter and sleep in your house.

This participant was under the impression that Indigenous Peoples knew what Europeans were planning and did not resist or know how to speak against colonialism. As explained above, people use many arguments to justify the colonization of Indigenous Peoples. Amelia did not argue that Indigenous Peoples wanted to be colonized by an outside leader, however, she questioned how Indigenous Peoples could let themselves be colonized. Fanon provides an explanation for this type of questioning: "the European, the foreigner, was never thought as an enemy" (1967, p.75). According to Fanon, Indigenous Peoples' friendly attitude towards Europeans should not be used against them, as they had no prior experience with Europeans to inform their response. Amelia's understanding was informed with the benefit of hindsight, the knowledge of the outcome and therefore her suggestion that Indigenous Peoples should have been more militant with the settlers, and military resistance should have been the first response, seems obvious to her. The response does not account for Europeans' history with colonialization and their experience in colonizing entire nations. Her analysis may be linked to her coming to Canada later in her life and having all of her schooling in Peru. Amelia's formal education did not include information on settler colonialism of these lands now called Canada.

Amelia's and similar beliefs held by other participants came from a lack of knowledge about the early days of settler colonialism and the ongoing resistance of Indigenous Peoples. Participants' knowledge of Spanish colonialism in Latin America may have also informed their analysis of colonialism here. Indigenous Peoples and Mestizes in Latin America fought against the Spaniards and were able to achieve 'Independence,' although it has been argued that colonialization continues (Zaffaroni, 2015, p. 195). This perspective may explain why some participants expect Indigenous Peoples in Canada to respond similarly and be able to achieve the

same result. There are significant differences between the colonialism in Latin America and North America (Lange et al., 2006, p. 1414) and even between the US and the Canadian state.

One of the differences between colonialism in Latin America and Canada is that Canada has nation-to-nation relationships between Indigenous nations and the colonial government. The treaties play a key role in this partnership as they are supposed to provide a framework to guide how Indigenous Peoples from these lands and settlers are supposed to live together peacefully: "[even though] the state had different intentions. It took a colonizing approach to negotiating and interpreting these agreements … Nonetheless, treaties fundamentally defined the relationship between Indigenous nations and Canada. They remain important to this day" (Kane, 2023).

On the other hand, Quechua people living in Peru are governed through a state-to-community relationship (Chuecas Cabrera, n.d., p. 1). There are collective rights that Indigenous Peoples have as Indigenous groups, such as the right to prior consultation in matters that affect them; however, they do not have a nation-to-nation relationship with the government. The government seeks to unify all people through laws that state that "everyone has the right to equality in front of the law" (Chuecas Cabrera, n.d., p. 5). However, in doing so, there is a constitutional homogenization that happens, which undermines the specific rights that Indigenous Peoples should have. The lack of information on settler colonialism leaves Amelia and other participants to impose their own context and history onto the present situation in order to build understanding.

According to Lange et al. (2006), Spanish colonialism was not as intrusive as English colonialism because the purposes and therefore methods differed. Spanish colonialism was focused on extracting resources; they were not interested in creating lasting states with entrenched institutions with the sole purpose of destroying Indigenous Peoples, even though they

took many actions to destroy them. English colonialism aimed to establish permanent settlements on Indigenous lands and to exploit resources. This difference in intent and purpose made it harder for Indigenous Peoples to overthrow the English because they expected to meet resistance and pre-empted it (Lange et al., 2006, p. 1414). Despite her perspective, Amelia believed that settlers needed to acknowledge that this is not their homeland and need to behave accordingly.

Similarly, most participants were confused by the discrepancy between how colonial institutions are portrayed and the reality of how they operate, and they lacked knowledge of the injustices that Indigenous Peoples experienced in Canada. For example, when I brought up how residential schools and child welfare were institutional forms of violence towards Indigenous children and families in Canada, most participants responded that they were unaware of them. The participants then tried to understand these acts of institutional violence within colonial frameworks. Mary stated, "Those [Indigenous] children [are apprehended] so that they have more knowledge. So that they learn to have a career. Or do they just remove them so that they are isolated? What for?" Mary and Rebecca thought that child welfare services are doing the best they can to support Indigenous families; they trust child welfare systems. Their explanations lack the historical context of residential schools and child welfare as tools of the Canadian state to destroy Indigenous Nations. When Mary and Rebecca learned that presently the number of Indigenous children apprehended by child welfare is disproportionate to how many Indigenous children there are, they were confused about the governments' motives.

Mary and Rebecca thought that Indigenous children are removed to have a better education because they believed that these opportunities are not available if they stay with their families. Their understanding coincides with the proclaimed objective of Indian Residential Schools rather than an understanding of settler colonial mechanisms. Further, Maria and

Rebecca's answer aligns with child welfare agencies' approach, which considers families on a case-by-case basis. This micro-systems approach overlooks how generations of state-imposed systemic violence has disrupted Indigenous families and that the current situation was the intended result.

The language of "systemic discrimination" was not used during the interviews because it is an academic concept that many people are unaware of; however, as mentioned, we discussed various structures that have contributed to the discrimination of Indigenous Peoples, such as residential schools and child welfare. There are rarely discussions about the stress that involvement with child protective services adds to families already experiencing stress. These critiques about child protection services are not accessible, since they are not part of the dominant discourses on child welfare and do not include these critiques; dominant discourses argue that child welfare provides help to families who are not able to manage well on their own. We need to be "deconstructing colonial ideologies of the superiority and privilege of Western thought and approaches" (Cull, et al, 2018, p. 7). This way, child welfare services can be understood as a colonial institution intervening in situations created by colonial institutions under the guise of help framed within colonizing discourses that continue to suggest Indigenous Peoples need Western interventions. Colonial institutions such as child welfare organizations continue to influence the experiences of Indigenous Peoples by employing oppressive practices that define the experience of Indigenous families within the colonial state (Lavallée and Menzies, 2014).

Without an understanding of colonization in the Canadian state, it makes sense that Mary and Rebecca view child welfare's apprehension of Indigenous children as providing care and support to Indigenous children. They began to re-think their view during our conversations. It is

essential to see how Mary and Rebecca accepted access to education as a reason to apprehend children. They believed it is acceptable to remove children if it improves their educational opportunities and thereby empowers them in the future. They appeared to hold education as a high priority over other forms of support that the child may be receiving at home.

Following Indigenous methods, I used an interactional format in our discussions, which opened the space for participants and I to have a more open conversation on my thesis topics. I feared that this process would leave participants feeling unsettled as we discussed research topics that may challenge their views. However, during these conversations, participants appeared engaged and content and did not seem unsettled.

In the case of Rebecca and Mary, they were older adults. Mary came here in her early senior years and Rebecca came to Canada with her child to have a better quality of life. Before our conversation, Mary and Rebecca were unaware of Indigenous families' history with residential schools or child welfare; they were unaware of the injustices that Indigenous Peoples experience. They had a challenging time understanding why people disagree with the actions of child welfare agencies until we spoke about the complexities of the matter. The government intentionally conceals the realities that Indigenous Peoples experience and promotes a narrative that blames Indigenous Peoples for being responsible for what they are experiencing and disregards settler colonialism (Choate & Tortorelli, 2022). In this way, they gain the support of the general population.

As participants began to talk about their understanding of settler colonialism and the government-run institutions that help maintain it, such as child welfare, they began to recognize the critical role that the government plays in keeping the status quo. We discussed other ways that the government supports colonialism, including through assimilation and citizenship.

Understanding of the Government's Role in Settler Colonialism

A few participants were aware of and critiqued government discrimination towards First Nations, Métis and Inuit people at the individual, mezzo, and macro levels. Some participants learned this information passively by living in Canada and engaging in this research. Other participants assumed the existence of government discrimination based on their experiences with government discrimination towards Indigenous Peoples in their country of origin. Participants learned through our discussions about the government's role in settler colonialism by focusing on assimilation, the institution of citizenship, and mechanisms such as institutionalized racism in child welfare agencies and legal systems.

Two mechanisms that continue to be used to establish and maintain settler colonialism are assimilation and the institution of citizenship. Participants and I discussed how the government works towards the assimilation of Indigenous cultures to maintain settler colonialism.

Assimilation as a Mechanism of Settler Colonialism

Assimilation is "the process by which a minority population is absorbed into a prevailing dominant culture" (Macdonald & Steenbeek, 2015, p. 34). Throughout settler colonialism, colonizers have worked towards imposing Western cultural beliefs and ways of life on Indigenous Peoples (Macdonald & Steenbeek, 2015, p. 34). Some participants compared the pressure they experience to assimilate in Canada to the pressure to assimilate that Indigenous Peoples experience. Some of their knowledge stems from witnessing First Nations, Métis and Inuit people having to assimilate. Others were unaware of the assimilation processes that Indigenous Peoples experience within the Canadian state. Macdonald and Steenbeek (2015)

argue that immigrants need to learn how government policies and legislation work to assimilate First Nations, Métis and Inuit people into dominant cultures (p 34).

Fanon (1967) focuses on a particular Indigenous population, the Malagasy, to explain the psychological effects of colonialism. Fanon argues that the identity of Indigenous Peoples, such as the Malagasy people, ends up shifting due to colonialism and the discrimination they experienced. Fanon argues, contrary to common belief, that the Malagasy people do not desire whiteness after colonization. Any changes the Malagasy make are due to the suffering and poor treatment at the hands of white people; they end up believing that the only way that discrimination will stop is if they somehow become white, because being white is the only way they can be seen and considered human (p. 73). Fanon also discusses how Indigenous Peoples are pressured to learn white ways of being, not necessarily because people want to be white but because they learned that being white allowed them to access more rights. In this way, people assimilate for their well-being within a system that values whiteness. This is akin to the forced whiteness Quechua people experience to access more rights and be considered better human beings (De La Cadena, 2005, p. 262).

Racialized immigrants in Canada are also pressured to assimilate according to the image of a 'good citizen' (MacDonald & Steenbeek, 2015, p. 76). Through assimilation, racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, are subjected to a process of indoctrination, by choice and/or due to pressure, into dominant ways of thinking and supporting institutions that reinforce settler colonialism (Thobani, 2007, pp. 79–80). While some Indigenous immigrants may assimilate to access more opportunities (this topic will be elaborated on in the next chapter), forced assimilation becomes part of the settler identity. In other words, Indigenous immigrants are expected to assimilate to survive in the Canadian state.

Participants shared their views on the pressures that Quechua immigrants and Indigenous Peoples in Canada experience to assimilate to white society and access a "better life."[24] As is discussed more in the next chapter, Jessica brought up the invisibility that Indigenous immigrants experience in Canada as their identities are not acknowledged here. In this way, Indigenous Latine immigrants are forced into dominant society's concept of who Latin American people are — one large homogenous group where Indigeneity is not recognized.

Williams et. al. (2022) explain that Black, Indigenous and/or People of Colour (BIPOC) experience racial trauma due to multiculturalism. Racialized trauma refers to the trauma BIPOC newcomers and other BIPOC settlers that have been living here for years experience due to discrimination. This form of trauma is less acknowledged by the government's claims of multiculturalism, which is supposed to prevent immigrants from experiencing discrimination. However, multiculturalism does not address the discrimination that BIPOC people experience. People of colour continue to be discriminated against through "structural discrimination" and pressure to assimilate (Williams et al. 2022, p. 24). They are pressured to assimilate into settler colonialism in their everyday lives: "People of colour do not always have a choice as to how they

---

[24] What constitutes a "better life" depends on your values and belief systems. In Latin America, a better life may hold a very different meaning: for Kishwa people from Ecuador and Quechua people from Peru, "living well" is called "Sumak Kawsay" and Aymara people mainly from Bolivia have the term "Suma Gamaña" (Cardoso-Ruiz, et al., 2016). Since this study involved Indigenous Peoples from Peru and one Indigenous person from Ecuador, I will describe two interpretations of the Sumak Kawsay. One from an Indigenous group from Ecuador and one from an Indigenous group from Peru.

Amongst the Achuar people of the Ecuadorian Amazons: "the main purpose is a good use of nature, not the infinite accumulation of consumer objects but the obtaining of a state of equilibrium that they define as well living" (Cardoso-Ruiz et al., 2016). For some Indigenous groups such as the Mochica people of Peru, "it is understood as the flourishing of the farms, a state of joy, happiness about cultivating life without violence. Giving love, affection and sweetness, people treated this way in the community" (Cardoso-Ruiz et al., 2016). Other Indigenous cultures discussed at length how living well was strongly connected to the land (Cardoso-Ruiz et al, 2016). Some countries take this concept to another level. It has been proposed as an alternative to capitalism to promote productivity and material gains but at other times structural discrimination forces them to follow certain lifestyles. In Bolivia and Ecuador, they have enshrined this concept in their constitution (Cardozo-Ruiz, 2016). Some Quechua people may not follow these concepts; however, it is important to consider them in case there are Quechuas that do follow these ways of living. In summary, these various ways of interpreting what a 'better life' is needs to be accounted for when understanding and offering services to Indigenous immigrants living in Canada.

engage with their environment due to issues of structural racism, and hence, they can be at risk for poorer mental health" (Williams et al., 2022, p. 24). They are forced to engage with their environment in specific ways in response to structural discrimination. Participants such as Sonia were familiar with some forms of assimilation Indigenous Peoples in Canada experience because of her experiences back home. Sonia spoke about how Indigenous Peoples from Canada are forced to fit into dominant ways of life to keep their employment. Sonia shared her views on the assimilation that Indigenous Peoples in Canada experience as an Indigenous person moving to the city:

> They [Indigenous Peoples from Canada] do not leave [reserves]. If they leave, they are lost in the system . . . there are only some who have overcome this and have jobs but if you realize that those who have overcome [the barriers] . . . in the city . . . had to assimilate to the people who live here because otherwise, no [they wouldn't make it].

Similarly, Sonia pointed out that Indigenous Peoples in Peru acquiesce to the idea that they cannot hold on to their Indigeneity if they wish to obtain and secure employment. Other participants explained that to overcome this reality, some Indigenous Peoples in Peru deny their Indigeneity or live a double life where they mold to the dominant lifestyles outside of the home while maintaining their cultural practices in the home. Sonia spoke about her experience of being pressured to assimilate in Peru when she moved from a small province to the capital. She stated:

> Going from Ayacucho to Lima so young was very difficult. They throw you into the water, and you learn to swim, or you sink. That has helped me to adapt to here . . . When I went to Lima. . . I saw . . . that they made fun of me . . .

Sonia shared her various experiences with relocation within Peru from an early age that taught her to adapt to and absorb the culture where she moved. In the above case, it is clear that Sonia

did not freely choose whether or not she assimilated, she saw it as a matter of life or death. To resist these forms of oppression, there is a need for "deconstructing the colonial ideologies of the superiority and privilege of Western thought and approaches" (Cull et al., 2018, p. 7). In this way, people would not feel the pressure to have to assimilate in order to survive.

Experiences such as Sonia's call for racism to be addressed together with classism, as her experience demonstrates that financial and social status are impacted by cultural identity. Similar to when she moved to Lima, when Sonia moved to Canada, she placed aside her Indigenous identity and purposefully engaged in the assimilation process to better fit into her new home. Sonia discussed her process of integrating into Canada:

> I don't miss it much. Yes, I miss the music from time to time, but I don't have that need to go. Unless it's for the 28th [of July, Independence Day], maybe it hasn't been a part of me . . . that is deeply rooted. I learned to be where I was. If I was in Iquitos [a province in Peru], I was in Iquitos. If I was in Lima, I was in Lima . . . if I'm in Toronto, I have to be in Toronto . . . I do adapt to what is here . . . probably also for the kids. To look after them, work. That doesn't mean you don't want to go there. When I go to carnivals, yes or for Easter . . . because my dad was buried there.

Sonia has adapted and absorbed the culture of her place of residence, now Canada, which involves accepting the norms, cultural beliefs and values of the host country. Often, this approach has helped her support her children and find employment. However, she still discusses her connection with her homeland and culture, even when she takes on the culture of her new place of residence. Sonia does not necessarily see assimilation as an attack on her culture, but as a part of the process of migrating. She does not interpret it as forced assimilation. She implied that immigrants may have a degree of choice in these matters. It is vital to take Sonia's

experience with immigration into consideration. Ideally, Indigenous Peoples would be able to integrate into the place they move to without having to distance themselves from their own cultures; however, as Sonia stated, this is not always possible.

Most participants were unaware of the Canadian government's efforts to assimilate Indigenous Peoples into the body politic of Canada. However, they were aware of the assimilation processes enforced on immigrants. Some participants used their understanding of the assimilation of immigrants to understand the assimilation of Indigenous Peoples. This comparison can be helpful to a degree. However, it may lead to comparing both forms of assimilation without noting the differences. Scholars such as Fachinger (2014) claim that "any discussion of intersections between diasporic and Indigenous Peoples needs to proceed with an awareness of crucial differences between them, and that more work needs to be done to theorize the relationships between diaspora studies and Indigenous studies" (p. 75). By comparing the assimilation of Indigenous Peoples and immigrants, there is the risk of forgetting that Indigenous Peoples are the original caretakers of these lands. The position of immigrants is complicated as there are immigrants who claim that they had no choice but to relocate here. Without invalidating these realities, it is important to recognize that the rights and autonomy of First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples on these lands are different from those of immigrants/guests.

Indigenous worldviews value and respect people's inner journeys and believe they should not be interfered with; this is what First Nations, Métis and Inuit people are asking from immigrants. At the same time, the Eagle and Condor prophecy teaches about the reunion of the Indigenous Peoples from the North and South. According to this Quechua teaching, there was a union before colonization. These two teachings provide a guide for respecting each other as

distinct peoples while we join together. Indigenous immigrants must acknowledge the journeys that First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations are experiencing when looking to build relationships.

As expected, participants were unaware of how the government not only attempts to eliminate the autonomy and rights of immigrants but also encourages immigrants to support similar attempts against Indigenous Peoples. In this way, the assimilation of immigrants into dominant Canadian society, which is also partial and limited as they never get to be considered full citizens, contributes to settler colonialism. As discussed next, assimilation processes are embedded in the institution of citizenship to support settler colonialism.

Citizenship as a Toolof Settler Colonialism

The institution of citizenship supports settler colonialism by establishing divisions amongst the people living in the Canadian state. The Canadian state was created based on a white-dominant identity referred to as the 'national identity.' As Thobani (2007) states, colonizers established systems, such as citizenship regimes, in which the values and beliefs of this national identity are exalted. A specific white settler referred to as a 'national' becomes the ideal and accurate representation of Canadian values. The national identity refers to a type of citizen of European descent that is Christian and is considered: "exalted above all others . . . the embodiment of the quintessential characteristics of the nation and the personification of its values, ethics, and civilizational mores" (Thobani, 2007, p. 3). Systems such as citizenship serve to position this group of settlers into "exalted insiders" (p. 74). Their positions are legitimized and placed as the standard. Perspectives favouring a national identity are biased against the racialized immigrant or anyone that belongs to the 'other' group (p. 9), including Indigenous Peoples from these lands. Indigenous immigrants may also hold biases against the 'Other,' depending on who that 'Other' is.

According to Thobani (2017), racialized immigrants may be more exalted than Indigenous Peoples (p. 17) who are also an 'Other' group. However, dominant society blurs the differences within the 'Other' groups when addressing the inequalities they experience. In this way, their oppressions are not addressed accurately. McWatt (in Fachinger, 2014) claims: "white Canadian society in their discomfort with racial and cultural otherness employ strategies to 'familiarize' the unknown in a process that blurs differences between Indigenous and diasporic identities rather than making appropriate and constructive connections between them" (p. 81). These processes are normalized within the general public.

The difference in exaltation between Indigenous Peoples and immigrants who belong to the 'Other' may be rooted in the concept of Canadian identity. Based on the Canadian identity, "the nation is committed to tolerance and equality because it speaks a language of ethnic inclusion rather than exclusion" (Légaré, 1995, p. 353). Within this view, Indigenous Peoples are seen as one of the populations that are 'different,' and their differences are celebrated (on a superficial level). Racialized immigrants are also included as part of the diverse Canadian identity, with some stipulations. Indigenous immigrants are part of the racialized immigrant population, but their presence in Canada is often overlooked. These nationalist discourses aim to "identify a singular identity, the Canadian nation. By doing so, it seeks to neutralize diversity and construct internal cultural homogeneity" (Légaré, 1995, p. 353). Indigenous Peoples who claim to be separate from the Canadian state are seen as a threat to the Canadian nation and are attacked for their stance (Légaré, 1995, p. 353). Consequently, their rights to self-determination and support to keep their Indigeneity are questioned. Even when some supports are granted to Indigenous Peoples by the Canadian state, they are inadequate.

For example, schools receive more funding to implement Indigenous learning through a mandatory curriculum (Ontario Newsroom, 2021). This funding supports teaching children about Indigenous communities' history and present issues, their resilience, their relationship with the earth and nature, and the "residential school system and the reclamation and revitalization of identity, language, culture and community connections" (Ontario Newsroom, 2021). However, if Indigenous children want to access Indigenous language training, they must do so at home, without governmental support, or through Indigenous community programs in Indigenous centres (Ball & McIvor, 2013, pp. 22–23). Some schools offer Indigenous languages, but they are few.

Racialized immigrants may be viewed by the Canadian public as having higher status due to the discrimination against Indigenous Peoples, while remaining a very vulnerable population. In this context, Indigenous immigrants may be viewed by the general Canadian public as having lower status compared to non-Indigenous racialized populations because of the discrimination that exists towards people with Indigenous backgrounds.

There is systemic discrimination as the Indigenous identities of immigrants become invisible within immigration systems that assume homogeneity within ethnic groups (Tenenbaum and Singer, 2018, p. 248). Furthermore, there is limited information on how the Canadian state treats Indigenous immigrants, mainly because their Indigenous identities are overlooked. The history of discrimination against Indigenous Peoples worldwide by dominant Western governments has led some Indigenous refugees, such as those from Guatemala, to refrain from disclosing their Indigenous identities once they arrive in Canada. They fear that disclosing their Indigenous identities might jeopardize their application for refugee status (Tenenbaum and Singer, 2018, p. 247). As discussed earlier, the discrimination against

Indigenous immigrants is also experienced within racialized immigrant groups (Tenenbaum and Singer, 2018, p. 247). Racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, invest in becoming citizens to gain power and are pressured to assimilate into the national identity. In the process, they become more involved in the marginalization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples (Thobani, 2007, p. 74). Thobani (2007) explains that while nationals dismiss the systemic violence that characterizes Indigenous-settler relations (Regan, 2010, p. 21) and keep their peacemaker identity (Regan, 2010, p. 10), racialized immigrants who seek support to settle in Canada consequently end up conspiring with the nationals and the state (Thobani, 2007, p. 16). Therefore, the precarious power of racialized immigrants contributes to their role in settler colonialism. They are also actively partaking in settler colonialism simply by becoming citizens. However, even though they/we are complicit in settler colonialism through our desire to become citizens, there are actions they/we can take to support decolonization and work towards collaboration actively. The belief that there is no choice maintains the status quo of having racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, support settler colonialism.

In this study, most of the participants had difficulty connecting their pursuit of citizenship to complicity with settler colonialism, so they spoke about these topics separately. However, when discussing the citizenship exam, Jessica questioned the lack of information on Indigenous Peoples and she recognized this omission as contributing to settler colonialism. Jessica stated:

> I think the state should do more. Because when you get your residency, your citizenship, you have to take, pass an exam. I do not know what that exam is like. I think there should be more things like their story in it, what is behind Canada. So every person who wants to be Canadian has to know, not just how many states it has . . . I believe that the country does not know. So people don't care . . . Even they (the immigrants) have more support

than the Indigenous . . . And we criticize them [Indigenous Peoples]. The people who come [immigrants] . . . if I understand [correctly] if they [immigrants] come with problems, the state gives them everything. And those who have been here all their lives. They [the state] do not care about them. It makes you furious.

Jessica saw how the government's disregard of accurate Indigenous knowledge and histories leads to immigrants being misinformed and supportive of settler colonialism. Jessica was very critical of how the government treats Indigenous Peoples. She argued that the treatment of Indigenous Peoples by the government is worse than that of immigrants. I agree with Jessica that people who have been here for generations and taking care of these lands need to be recognized for their work. They should be treated as the caregivers of these lands and not as guests or strangers. Indigenous Peoples are treated as the 'Other' in their lands (Allan & Smylie, 2015, p. 2).

Some Indigenous scholars claim that the government pays more attention to multiculturalism than the rights of Indigenous Peoples (Macdonald & Steenbeek, 2015, p. 65). In other words, the government pays more attention to the issues that arise for immigrants while ignoring those that affect Indigenous Peoples. The government is "failing to address the continuing economic, social, and political inequalities between Aboriginal and settler populations" (2015, p. 65). These inequalities can encourage further distance between the two populations as Indigenous Peoples are treated as the 'Other' in their lands (this point is elaborated in the second part of the chapter). These injustices and the 'Othering' of Indigenous Nations can be understood within a critical place enquiry model.

As discussed in Chapter One, critical place enquiry is based on the notion that a place can symbolize a particular emotion and meaning attached to that space and time. Because of settler

colonialism, Indigenous lands have been subject to injustice, resentment and resilience (Coulthard, 2014). According to Coulthard (2014), there is justified resentment within Indigenous communities against settlers and the state for the injustices they enact against Indigenous Peoples' lands (p. 126). For instance, Coulthard shows the double consciousness in the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples actions:

> RCAP's vision of a reconciled relationship premised on mutual recognition is not without flaw—indeed, many critics have convincingly argued that its vision still ultimately situates Indigenous lands and political authority in a subordinate position within the political and economic framework of Canadian sovereignty. (2014, p. 119)

These injustices lead to resentment the government claims to address through reconciliation efforts (p. 120). Coulthard claims that the resentment that these injustices create can be used to encourage Indigenous Peoples to become critically conscious of the injustices they experience and actively engage in projects that fight back against settler colonialism (p. 128). This perspective follows a decolonizing lens as it encourages moves of self-empowerment by using feelings of resentment productively to fuel decolonization projects.

In discussing decolonization, it is also important to consider how settlers can engage in decolonization from the position they occupy. Scholars such as Fachinger (2014) argue for the need to see the connection between the discrimination of racialized immigrants and First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people. Fachinger (2014) claim that it is necessary to examine "the binaries [such as racialized immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from these lands], on which the construction of Canada's diversity rests and . . . encourage(s) new ways of looking at relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in Canada" (p. 75). This approach reveals the oppressions that both groups are experiencing because of the exaltation of the

nationalist identity and the complicity of "racialized diasporic groups" in settler colonialism (p. 75). An analysis of the relationships between racialized diasporic groups and Indigenous Peoples needs to move away from placing these groups in separate categories. Instead, it needs to examine the various ways in which their oppressions are interlocking, as well as the roles that diasporic communities have in settler colonialism.

Most participants were not aware of how structural factors (citizenship regimes, immigration policies, multiculturalism) and their active pursuit of obtaining their citizenship and fitting into dominant Canadian culture contribute to settler colonialism, including the poverty of Indigenous Peoples. I share Thobani's (2007) view that most of the participants, as immigrants, had experienced much hardship and they had minimal opportunities to secure their "own migrations, relocations, and access to citizenship" (p. 17). The vulnerable position they hold has become a barrier to them seeing the connection between their struggle and the oppression of Indigenous Peoples. They do not realize how pursuing acceptance within the dominant Canadian society is harmful to Indigenous Peoples. This dilemma (discussed in more detail in the next chapter) stems from the discrimination that racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, experience.

Moving forward, as Indigenous immigrants are expected to collaborate in the decolonization of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people, non-racialized immigrants also need to work at addressing the oppression that racialized and Indigenous immigrants in general experience. This needs to be done without displacing their commitment to projects of decolonization of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people. Discussions of collaboration between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people need to consider the many complications that these relationships have because Quechua immigrants are also Indigenous

while being immigrants and settlers. Despite these complications, their collaboration in decolonization projects is needed. As the Eagle and Condor prophecy calls for, Indigenous Peoples from the South and North need to come together to overcome the suffering they both experience.

As discussed above, there are mechanisms of colonization in place that encourage racialized people to support colonization. With the complicity of the 'other' groups, such as Indigenous immigrants, the government maintains the exalted positions that national settlers hold. In this way, their dominance continues, and Indigenous Peoples continue to be colonized and live in poverty. Following, I expand on how poverty is maintained in Indigenous communities.

Poverty as a Tool of Settler Colonialism

Government underfunding of Indigenous Peoples is part of the very overt strategy to assimilate and extinguish them. The regulations imposed by the state also aim to reduce its responsibility for social welfare, thereby impacting the welfare of Indigenous Peoples who are overly represented amongst people living in poverty. According to the Canadian Community Health Survey used to examine food insecurity amongst off-reserve Indigenous households, "thirty-three percent of Aboriginal households were food insecure as compared with 9% of non-Aboriginal households. Whereas 14% of Aboriginal households had severe food insecurity, 3% of non-Aboriginal households did" (Willows et al., 2009, p. 1150). While the government provides social welfare to argue that they are supporting people, the levels of support are inadequate, so in actuality they are shirking their responsibilities (Willows et al., 2009, p. 1152). In the case of Latin America, Fermín (2010) argues that the state's regulations are designed to provide limited financial assistance under the guise of promoting the independence and

autonomy of Indigenous Peoples (p. 691). The claim is that the state only provides temporary and limited funding to encourage the person to recover and return to the workforce. In reality, the financial aid provided under these neoliberal policies keep people living below poverty levels (Fermín, 2010, p. 692).

There have been many purposeful and intentional methods to ensure poverty amongst Indigenous Peoples as a mechanism to maintain settler colonialism. When I brought up poverty amongst Indigenous Peoples in Canada, most participants were either not well informed or unaware of the disproportionate poverty levels compared to other populations (Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, OCASI, 2017). It is crucial to mention that the poverty levels reported by Statistics Canada in 2017 (in OCASI, 2017), do not include the Territories and Indigenous Peoples living on reserves. This point is important because “First Nations reserves, and the three territories contain some of the highest poverty rates in the country” (Beedie et al., 2019, p. 7). Participants did not learn about the poverty of Indigenous Peoples. Many said that they had not heard this information, nor was it given to them by the government when they were presented with information about Canada. Keeping this information under the radar is convenient for the state as it could disrupt the narrative of Canada as being a wealthy and generous country. Quechua immigrants’ lack of knowledge and awareness about the realities that Indigenous Peoples from these lands face contribute to their complicity. For this study, poverty is measured by the Market-Basket measure (MBM), which is based on:

> The calculation of the amount of income needed by a household to meet its needs defined not just in bare subsistence terms, but also in terms of what is needed to approach “creditable” community norms. Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSDC) views the MBM as falling somewhere between a subsistence standard of living

> and a more generous social inclusion basket. (Canadian Council of Social Development, 2013, n.p.)

In 2019, the poverty line was based on the MBM (Arriagada et al., 2020). First Nations, Métis and Inuit people are over-represented in Canada's population living below the poverty line:

> According to the market basket measure (MBM), Canada's official poverty line, approximately one-quarter (24%) of Indigenous Peoples living in urban areas in the provinces were in poverty. By comparison, 13% of the non-Indigenous population in these areas were in poverty. (Arriagada et al., 2020, n.p.)

When looking at the barriers Indigenous Peoples experience, such as access to services and socio-economic indicators, it is important to connect them to "racialization, class, historical positioning and gender" (MacDonald & Steenbek, 2015, p. 34). However, studies such as the Canadian Election Study in 2011 suggest that Canadians do not consider these factors when understanding why Indigenous Peoples need financial assistance (Harell et al., 2014). Part of the Canadian Election Study online panel was created to "examine whether portraying social assistance recipients as Aboriginal negatively influences support for cash benefits" (Harell et al., 2014, p. 2580). Another objective was to determine whether a social assistance recipient's status as either Indigenous or non-Indigenous affected whether they were positively or negatively judged for receiving financial assistance. Participants who already held racist views towards Indigenous Peoples were very critical of their use of social assistance. Meanwhile, participants who were supportive of Indigenous Peoples, in general, supported them accessing financial assistance. In comparison to white people, "results suggest that respondents' support for redistribution is lower when recipients are Aboriginal rather than white" (p. 2580). This study

highlights how racism and poverty are connected, particularly for Indigenous Peoples living in poverty.

The government is responsible for maintaining the injustices of settler colonialism and for the conditions that result in Indigenous Peoples' vastly disproportionate financial hardship (Harell et al., 2014, p. 2585). The Canadian government places many Indigenous communities in highly impoverished situations. Indigenous Peoples are "statistically over-represented in all indicators of social well-being (such as unemployment, poverty, and children in protective care). Indigenous Peoples are among the poorest in Canada" (Harell et al., 2014, p. 2585). These long-standing conditions are part of the colonial process that brings about "subjugation and dispossession of Indigenous Peoples for the benefit of capitalist expansion" (Harell et al, 2014, p. 2584). Indigenous Peoples suffer attacks to their "subsistence economies" and cultures through dispossession of lands and are subjected to various racist policies that destroy Indigenous industries and have led to economic dependency on the state (Harell et al., 2014, p. 2585). Despite these ongoing attacks, Indigenous Peoples and communities continue to be blamed for the impoverished conditions they experience.

When participants talked about poverty, some spoke about the lack of information about Indigenous Peoples in Canada in general before migrating. For example, Elli and Jessica, who were interviewed together, stated that they had not heard about Indigenous Peoples from Canada, much less the poverty levels. Elli stated:

> When I was about to come, the only news received from Canada was good news. The happiest country was Canada. So you thought what kind of bad history Canada can have? And then [after moving here] . . . I would say to my mom, look, yes they [Indigenous Peoples from Canada] go through this . . .

Elli talked about his experience as he was preparing to come to Canada as an international student. He was only given information that showed Canada as wealthy and peaceful. Indigenous Peoples were not discussed. The Canadian state intentionally presents this skewed image as part of its narrative to sell Canada to international students and the rest of the world.

Most participants were unaware that settler colonialism kept Indigenous communities poor and dependent on the government. Their knowledge of settler colonialism was minimal. However, as discussed later in this chapter, most participants had a lot to say about the connection between poverty levels of Indigenous Peoples in Canada and transnational economies. In general, participants were more familiar with how transnational companies exploit Indigenous Peoples and their lands back home, and some used this knowledge to understand the situation of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Participants talked about the pollution caused by mining and its effects on the lands and the lives of Indigenous Peoples.

In my study, participants who were aware of the poverty levels within Indigenous communities were also aware of settler populations' judgement of poor and Indigenous Peoples. Some participants were very critical of the government's ill treatment of Indigenous Peoples, particularly the poverty they experienced. For example, Hugo stated that the government often discriminates and encourages judgement against poor Indigenous populations. He denounced the assumptions that the government places on Indigenous Peoples: "The media and the government somehow make us believe that the poor, relegated, non-productive segments in this society are like that because they chose to be poor." According to Hugo, we need to spend more time thinking about the cause of injustices around us. This conscientization is necessary to address injustice. Hugo argued that to get rid of the roots of poverty, we need to understand the factors that are keeping it alive. For instance, the government works in conjunction with other power

structures such as the media to amplify the message that Indigenous Peoples and other marginalized people choose to be poor. These discourses help dissolve the government's responsibility towards marginalized people, hence the urgency for them to be addressed.

Hugo talked about the judgmental attitudes the government displays when offering assistance to Indigenous Peoples. The government acted as if it was giving Indigenous Peoples special treatment. According to Hugo, the government thinks: “We [the government] will give you [Indigenous Peoples from Canada] money, even though you burned the pot [made so many mistakes].” The government offers Indigenous Peoples financial help while at the same time criticizing them for being impoverished. This move is another strategy to justify the inadequate government assistance available to Indigenous communities. Hugo also spoke about the government’s deceitful discourse wherein they pretend to listen to the needs of Indigenous Peoples, but in reality, they do not. Hugo said:

> I [the state] am listening to you [First Nations, Métis and Inuit people] and I am going to pretend that I am going to do something and there is no change . . . that is the story . . . changes, they are overshadowed by a corrupted machinery [the government] . . . there is no time to make better citizens, better communities within society . . . to reclaim past culture . . . it is about production . . .

Hugo argued that the government is corrupt, and its only purpose is to make a profit. It places production and profit above the well-being of the people. Furthermore, the government forgets the fact that all of Canada’s wealth comes from the exploitation of the lands that Indigenous Peoples have lived on since time immemorial. Hugo’s comment is not specific to First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in Canada but based mainly on the oppression of Indigenous Peoples in his home country and worldwide, as he is not familiar with the specific issues that Indigenous

Peoples in Canada experience. Similarly, Tait (2013) critiques the government's bureaucratic operations when coordinating services for Indigenous Peoples, making it impossible for them to receive appropriate assistance. Tait discusses how the various levels of government individually work when asked to respond to the needs of Indigenous Peoples, each looking at ways to save money. Tait explains: "[the] jurisdictional lines that divide up governments' responsibility for Indigenous Peoples along federal and provincial/territorial lines, or across government ministries" (2013, p. 72) lead to the ongoing debate about who should be in charge of providing services for Indigenous Peoples.

Other participants also denounced the ill-treatment that Indigenous Peoples receive from the government. Mary stated: "They [Indigenous Peoples in Canada] say they are the most abandoned. Most abandoned by the government. The government does not care about them. But how ugly when they are the First People." It is important to note that Mary had strong connections to her Indigenous heritage. Her respect towards Indigenous Peoples from Canada may be in-part due to her closeness to her own Indigeneity. Although most participants had limited knowledge of the history of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, they were supportive of them and their protests against poverty and the government's role in it. Poverty is also connected to religion, as Christianity placed Indigenous Peoples in a subaltern position, causing them to have fewer opportunities. In this way, religion has been used to impoverish Indigenous Peoples and keep them colonized.

Religion as a Tool of Settler Colonialism

Participants discussed their understanding of the discrimination that Indigenous Peoples experience through the exaltation of Christian values and beliefs of white people. As explained above, compared to the standards imposed by the national identity, the values and beliefs of

Indigenous Peoples are viewed as inferior to those of 'nationals' (Thobani, 2007, p. 87). Consequently, the discrimination they experience becomes justified, more accepted and normalized.

Participants shared their opinions about how immigrants discriminate against Indigenous Peoples based on Christianity. Sonia talked about Christian values and how some immigrants believe that Christian values are above all others. Consequently, they try to impose their values on Indigenous Peoples. For example, Sonia explained that being Christian may influence service providers to treat service users better, while being judgmental of them. She stated, ". . . so that [Christianity] is also going to influence the treatment that you will give people. Sometimes it could be that you give them good treatment, but at the same time, you are judging them." Sonia explained that while Christian values may influence service providers to treat all Indigenous Peoples with respect, they may still judge them negatively if the Indigenous person does not live an acceptable lifestyle according to Christian beliefs.

Sonia shared her observations of the way Christian immigrants impose Christian values on Indigenous Peoples. She stated, "you can believe in loving your neighbour, but at the same time, you are trying to educate them [Indigenous Peoples]. In the end, it may be that the one who has to be educated is you." Sonia discussed her opinions on the double standard embedded in Christianity. According to Sonia, while Christianity teaches people to love their neighbour, it also teaches people to believe in their own exaltation based on their membership in Christianity. Historically, in Canada, Christianity has been misused by settlers as a tool to perpetuate forms of settler colonization, such as residential schools (Lavallée & Menzies, 2014, pp. 31–32). The government collaborated with religious organizations because they had similar goals, but the government's motives were different than those of Christians. While Christians were interested in

indoctrinating Christianity in Indigenous Peoples because they saw it as the best way of life, the government was interested in using Christianity to justify settler colonialism. They could justify attacks against Indigenous cultures and people by claiming they were helping them become Christians. These forms of genocide were part of their plot to "get rid of the Indian problem" (First Nations Child & Family Caring Society of Canada, 2016). As discussed next, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC) was established to bring light to the damage caused by Catholic-led residential schools in Canada. Some participants came to understand the TRCC by comparing it to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in Peru.

Truth and Reconciliation. Participants compared the experiences of Quechua people with the TRC in Peru to the experiences of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. In Peru, the TRC process began in 2001, and the report was completed in 2003 (Mantilla Falcón, 2006, p. 323). It was an attempt by the Peruvian government to repair the damage they caused against Indigenous communities. The TRC process in Peru was a response to the violence towards Indigenous Peoples enacted by terrorists and the military during the Shining Path period. [25]

Participants compared the efficacy of the TRC process in Peru to the TRC process in Canada. The TRCC came as a response to the genocide of Indigenous Peoples carried out through the residential school system. It was established as part of the Indigenous Residential Schools Settlement and was meant to address the damage caused by these schools. Participants such as Esperanza compared the TRCC to the TRC in Peru. Esperanza agreed with this method of reconciliation implemented by the government in Canada. She believed that the reconciliation

---

[25] The objective of the TRC in Peru was to "investigate the crimes and violations of human rights taking place between May of 1980 and November of 2000, carried out by those responsible of the internal armed conflict, amongst the Peruvian state, the subversive groups *Shining Path* and the *revolutionary movement of Túpac Amaru*" (Mantilla Falcón, 2006, p. 323). In this research, I mainly mention the Shining Path because they headed the plots that the two subversive movements carried out.

process worked well as a model to address injustices in Peru. Esperanza compared the two TRCs and stated:

> Yes, like the truth and reconciliation in Peru. Fujimori [former president] was responsible for all the deaths... He sent people [the military] to kill them [terrorists or any people suspected to be terrorists]. The United Nations intervened to conduct the whole study [TRC] that was done to remunerate and give them houses.

Even though Esperanza compared the TRCC to the TRC in Peru, she realized they were different situations. In my conversations with other participants, the participants who supported the TRC in Peru also supported the TRCC, seeing the TRCC as a positive step to remedying the harm done to Indigenous Peoples in Canada.

I am unsure if Esperanza or the other participants that were supportive of the TRC in Peru were aware of the critiques circulating about it. The TRC in Peru has been questioned for its usefulness since the government has not followed through with the report's recommendations (Suarez & Suarez, 2015, p. 6). As stated by Rice (2011), for the governments to take the issues raised by TRCs in general more seriously, there needs to be a system that involves Indigenous Peoples in all aspects being addressed. Indigenous Peoples would need to be involved in the "negotiations, operations, writing the commission's report, and the follow-up bodies that grow from the commission. And Indigenous People[s] themselves need to set the standard for what will constitute meaningful consultations" (Rice, 2011, n.p.).

In the context of Peru, Indigenous Peoples are part of the affected group and part of the government that pushes back their support towards Indigenous communities, which makes this work more complex. The TRC in Peru created recommendations after conducting an investigation that not only focused on the specific incidents of violence committed during the

conflict between the armed forces and the Shining Path, mainly against a large number of the Indigenous communities, but it also looked at one of the root causes: the pervasive discrimination against Indigenous Peoples in Peru at every level (Correa, 2013, p. 1). One of the recommendations involved an integral plan of reparations (IPR) with its primary goal to "repair and compensate the violation of the human rights as much as loss and social and moral harms and goods suffered by the victims as a result of the internal conflict" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2003, vol ix, p. 147, in Oelschlegel, 2006, p. 1338).

There have been mixed efforts from the government to implement the IPR recommendations even though they had agreed on them (Correa, 2013, p. 1). The IPR recommends these six programs: "symbolic reparations, reparations in health education, reinstitution of the citizen's rights, economic reparations and collective reparations" (Oelschlegel, 2006, p. 1338). These recommendations have only been followed to a small degree because the government, society at large and its elite political members have had a difficult time "recognizing their responsibility for the violations committed during the conflict and accepting the history of the marginalization (of Indigenous Peoples) reported by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission" (Correa, 2013, p. 1).

Another key focus in the recommendations was to find the people victimized by this conflict and provide compensation. However, implementing this and other recommendations has depended on each new government's commitment to following them. Therefore, progress in these implementations has been plodding (Correa, 2013, p. 1). There is also an overall lack of recognition of the government's role in the massacres against Indigenous Peoples. There are no efforts to investigate the armed forces and their involvement in the violations against Indigenous Peoples and make them accountable for their deadly acts through the legal process. The

information that could have been used as proof to charge the military members was well protected by the government and not accessible to those trying to make a case against the military members (Correa, 2013, p. 28). The government has responded by focusing on reparations for the violations committed by the Shining Path (Correa, 2013, p. 29). There was a lack of inclusion of members of subversive groups that could have benefited from the reparation initiatives and the denial of reparations to those they consider terrorists (Correa, 2013, p. 29). The word terrorist became a disqualifier for people who were also victims, as many of the members of the Shining Path joined under threats of death to themselves or their families. In general, there was a tendency to address isolated issues such as poverty instead of offering integral programs that address poverty under the intersectionalities of gender violence, racism and classism as recommended by the TRC. Similarly, in Canada, a significant critique of the TRCC is that it has been used to assuage the guilt of national settlers, more so than to make reparations and end the harm being inflicted on First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples (Lawrence, 2017; Regan, 2010, p. 47). During discussions with participants, I brought up some well-known problems with the TRCC, such as its inability to change the government's treatment of Indigenous Peoples that most participants were not aware of.

Critiques of the TRCC. One perspective on the TRCC has been that current efforts to address settler colonial dispossession do not work because they focus on reconciliation more than challenging the status quo (Chatterjee, 2018, p. 6). Jafri (2020) suggests these reconciliation moves are probably not going to contribute to changes in settler colonialism as they use the tools of the state (pp. 112–113). Similarly, Watson (2020) believes that reconciliation requires consideration of the needs of Indigenous Peoples and ways to bridge the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples in a way that respects the complicated past (p. 75).

Watson points to one of the primary faults in reconciliation: it is concerned with forming relations without prioritizing the needs of Indigenous Peoples. Watson recommends that if we talk about reconciliation steps that benefit Indigenous Peoples (p. 73), it may be better to use another term entirely. This shift may help address the connotations that reconciliation implies, such as assuming that colonization is an issue of the past. Instead, "other words such as reparations, redress and restitution would serve the purpose better" (Wakeham, 2012, in Watson, 2020, p. 75).

Another critique of the TRCC involves the Calls to Action, which were released in June 2015 and are yet to be completely followed. They came as a response to the TRCC report (Jewell & Mosby, 2019 in Martens, 2019). Up until 2019, only eight of the 94 Calls for Action were completed (Jewell & Mosby, 2019, in Martens, 2019). The Calls to Action asked for a commitment to work on the relations between Indigenous Peoples and settlers, but these calls remain to be followed up accordingly. For instance, the knowledge of Indigenous Peoples taught to newcomers is minimal unless they attend formal schooling through the school boards or recognized post-secondary schools. There are limitations in access to information even though "among the TRC's 94 recommendations for reconciliation, two are specifically meant for newcomers/immigrants to Canada and are aimed to build knowledge and understanding of reconciliation among new immigrants" (Chatterjee, 2018, p. 2). However, there are few venues where immigrants can obtain this knowledge through government-run programs outside of school. Even when immigrants come at a younger age, their education on Indigenous Peoples received through the school system is very problematic (this will be explained in the next section). People who do not attend formal schooling learn about Indigenous Peoples and their culture from the Discover Canada Guidebook 2018 that is produced to pass the citizenship test.

The Discover Canada Guidebook, which is meant to prepare immigrants for their citizenship exam, is criticized for not giving accurate information about the history of Canada (Singh, 2021). Amongst the participants, only a few attended formal Canadian schooling. Most of them received their knowledge of Canada based on the citizenship test; as argued earlier, this information lacks depth around Indigenous Peoples' realities and histories. Sonia pointed to the lack of support from the government to teach newcomers about Indigenous Peoples' history. She stated: "When one arrives — one does not know anything. The government does not encourage you to learn about them [Indigenous Peoples]."

Due to a lack of formal education about Indigenous cultures, immigrants end up being misinformed or lack knowledge on Indigenous Peoples and their cultures (Casuncad, 2020, p. 11). However, making changes and improving Indigenous education is not enough to change the status quo. Chatterjee (2018) argues "against this transcendental frame of analysis that seems to claim the pursuit of education as the key condition for reconciliation" (p. 3). Without minimizing the importance of education in transforming the common systems in place, many other contributing factors beyond a lack of knowledge and education are involved in the tensions between Indigenous Peoples and settlers (Chatterjee, 2018, p. 2). For example, from the Calls to Action (TRCC: Calls to Action, 2015), Call 94 asks for the Oath of Citizenship to be replaced. The government would have to change:

> I swear (or affirm) that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Canada including Treaties with Indigenous Peoples and fulfill my duties as a Canadian citizen. (p. 11)

Such a change might help newcomers be more aware of whose laws they must respect in Canada (TRCC: Calls to Action, 2015).

Not surprisingly, the Calls to Action meant to work towards transforming the status quo were mainly unknown to the participants. Many participants talked about how busy they were and how misinformed they were on issues concerning Indigenous Peoples from Canada. They discussed their limitations in the English language and how this barrier prevented them from accessing information. When Esperanza and I talked about the TRCs in Canada and Peru, she was not aware of her role in the Calls to Action that resulted from the TRCC. This lack of awareness is not surprising because most people in Canada are uninformed of the critiques of the TRCC and its implementation. After talking to participants about the TRCC and the Calls for Action, they had various reactions ranging from support to distrusting its efficacy. Some participants argued against the TRCC reparation methods, claiming they were ineffective. One participant suggested that the efforts from the Canadian government to reconcile with Indigenous Peoples were not genuine. Hugo stated:

> The truth is, I am not very aware of the details [of the TRC in Canada] . . . but I think that everything remains on paper, I mean, for example, if there are ways for the government to develop, to improve the lives of the Indigenous People[s] here, these remain in paper.

Hugo critiqued the government because he thinks they do not follow through with their promises. As he previously stated, the government is motivated by forms of production rather than repairing the damage caused to Indigenous Peoples. Hugo's views are similar to Watson's (2020), who claims that the TRCC process will not lead to significant changes for Indigenous Peoples. Watson argues against reconciliation because it implies that there was a respectful relationship before. This assumption has been strongly contested (p. 3). When Hugo was

discussing the TRCC, he admitted to not having actual knowledge of the TRCC. Instead, his analysis was based on other forms of knowledge, such as the TRC in Peru. In general, participants' opinions on the TRC back home, whether their opinions were based on accurate information or not, were used by default to determine whether to trust or be cautious of what the Canadian government offers with the TRCC. As with all information regarding Indigenous communities, there is minimal information on the critiques of the TRCC.

In general, it is difficult to decide whether or not these attempts at reconciliation are helpful and represent a step forward (Chatterjee, 2018, p. 12). As will be discussed later on, the lack of Indigenous education in the school system is being addressed, but the quality of education is poor (Madden, 2019, pp. 285–286). As stated above, reconciliation offers solutions that do not address the problems at their roots because the mechanisms that initially caused them continue (Jafri, 2020, pp. 112–113). I have discussed the participants' support and disagreement with the TRCC by comparing it to the TRC in Peru. Some participants discussed the Calls to Action in response to the TRCC, specifically those about the educational system. Participants tried to understand some of the complexities involved in the education system and its limited inclusion of Indigenous Peoples in Canada by comparing it to the education of Indigenous Peoples in Peru. We discussed the limitations they experienced by accessing information on the TRCC's recommendations. Participants and I contrasted reconciliation with a fundamental transformation of the systems in place, and this discussion revealed that while there are efforts towards reconciliation by the government, which is beginning to follow some Calls to Action, there are still many moves to support settler colonialism. The education sector is a contested field in the TRCC and the Calls to Action. Education has the potential to inform people of all ages about the history and current situation of Indigenous Peoples. Therefore, depending on how it is

used, it becomes a critical element in supporting or contesting settler colonialism. The participants and I discussed some of the controversies involved in education.

The Educational System as a Tool of Settler Colonialism

Participants discussed how Indigenous knowledge is incorporated in the education system in Canada. Participants began by discussing the inclusion of Indigenous knowledge in the education system in Peru. In the context of Peru, scholars such as Herzfeld (2008) explain that the Quechua language is disappearing and, as a result, many Indigenous communities are fighting the government to have the Quechua language taught in all schools (Herzfeld, 2008, p. 91). However, as Herzfeld argues, this goal cannot be achieved without the support of laws and government mandates to enforce teaching Quechua language at national levels (p. 91). Still, acceptance of language does not equate to acceptance of Quechua people. If the overall goal is to reclaim Quechua heritage, efforts need to address all aspects of this heritage.

In the context of the Canadian state, the government has tried to erase Indigenous Peoples and their cultures using the education system, most notoriously, the residential school system (Lavallée & Menzies, 2014, p. 32). Residential schools were tasked with extinguishing Indigenous languages as one mechanism for destroying Indigenous communities. Despite the closure of residential schools, the educational material taught in schools still excludes Indigenous languages, even though these are critical to preserving culture. Currently, education material is decided by centralized and state-run institutions with limited consultation with Indigenous communities (Bear Nicholas, 2001). One of the exceptions is the territory of Nunavut, which is meant to include Inuit knowledge as part of the foundations of its curriculum. It involves a “made-in-Nunavut curriculum, teaching materials and learning resources, which combine Inuit knowledge with the best Western educational thought and practice (Nunavut Department of

Education, 2008, p. 5) After the Calls to Action highlighted the lack of Indigenous teachings in the educational system (TRCC, 2015, p. 2), some changes were made in the Ontario curriculum to include Indigenous knowledge (Madden, 2019, p. 284). However, as explained earlier, the materials and approaches to change the present education system are insufficient (Madden, 2019, p. 284). Teachers are still lacking the training necessary to include Indigenous teachings.

When participants talked about the lack of formal Indigenous education in the Canadian state, a few believed that could be partly due to Indigenous Peoples being very reserved about sharing their culture with immigrants. Isabel stated: "You do not hear that they [First Nations, Métis and Inuit people] speak about anything, for example, of their reserves. That you can go, go to visit, to know [the reserves] . . ." Other participants shared similar beliefs. These beliefs could come from a lack of knowledge of the programs open to the public, such as the ones offered by the Native Canadian Centre of Toronto and run by Indigenous Peoples. Their programs are open to everyone, including the cultural and language programs that discuss themes related to Indigenous cultures. However, dominant society also plays a role in placing Indigenous Peoples in a position of responsibility for educating non-Indigenous Peoples on colonialism.

Some participants believed that the government made no effort to include teachings about Indigenous Peoples in the school curriculum, despite it being their responsibility to do so. Isabel compared the approaches to teaching Indigenous education in Canada to those in Peru and argued that Indigenous education is part of the curriculum across Peru. According to participants, unlike here, the curriculum on Indigenous cultures back home is in-depth and teaches about the many Indigenous cultures existing in South America before and after contact. It also elaborates on the adverse effects of colonialization in these countries. Isabel stated:

> Here I do not see that they have many history courses [about Indigenous cultures]. In Peru, they teach you the Incas' history, their empire, how it was, and how they began. So, from the time that you are a child, they begin to instill in you that respect, that love for your culture.

Isabel argued that there are many courses taught in school to children from an early age which talk about Indigenous Peoples before and after contact. Students learn about the various Indigenous cultures that were part of the Tahuantinsuyo, bringing people closer to their cultures. In my opinion, in Peru, there is a direct relationship with Indigeneity even for the dominant society because whether the society rejects it or not, large segments of the population connect to Indigeneity. Based on the National Census of 2017,

> approximately 60% of Peruvians consider themselves Mestizes [26] . . . 25% of the Peruvian populations consider themselves Quechua Aimara, Shawi, Ashaninka, Awajun, Shipibo Konibo, Indigenous of the Amazon or from another Indigenous town. (In Servindi, 2018)

Due to the high percentage of people with Indigenous heritage, dominant society tries to address discrimination against Indigenous worldviews and cultures through education on Indigenous cultures, their strengths and resiliency (Chirapaq, Centro de Cultura Indígenas del Perú, 2013, p. 28). Despite these efforts, there remains a strong racial discrimination towards Indigenous populations (Chirapaq, Centro de Cultura Indígenas del Perú, 2013, p. 42).

The fact that Indigeneity is part of all aspects of Peruvian society does not abolish racial discrimination. The government does not necessarily see racial discrimination as a social problem but more of an interpersonal problem. In this way, the discrimination taking place in

[26]Although I had previously used the Chole identity to identify myself, and other people also use it to self-identify, it is not an officially recognized ethnic category.

Peru against Indigenous Peoples is underestimated (Oboler, 1996, p. 69). As argued earlier, since there is a high number of communities with Indigenous heritage and "we are all Mestizos," (Callirgos, 1993, p. 95) there is no recognition of racial discrimination, based on the argument that we are all more or less the same. Racial discrimination is denied based on the argument that there cannot be racial discrimination amongst people that share the same roots. Instead, discrimination is considered ethnic prejudicial beliefs at the interpersonal level. However, this is not the case: although most Peruvian populations have Indigenous heritage, this heritage is not experienced the same way; sharing Indigenous heritage does not stop racial discrimination. Differences amongst and between Mestizes and Indigenous groups have led to racial discrimination (Callirgos, 1993, p. 94). There are many stereotypes, negative beliefs and discrimination against Indigenous heritage. Although I am only focusing on Indigenous Peoples, other cultures, such as the Afro-Peruvian cultures, are also excluded in Peru (Álvarez Gamboa, 2012 p. 12).

In the case of the Canadian state, there is a large non-Indigenous population learning about Indigenous Peoples from an outsider perspective and a detached place. The histories are taught to non-Indigenous people as part of the TRCC's Calls to Action. As a result, Indigenous education is deeply connected to themes of reconciliation based on Western ideologies, particularly Christianity (Madden, 2019, p. 286). Madden (2019) argues that Indigenous education has reconciliation as its ultimate goal. Indigenous education is not the end goal of the work that needs to be done neither is self-determination. It does not aim to deconstruct the white supremacist state. Rather, reconciliation comes from a "Eurocentric paradigm… anchored to Christianity and its particular modes, categories, and signs (e.g. dualism; civility and morality; reliance on confession, apology, forgiveness, and absolution)" (Madden, 2019, p. 286). Such

approaches decentre Indigenous principles and cultural beliefs and, in the process, dismiss their strengths. In Canada, Indigenous education is not a vital component of the curriculum, and it competes with education about the English and French settlers (Watson, 2020, p.156).

Isabel placed some responsibility for promoting Indigenous education on First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. However, as many Indigenous and non-Indigenous allies have argued, it is the job of settlers to educate themselves about Indigenous Peoples (Davis, 2017, pp. 400, 407). The government has the power and responsibility to incorporate this knowledge in various settings. According to Madden (2019), although it has become a "political project" to discuss Indigenous education in schools, it is carried out without being informed by theories and critical analysis (p. 285). The reasons and commitment to Indigenous education are weak. Madden claims: "I regularly read uncertainty and/or disregard in the texts of scholars and educators when it comes to articulating how they conceptualize and respond to the assumptions, purposes, goals, scholarship, and discourses of reconciliation" (p. 286). Madden is calling on the education sector to pay more attention and reflect on how Indigenous education is taking place and for teachers to be more comfortable with the material they are teaching. However, it is important to ask whether teachers receive support to teach this material. According to Lowan-Trudeau (2016), teachers face challenges teaching Indigenous education partly due to resistance from students and a lack of support and resources available (p. 66).

Beyond looking at how formal education is offered, participants such as Isabel looked at how Indigenous knowledge is taught in Peru amongst Indigenous Peoples. Isabel tried to understand the disparities in Indigenous knowledge taught in Latin America and North America. For example, Isabel stated: "Depending on the environment in your house [back home], if your parents are people who still maintain that culture, they will teach you to respect it and respect

your [Indigenous] values . . . Indigenous blood." Isabel explained that since most of Peru's populations have Indigenous heritage, children learn about Indigenous cultures at home from a young age. Despite this, there remains a significant rejection of Quechua identities in South America (Oboler, 1996, p. 53). Isabel is unsure how Indigenous knowledge is passed on at home amongst Indigenous families in Canada.

On the other hand, Indigenous Peoples in Canada are concerned about non-Indigenous children's education regarding Indigenous cultures at home. Indigenous Peoples in Canada advocate for more non-Indigenous families to teach their children about the celebrations of Indigenous cultures as well as the history and harsh realities that Indigenous Peoples experience (Singh, 2021). Assuming that many non-Indigenous families are not teaching their children about Indigenous knowledge, the majority of students in Canada are likely to learn about it through their schools. However, as explained above, the schools are not adequately teaching Indigenous education. One of the implications of a lack of adequate information on Indigenous Peoples, Indigenous knowledges and colonization is less likely future allyship with Indigenous Peoples.

Overall, most participants were unaware that in Canada, just as in Latin America, the state has a long and ongoing history of extinguishing Indigenous languages, traditions and cultures. From a decolonizing perspective, keeping Indigenous knowledge in a subordinate place is one of the tools of colonization (Kovach, 2009 pp. 67–68). Academic spaces do not value Indigenous knowledge the same way as other forms of knowledge (Kovach, 2009, pp. 156–157). Having shared experiences of colonization helped participants better understand the issues that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people face. However, at times participants equated the experiences of both populations. When this happened, we discussed how colonization experiences might converge at some points, but they cannot be equated because of contextual

differences. Knowledge of First Nations, Métis and Inuit histories and cultures is relatively new to Indigenous immigrants. I structured the interviews to create space for an exchange of knowledge. For instance, I learned more about Quechua people living in Ayacucho, and Sonia learned more about First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and how settler colonialism impacts them. Using Freire's (1970a) pedagogy, where the educator and student try to "engage in critical thinking and the quest for mutual humanization" (p. 75), as a researcher, I tried to cultivate a similar relationship with participants, which involves "problem-posing . . . and stimulates true reflection." (p. 84). Under these views, emerging in an inquiry process and accounting for people's historicity is critical to learning (Freire, 1970a, p. 84).

So far, I have discussed participants' understanding of Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism and how they came to know by comparing their experiences of Indigenous Peoples in their homelands to Indigenous Peoples in the Canadian state. I will now discuss how participants learned about Indigenous Peoples through misconceptions based on stereotypes.

Immigrant Misconceptions about Indigenous Peoples

The misconceptions about Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism discussed by participants were often rooted in stereotypes. In our discussions we talked about these beliefs and challenged them. Some participants had an analysis of these stereotypes and assumptions and connected them to forms of discrimination. Some stereotypes revolved around the needs of Indigenous Peoples. Some false assumptions included the idea that Indigenous Peoples prevented technological advancement in the pursuit of keeping traditions; whereas Indigenous Peoples support technology that follows Indigenous beliefs and values such as respect for Indigenous knowledge, "principles of reciprocity . . . relationships between humans and ecosystem and the need to maintain balance (Robyn, 2002, p. 203). As Stollery (2018)) explain, Indigenous

communities try to address present issues such as the sustainability of the landscape by opening themselves to new technologies and creating best practices that incorporate Indigenous knowledge and values (p. 8). In actuality, many Indigenous communities are denied access to technology in ways that contribute to their oppression (Stollery, 2018). Denial of up-to-date communications technology for example is detrimental as Indigenous communities, especially those on reserves, rely heavily on telecommunications to access otherwise unavailable services (Stollery, 2018). In general, fighting to maintain one's culture has been interpreted as resisting technology or any other forms of 'modernity.' Some of the participants in the study also shared these beliefs. Esperanza stated:

> Indigenous People[s] [in Canada] still want to keep what is so rich (from the culture) . . . Nobody is going to take away their habits, nobody is going to change them . . . but how would they achieve progress? . . . They do not want to have television . . . They do not want to have light.

People have come to adopt these beliefs perhaps by living in the city and not fully understanding the views and experiences of Indigenous Peoples in rural areas. A few participants, such as Miguel, discussed technological practices that they consider hurtful to Indigenous culture. Miguel stated:

> It has changed. I went to Ayacucho. It has changed in terms of the arts. There is a lot of mixing [in music]. People no longer value . . . what is natural. For example, our natural tradition was the arpa and violin, and most of us played and were dancers. The scissors dance. I played the violin. . . Now others have combined huayno (a form of traditional music) with electric bass. That is no longer huayno for me. . .. They no longer value it . . . In my time, I had to suffer a lot to learn to play [the instrument]. I had to listen . . . it was

> hard to learn. They [young people] are inventing things with technology. They no longer learn [the traditional ways of playing music]. We cannot fight it. It is about turning our heads to not see it, what can we do? But it has changed so much.

Miguel argues that Indigenous cultural traditions, particularly musical ones, are shifting, and some old traditions are being mixed with modern technological styles. As a result, the older traditional music is disappearing.

I believe Miguel brings up a valid point: certain traditions should not be changed. He claims that some aspects of culture need to stay static. I did not question some of the implications of these beliefs, such that younger generations might not connect or engage with these static forms of cultural music. On the other hand, if I was interviewing one of the young Quechua members mixing Huayno beats with electric bass, they may argue that the traditions are being kept while being combined with modern musical technology. Some examples of Indigenous music in the North and South have kept Indigenous beats and mixed them with pop styles, making their music more appealing to the newer generations. For example, A Tribe Called Red/The Halluci Nation in Canada creates electric powwow music. It has made powwow music more mainstream and accessible, providing social critique and education. Quechua artist from Ayacucho, Peru, Renata Flores, also combine rap and Quechua beats to produce songs with social justice themes.

The stereotype that Indigenous Peoples reject modernity altogether is dangerous. There may be aspects of modernity and technology that Indigenous Peoples reject, but to generalize and claim that they reject all forms of modernity is not accurate, and likewise, to suggest that there is one singular Indigenous view on technology is an oversimplification. There needs to be

more research on what aspects are in conflict with Indigenous beliefs/worldviews rather than again suggesting a singular Indigenous view.

Some participants were aware of other stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples that supported discrimination, such as socioeconomic ones. As stated earlier, Hugo reflected on some of these stereotypes. He explained that the lack of knowledge about Indigenous communities in Canada left immigrants to take on stereotypical beliefs such as that Indigenous Peoples choose to be in their situation and therefore, their struggles do not deserve support. Hugo criticized, "so many in our society believe that an Indigenous protest here is not valid because they [Indigenous Peoples] chose to be poor . . . so it is not worth supporting them." Hugo and other participants such as Isabel argued that immigrants blame Indigenous Peoples for their histories and present situations. These judgements are due to a lack of knowledge and the stereotypes that exist. As Chatterjee (2018) states, misinformation is one factor. However, it cannot be assumed that if racialized immigrants such as Indigenous immigrants had the correct information, they would oppose colonialism. It is essential to recognize that colonialism also benefits racialized immigrants. Therefore, immigrants may support colonialism because it benefits them/us, suggesting that the tensions between racialized immigrants and Indigenous Peoples go beyond education (Chatterjee, 2018, p. 3).

During this research, some participants became aware of their misconceptions but continued to struggle to understand why Indigenous Peoples could not recover from the hardships they experienced. These ways of thinking align with the dominant narrative that continuously underestimates the extent of the trauma that settler colonialism causes. Despite some participants not understanding the impact of settler colonialism, they still agreed that settler

colonialism continues to place Indigenous Peoples in these situations, and immigrants should support Indigenous communities in their struggles.

Participants also spoke about the influence stereotypes portrayed in the media about Indigenous Peoples had on their perceptions. For example, Sonia talked about how Indigenous Peoples were cast as the "bad guys" on T.V., Sonia stated:

> When I was a girl [watching cowboy movies at home] . . . there were some Indigenous characters [from North America] who were the ones that helped but most of them' were the bad guys . . . this we watched in Peru . . . [In contrast], you did not see that same portrayal of Indigenous People[s] from Peru.

Sonia brought attention to the power that media and television have in giving rise to discrimination towards Indigenous Peoples. In the case of Sonia, the only exposure that she had to Indigenous Peoples from North America was through these movies. With the advent of globalized media, stereotypes can be spread throughout the world. Although the portrayal of First Nations, Métis and Inuit as "savage" is no longer acceptable in movies, their portrayals continue to be based on stereotypes and they are 'romanticized' (Canada's Centre for Digital and Media Literacy, n.d.). Sonia pointed out that racist stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples from Peru were not so common in their television programs.

North American movies portray Indigenous Peoples from the North inappropriately, and these programs are openly accepted in the North and internationally. While Sonia was referring to what she witnessed about 30 to 40 years ago, these movies still contributed to how Sonia and, perhaps other people from South America, view Indigenous Peoples from Canada. These stereotypes have hurt and traumatized Indigenous Peoples and continue to do so as they struggle

and resist settler colonialism. As I analyze next, the trauma that Indigenous Peoples have experienced varies and is well hidden.

Trauma as an Effect of Colonization

Participants and I discussed the ongoing trauma caused by settler colonialism in Indigenous communities. Most participants were learning this information for the first time. Participants' understanding of trauma varied and was limited in most instances. Even in cases when people knew the traumatic experiences inflicted by colonialism on Indigenous Peoples, they had a difficult time understanding why its effects continue at present. I am unsure if their difficulty understanding the ongoing effects of trauma actually suggests that their understanding of the trauma is inadequate. Using a decolonizing lens, it is necessary to discuss trauma in connection with settler colonialism.

Trauma concerning Indigenous Peoples is usually discussed as stemming from a past event, and the ongoing oppression of Indigenous Peoples in the present is put aside. The traumatic circumstances that Indigenous Peoples continue to experience due to settler colonialism requires going beyond reparations for past harms (Watson, 2020, p. 28). It means making drastic changes to the current systems in place (Watson, 2020, p. 50). However, these reparations are not taking place. Problematically, even though trauma caused by colonialism is systemic, it has been addressed through individualistic approaches rather than approaches that examine systemic processes of settler colonialism (Bear Nicholas, 2001). Individual approaches to trauma assume that the issue is within the individual and "there is nothing wrong with the system" (p. 18). This assumption marginalizes people and blames them for a presumed lack of resilience (Bear Nicholas, 2001). Individualistic approaches allow for the continuation of the status quo and the belief in a benevolent government. The apparatus of ongoing settler

colonialism has included "efforts at extermination, marginalization, or exclusion and, eventually state dependency; the effects of residential schools and other regimes of cultural suppression and forced assimilation" (Kirmayer et al., 2011, p. 85), which has been directly connected to increased levels of poor health, trauma, stress, and many other adversities in Indigenous Peoples' lives (Kirmayer et al., 2011, pp. 85–87).

Allan and Smilie (2015) discuss how the trauma caused by ongoing colonialism is used to maintain it. The outcomes experienced by Indigenous Peoples, such as poor physical and mental health, high rates of missing and murdered Indigenous women, poverty, unemployment, under-housing and homelessness and overrepresentation in incarceration and child welfare are used to justify colonization and racist beliefs and ideologies (pp. 1–3). For example, these outcomes are used to justify interventions in policing, social work, and health care (p. 1). In this way, the present trauma that continues to be part of settler colonialism is deeply connected to systemic problems in criminal justice, child welfare, education and health care systems (pp. 1–5). Consequently, it is essential to account for intergenerational trauma in a way that historicizes the experiences of Indigenous Peoples while also stressing that the trauma is ongoing because colonization is ongoing (p. 15).

Most participants had some awareness of the traumatic effects of colonization on Indigenous Peoples in Canada. However, they did not necessarily know the severity. Again, their incomplete knowledge may be partly due to the government's lack of transparency in its actions against Indigenous Peoples. Isabel commented on her experiences doing front-line work in social services. She talked about the frustration that Indigenous Peoples experience being denied their rights on their land. She stated:

> I had Indigenous clients. They would comment that it was not easy for them to look for work. There are many closed doors to add to all the frustrations, obstacles. Yet they are the owners of this country, lands, that they are the Originals, the most important. This is their land.

Isabel imagined this is what Indigenous Peoples think: “You put a foot on this land, and you come to tell me how I need to live in my land. . .. This is what also causes much frustration. Much deception. The way that they are treated.” Isabel explained that these abuses become much more aggravating because these are Indigenous lands. Allan and Smylie (2015) spoke about Indigenous Peoples being treated as second-class citizens (p. 2). Their experiences are erased or put aside by the narrative that the Canadian state is “a nation of immigrants” (p. 2). This narrative disregards the origins of Canada, particularly the “sovereignty of First Nations and Inuits before colonization . . . or recogniz[ing] the unique experiences and contributions of Métis Peoples” (p. 2). As I have argued, these beliefs contribute to the tension between Indigenous Peoples and immigrants.

As stated above, some of the participants had difficulty understanding why Indigenous Peoples would be facing so many problems due to the trauma they experienced in the past. Other participants had a difficult time understanding the extent of the trauma related to settler colonization in Canada. As Allan and Smylie (2015) suggest, the trauma that ongoing colonialism continues to perpetuate is often denied or downplayed by the systems in place (pp. 14–15). Consequently, immigrants may not understand why Indigenous Peoples are struggling. Often Indigenous Peoples are harshly judged when they cope in ways that are socially unacceptable, such as through alcohol abuse. Many of the participants commented on alcohol use. We discussed this issue in connection with settler colonialism.

Settler Colonialism and the Perpetuation of Stereotypes

Many participants commented extensively about alcohol use amongst Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Some participants were able to see how alcohol is used to maintain the colonization of Indigenous Peoples. Other participants had a difficult time seeing beyond the stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples and alcohol and their knowledge was mainly based on these stereotypes.

Macdonald and Steenbeek (2015) discuss how immigrants' lack of information on Indigenous Peoples and the effects of settler colonialization partly contribute to maintaining the status quo. Indigenous communities are characterized as "dysfunctional and pathologic . . . [this] ignores the historical resilience and resistance of Aboriginal peoples in the face of adversity brought on by European colonization" (p. 33). Macdonald and Steenbeek call attention to how the lack of information on Indigenous Peoples has led to stereotypes that make Indigenous Peoples appear "dysfunctional." As the participants discussed these stereotypes, we challenged them by discussing how they encourage colonization. We used principles of Freire's (1970a) education for conscientization, such as historicity, to examine how the state embeds Indigenous history with stereotypes, including stereotypes about alcoholism, that serve to maintain discrimination against Indigenous Peoples.

Such stereotypical beliefs fit into the deficit discourse that mainly focuses on the negative experiences of Indigenous communities without elaborating on their strengths (Fforde et al., 2013, p. 166). Fforde et al. (2013) have argued that although this deficit discourse acknowledges an oppression that manifests itself in all areas of Indigenous Peoples' lives, it still relies on "negative assessments of Aboriginal communities, for whom deficit is assumed based on decades of accumulated meaning" (p. 167). It continues to enforce the image of Indigenous Peoples as "morally unpredictable and inferior" (p. 167). According to Fforde et al. (2013), the

detrimental consequences of these stereotypes are that Indigenous Peoples have automatically been associated with "abject oppression and deficit" (p. 167). These portrayals of Indigenous Peoples as powerless reduces them to two-dimensional objects of pity that lack positive attributes or experiences (p. 167). These beliefs dismiss centuries of resistance to domination (Macdonald & Steenbek, 2015, p. 33) and strengthen the mechanisms of colonialism as they are used to justify the removal of Indigenous Peoples' autonomy and the attacks against their integrity (Allan & Smylie, 2015, pp. 2–3).

Some participants attempted to challenge the stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples and alcohol use. However, in the process, they ended up falling into the deficit discourse. Some participants problematized how alcohol was used to colonize Indigenous Peoples and keep them colonized. For example, Isabel had many opinions about what Indigenous Peoples go through and knew that these barriers continue as settler colonialism continues. She discussed how colonizers used alcohol to attempt to destroy Indigenous Peoples. Isabel stated: "The government gave them [Indigenous Peoples] cigars and liquor in exchange. There was much alcohol. The government provided all of that. And it seems like it was with an intention to finish them." Isabel understood the strategies of colonizers to attempt to destroy Indigenous communities by diminishing their ability to resist further colonialism. In my opinion, Isabel is focusing on alcohol use and substance abuse amongst Indigenous Peoples because that has become a stereotype used against Indigenous communities. Isabel went beyond the stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples and forms a critical analysis of how the tools of settler colonialism work to conquer Indigenous Peoples. Isabel stated:

> They [Indigenous Peoples] have gone through enormous suffering that coincides a lot with the suffering that Indigenous People[s] in Peru went through . . . they [the

> landowners in Peru] mistreat them, don't pay them well. Abuse Indigenous Peoples. They [Indigenous Peoples in Peru] also have a life that is enslaving. That comes to be similar to what Indigenous People[s] in Canada have been fighting for, that their rights be respected.

By comparing the suffering of First Nations, Métis and Inuit to those in Peru, Isabel can also see some of the strengths within Indigenous communities. At times, she made some attempts to move away from the deficit discourse. Isabel had gone to school with an Indigenous student and learned about some of the government's abuse of Indigenous communities. Isabel was aware of the suffering of Indigenous Peoples at the hands of the government and people in power. Most participants focused mainly on the suffering that Indigenous Peoples go through. Participants compared Indigenous Peoples from Canada and Latin America based on their suffering/oppression.

Participants rarely discussed the strengths of Indigenous Peoples in their fight against the oppressing circumstances of colonialism. However, there are many initiatives happening across Canada that demonstrate how Indigenous Peoples are working to solve the problems the Canadian state has created with little help from the government. For instance, there are "community-based systems of reciprocal economic and social support such as community food sharing and intergenerational and extended family-child rearing roles" (Castellano, 2002 in Allan and Smylie, 2015, p. 30). These forms of resistance are not the public image that the Canadian government promotes; therefore, it makes sense that many non-Indigenous Peoples living in these lands now known as Canada are unaware of them. Portraying Indigenous Peoples as strong and powerful is threatening to the Canadian state and Canadian identity; therefore, the state relies on stereotypes to portray Indigenous communities (McLaurin, 2012, p. 49). As McLaurin (2012)

states, the stereotypes are more aggressive when the threat of having Indigenous Peoples in power is higher. This threat is towards those "economy, lives, or even lifestyles" (p. 49).

Other participants who understood settler colonialism also talked about the emotional effects of colonialism such as trauma and connected it to alcohol use. Hugo discussed the pain caused by trauma in relation to alcohol use and settler colonialism: "There is psychological damage . . . the clearest is alcoholism that comes from the times of colonialism." Hugo spoke about alcoholism as a coping strategy. Chrisjohn et al. (2017) call for attention to the underlying factors causing behaviours such as alcohol abuse. They argue that societal problems such as alcoholism or suicide within Indigenous populations are connected to ongoing genocide and land theft; that they are responses to present prolonged forms of violence and oppression. Therefore, they need to be understood as such and not as individual pathology. In general, when participants connected alcohol use to settler colonialism and claimed that alcohol became a tool for settler-colonialism, they referred to settler colonialism as an event in the past. Consequently, it became difficult for participants to understand why Indigenous Peoples still struggle.

Sonia, who works in the health sector, was conscious that service providers' stereotypes may influence how they treat marginalized communities, thereby becoming barriers to access. She stated, "those are the scenarios that you have to relate with them [Indigenous Peoples] when they [the police] brought them under the influence of alcohol, intoxicated . . . you judge them. It is wrong, but that is what happens." Sonia recognized the stereotypes that people have of Indigenous Peoples in the health care system and analyzed the effects of these stereotypes when Indigenous Peoples are accessing services. Sonia saw that when a non-Indigenous person is intoxicated and asking for medical care, there are not the same assumptions about their ethnicity. Sonia is still learning about the causes of the hardships that Indigenous Peoples experience.

Sonia was aware of not having much knowledge about Indigenous Peoples. One of the first times that she learned about Indigenous Peoples was when she went on a National Park tour. She talked about how she was introduced to Indigenous Peoples in these lands now known as Canada:

> When we went to a national park, and there was always a display in a park [about Indigenous Peoples] . . .. But it is because of my profession . . . when I worked downtown [Sonia had Indigenous service users] that I learned about them."

Sonia explained that she had learned more about Indigenous Peoples through her Indigenous service users than any formal education or training. Her work settings allowed her contact with Indigenous Peoples, and she learned more about them in this context. Sonia is a professional providing essential health care services; some of her service users are Indigenous. Sonia wished that the health care setting where she worked offered more training to workers; they barely offered training on Indigenous Peoples, their histories and current situations. This information appears to be extremely important as Indigenous Peoples access the majority of their health care through non-Indigenous organizations and from non-Indigenous providers. When service providers lack training on how to work with Indigenous Peoples, Indigenous Peoples are often denied proper services (Wylie & McConkey, 2019, p. 37). However, according to Wylie & McConkey (2019):

> although background training may be valuable, the organizational culture within health care institutions carries a strong weight of the past, normalizing colonial practices that reinforce the inferiority of Indigenous Peoples and practices. Effectively challenging and changing this deep-seated organizational culture within health care institutions will require ongoing training and vigilance to ensure new norms of equity. (p. 38)

Therefore, beyond exposure to training, it is the culture of the institutions that needs to be changed.

The use of alcohol became the focus for many participants. In general, there is minimal questioning of the disproportionate focus on alcohol use amongst Indigenous Peoples and the associated stereotypes, thereby supporting settler colonialism (McLaurin, 2012, pp. 62, 101–102). One of the barriers to challenging the stereotypes the study participants identified was lack of access to information. In the case of Rebecca and Mary, both struggle with the English language, making it more difficult to access accurate information about Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism.

Although my participants did not discuss this information, there is a strong stereotype that Indigenous Peoples in Peru have a drinking problem and are harshly judged for it (Gaspari, 2020, pp. 18–19; Gonzalo Prada, 1986, in Callirgos, 1993, p. 148).[27] The stereotypes of First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and Quechua people related to substance use have been used as vehicles for colonization (Macdonald and Steenbeek, 2015; Gaspari, 2020)). Although the contexts are different, the purpose of these stereotypes is to place Indigenous Peoples in a subordinate position. In this way, less attention is placed on how colonization affects Indigenous Peoples and more on the stereotypes about them.

While participants did not discuss the stereotypes existing in Peru regarding Indigenous Peoples and alcohol abuse, this awareness may have helped participants empathize with Indigenous Peoples in Canada and the discrimination they face. If we use the Condor and Eagle

[27] Quechua people were said to have an alcohol problem by the Jesuits and the Catholic religion who wanted to break the passing on of culture associated with festivities and ceremonies that Quechua people carried out, which involved drinking. Therefore, they began attacking the Quechua people by saying they had a drinking problem. Also, with the coming of positivism came the view of Quechua people as having drinking problems and other negative personality traits. Positivist philosophies argued that "the Indigenous modalities of ritual consumption were a distinctive sign, among others, of the intellectual, cultural and biological inferiority of the Indians" (Gaspari, 2020, p. 21)

teaching, which supports the union between the South and the North, we can see how this union is challenged by stereotypes held about Indigenous communities by other Indigenous communities. Therefore, for this union to occur, we need to disrupt the existing stereotypes against First Nations, Métis and Inuit people within Quechua communities, and, as a long-term plan, dismantle the systems in place that give rise to these forms of violence. Stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples infiltrate society as part of the apparatus that maintains the status quo. Another mechanism that works to maintain settler colonialism involves transnational forces such as transnational economies. As discussed in the following section, settler colonialism works together with transnational economies to dominate Indigenous Peoples.

Transnational Economies as a New Form of Colonialism

Some participants argued that new forms of colonialism involve transnational economies. Some of the participants discussed the effects of transnational economies on Indigenous Peoples in Canada and worldwide. Most participants based their knowledge on this topic by reflecting on what happens with Indigenous Peoples back home. In terms of South America, scholars such as Zaffaroni (2015) have claimed that transnational economies have benefited from the resources of Andean countries and polluted their lands (p. 211). These actions are supported by neoliberal policies that push for regulations that give more freedom to the trade markets once they enter foreign countries (Fermín, 2010, p. 689). Authors such as Nelson (2019) and Gombay & Palomino-Schalscha (2019) argue that these forms of exploitation are also observed in Canada.

Indigenous Peoples in Canada and worldwide are trying to negotiate to have their rights respected when companies want to extract resources from their lands. Against opposition, they try to protect their cultural traditions, lands and communities (Nelson, 2019, p. 2). However, trade markets and governments often ignore these ethical considerations. Multinational

companies that exploit Indigenous lands in Canada are protected by government legislation. For example, the Far North Act has allowed the development of a multibillion-dollar chromite mining industry on Indigenous lands in Northern Ontario (Nelson, 2019). This project allows one of "Canada's largest corporations . . . to extract various resources within this Oji-Cree traditional territory" (p. 2). These agreements involve the companies pressuring Indigenous Peoples to agree to their terms and support 'modern development' (p. 2).

The Canadian government has failed to uphold the rights of Indigenous Peoples in Canada to self-determination. The principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and the treaties emphasize the need to obtain consent from Indigenous Peoples before starting projects involving their lands: "governments cannot implement a policy or program on or concerning Indigenous Peoples' lands unless there is prior consultation and consent from the Indigenous community" (Institute for Human Rights and Business, 2022, n.p.). An example of the Canadian government disregarding this principle is the introduction of Bill 5, the Protect Ontario by Unleashing our Economy Act, 2025. Bill 5 is legislation intended to shorten the regulatory processes required for "infrastructure, mining, and resource projects" (Chiefs of Ontario, n.d., n.p.). In the process, it "significantly weakens environmental protections, reduces oversight of mining and development projects, and limits opportunities for First Nations consultation and consent" (Chiefs of Ontario, n.d., n.p). These capitalist practices that exploit Indigenous Peoples and their lands have caused distrust amongst Indigenous Peoples towards the government and their commitment to Indigenous communities.

Participants argued that transnational companies steal Indigenous lands in their homelands and Canada. Martin discussed how multinational mining companies operate in Peru:

> Mining takes the resources and leaves pollution in the lands. These transnational abuses happen in the lands of Indigenous People[s]. This is a result of colonialism because it positions Indigenous People[s] in a lower rank. . .. It encourages other foreign companies to also mistreat Indigenous People[s].

Participants also discussed the way transnational companies have shifted how societies work. Hugo discussed that in present economies, the goal is to produce and make a profit, placing the needs of people aside. He stated:

> There is no good intention, the main purpose is to make people produce, to make better workers . . . people that produce . . . not to create better people in society . . . instead it is about seeing how we can produce more . . .

Hugo raised the point that 'creating better people' has been displaced by the goal of producing for profit, and these ways of thinking need to be changed. Hugo based his understanding on his knowledge of what happens to Indigenous Peoples worldwide. As stated before, Hugo openly admitted in a few parts of the interview to not being sure of what is happening to Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Hugo was also speaking from his experience working in Canada in the construction industry and his experience with the pressure to produce. He witnessed these industries' disregard for people's basic needs.

Similar to Hugo's views, Fermín (2010) discusses how human beings are viewed as agents of production by present-day economies. Neoliberal policies that support the increase of privatization of state companies and government's reduced social expenditures have strengthened the free-market economy and, in the process, turned citizens into consumers (p. 688). Under current neoliberal policies, citizens become consumers of markets with no attention paid to their well-being (p. 688).

We have a government that wants to disengage from Indigenous communities and their responsibility to social expenditure. At the same time, this government takes on an overprotective and paternalistic approach to matters concerning Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous Peoples are stripped of their rights for "self-determination and self-sufficiency" by government legislation (Nelson, 2019, p. 6). In this way, their power to "protect and have stewardship over the land and its resources" is taken away (Nelson, 2019, p. 6).

It is argued that Indigenous Peoples should be involved in the negotiations between government and transnational companies. This way, they would be able to defend their interests. In general, the impacts of transnational companies on Indigenous communities have been negative because of their operational conditions (Romero & Vero Colina, 2014). Transnational companies also operate in a way that undermines the ability of Indigenous Peoples to determine what is best for their well-being (Aylwin, 2008, p. 35). Indigenous worldviews discuss the depth of the relationships and knowledge that Indigenous Peoples have with the lands and environment. However, this knowledge is ignored when transnational companies decide what is best for Indigenous lands.

In conjunction with the government, transnational companies take away the autonomy of Indigenous Peoples. Some participants were surprised to learn about the impact of transnational economies on Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Some were unaware of the Canadian government's exploitation of Indigenous communities and lands regarding resource extraction. They thought that these abuses only happened in developing countries. Participants were very upset to learn about these realities in the context of Canada's reputation as a wealthy country.

To this point, I have discussed settler colonialism and the new forms of colonialism that are emerging through transnational economies. In response to the various forms of colonialism,

Indigenous Peoples are continuously engaged in projects to resist these forms of abuses (Kirmayer et al., 2011, p. 84). However, as mentioned above, participants mainly talked about the hardships that Indigenous Peoples in Canada go through, and only a few discussed the strength and resiliency amongst Indigenous Peoples. A deficit discourse is adopted by non-Indigenous, and at times, by Indigenous Peoples (Fforde et al., 2013, p. 163), which can have many negative consequences. As Culler claims, a discourse is "constitutive and productive. It is a social action which frames and constrains understanding, but it is also productive of knowledge and social relationships" (Culler in Fforde et al., 2013, p. 163). Therefore, deficit discourses can also have substantial effects on the well-being of Indigenous Peoples. Participants and I discussed resilience and strength within Indigenous communities and their cultural practices to counteract the deficit discourses. The following section talks about participants' understanding of Indigenous cultures and wellness practices as tools for resistance.

Indigenous Cultural and Wellness Practices

Participants were aware of the importance of Indigenous cultures to Indigenous Peoples. We discussed the fact that this is not the case for every Indigenous person either. Some participants talked about their understanding of Indigenous cultures, powwows and folk festivals. Many participants learned for the first time about First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and their cultures when they performed dances at powwows and folk festivals. As Lavallée and Menzies (2014) claim, resilience and resistance within Indigenous Peoples and cultures have been critical to the uprising against gender violence and systems of settler colonialism such as the child welfare system (p. 326).

Scholars have argued for the importance of Indigenous worldviews as critical components in the continuation of Indigenous Peoples' ability to withstand oppression by

systems such as the legal system (Kirmayer et al., 2011, pp. 88–89; Lavallée & Menzies, 2014, p. 325). Indigenous People's resiliency is rooted in the many cultural aspects that people hold. As Kirmayer et al. (2011) argue, historical aspects of Indigenous culture as well as the "revitalization of culture, language, and tradition can help repair the ruptures of cultural continuity" (p. 84). Relying on these cultural aspects (sacred teachings, myths and collective history) helps create a positive vision in which other possibilities are imaginable (p. 85). As discussed in Chapter One, a decolonizing lens requires the viewer to value Indigenous knowledge and its cultural aspects. It involves breaking down the barriers that place Indigenous knowledge as lesser than dominant knowledge and advocates for the belief in culture as a tool for resilience. Participants wanted to learn more about Indigenous cultures and traditions in Canada. Esperanza, who is a folk dancer, shared her experience dancing in powwows. She talked about the opportunity to have more cultural exchanges as part of these festivals:

> It would be wonderful to mix, that they give us an opportunity . . . if they want, we could bring [food] . . . and we could let them know about our food, our dresses . . . like a cultural exchange . . . that would be excellent . . . Sometimes we [the folklore dance group she belongs to] have invitations. Before I danced for another group . . . in different places . . . with them [Indigenous Peoples from Canada]. . . and they liked us. They clapped . . . but to get there, it was very far, it was more about arriving, dancing and coming back . . . it did not allow us to learn much . . . I saw how the people dressed. They were happy [to see Quechuas dance], they clapped for us. I was able to see their crafts, what they sold, the bread [bannock] . . . and I saw them dance a bit.

Esperanza's experience fits with the Eagle and Condor prophecy. According to the prophecy, there is a need for Indigenous Peoples from the South and North to reconnect. Esperanza also

pointed out the lack of accessibility she experienced in attending Indigenous public gatherings because they were far away. Most participants were unaware of powwows and other Indigenous gatherings open to the public that happen within Tkaronto.

A few of the participants shared Esperanza's experiences because they were also Quechua folk dance performers. Most of the participants expressed wanting to learn more about Indigenous cultures and to participate in their cultural practices if they had the opportunity. They were aware that these cultural practices could only happen if Indigenous communities invited them. Participants and I talked about the importance of needing to be invited into Indigenous communities to be part of their ceremonies. One of the participants, Jennifer, had participated in sweat lodges she was invited to by Indigenous members. Participants were particularly interested in being part of Indigenous practices and ceremonies because they believed in their healing powers. In general, participants had some understanding of the cultural practices of Indigenous Peoples and believed in the strength that they embodied.

Some participants were also aware of the role that Elders play in Indigenous cultures. Samay talked about one of the Elders to whom she was introduced at an early age and discussed the work he did to strengthen urban Indigenous communities. Samay stated:

> He had a lot of this vision about being an Indigenous person in the city because there is a division sometimes between the Indigenous People[s] here and the people of the region. . .. Sometimes there are divisions or clashes. He would say: "you are Indigenous, it does not matter if you live in the city, that does not mean that you are not connected with your traditions. It just means that you are exposed to it in another way." So, there are many Indigenous People[s] who have grown up and were born in urban centres. They have connected with him for that reason. He does not deny who you are.

Samay discussed the strength encompassed within Indigenous identities and the identity struggles that people face as they move from the reserve or a town to the capital. Samay explained that Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada might feel that their Indigeneity is weakened because some traditions are connected to the land, which shifts when people move to urban cities. There is less opportunity to connect with natural spaces. In this case, some Elders help Indigenous Peoples re-connect to their Indigeneity. Elders may help people question their preconceptions of what an Indigenous person should be and the lifestyles they are supposed to adhere to. Most of all, who benefits from these preconceptions and who do they isolate? Participants empathized with these struggles because they shared similar experiences when they moved from smaller towns to larger cities in their countries of origin. As discussed earlier, when Indigenous Peoples move to larger places, they may feel pressured or forced to assimilate in the larger city. Participants talked extensively about their experiences with these shifts in identity as they lived through internal migration (moving from a small city to a larger city within the same country). Indigeneity as a resilience tool has become the focus for many Indigenous Peoples in North and South America (Coulthard, 2014, p. 18; Ludlow, 2016, p. 14).

Using a decolonizing lens, Coulthard (2014) proposes a shift towards the decolonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people based on cultural resurgence. This process entails developing one's own Indigenous identities away from those imposed by colonialism. Coulthard encourages Indigenous Peoples to know who they are and not rely on others' recognition and approval of their identity (p. 18). Instead, Coulthard recommends a move towards a resurgent paradigm to engage Indigenous Peoples from the Canadian state in the process of decolonizing the mind (p. 18) as an alternative to recognition-based approaches. As I stated in the key

concepts section, Coulthard discusses a shift in the colonial power that happened in Canada as moving from:

> a structure that was once primarily reinforced by policies, techniques, and ideologies explicitly oriented around the genocidal exclusion/assimilation double, to one that is now reproduced through a seemingly more conciliatory set of discourses and institutional practices that emphasize our recognition and accommodation. Regardless of this modification, however, the relationship between Indigenous Peoples and the state has remained colonial to its foundation. (Coulthard, 2014, p. 6)

The resurgence paradigm focuses on regenerating the values from the past to readjust to present situations. In this way, the resurgence paradigm "draws critically on the past with an eye to radically transform the colonial power relations that have come to dominate our present" (Coulthard, 2014, p. 157).

This aspect of the resurgence paradigm is similar to Quijano's (2014) discussion of the decolonial project. Quijano proposes that achieving good living for Indigenous people requires a decoloniality of power that centres on democracy, which differs significantly from the current systems we are used to. Decoloniality of power takes into account the historical context. Similarly, Coulthard (2014) claims that the resurgence of Indigenous culture and its people must consider the histories of these cultures as we aim to build more equitable societies. The resurgence paradigm is also based on principles of prefigurative politics, which ensure that the tools used for decolonization support decolonization goals (p. 159). In other words, ensuring that Indigenous values and beliefs from the past or present do not oppress people fighting for decolonization.

On this topic of a resurgence amongst First Nations, Métis and Inuit, participants spoke extensively about their Indigeneity and resurgence once they migrated to the Canadian state. In some cases, their relationship to their Indigeneity prompted a desire to connect to Indigenous Peoples and their resurgence in Canada, as discussed in the next chapter. Other participants spoke about how they felt now that they had been in the Canadian state for many years and away from their homelands and Quechua heritage. As stated earlier, some participants, such as Sonia, identified more with dominant Peruvian groups than with Indigenous groups. She has assimilated to her residence but maintains a solid connection to her country of origin, less so to her Quechua heritage. However, her experiences with Indigeneity, particularly back home, helped her be concerned about what is happening with Indigenous Peoples in Canada (this point will be expanded in the next chapter). Other participants, such as Rebecca, continued to be connected to their Quechua heritage after moving to Canada. When Rebecca and Mary were asked whether it was challenging to maintain Indigenous connections once they moved to Canada, Mary stated: "It is not difficult. You can keep them. When you love your ancestral heritage, it is not hard to keep it, the food, the language."

Similarly, Rebecca, stated*:* "When we see each other, we speak it [Quechua]. Since we attend the same groups, community centres, we speak it. So, we keep our Quechua language, our Quechua traditions. Our dances. We also sing very well in Quechua." Their testimonies show how their connection to their traditions has continued despite not being in their homelands. They have been able to find each other and other Quechua people to share their Quechua traditions, knowledge and culture in general. Using an Indigenous methodology allowed participants space to discuss their cultural practices and knowledge as critical components of their understanding of the world and identity. Their example shows the importance of forming Indigenous communities

in order to connect to their Indigenous heritage. Mary's experiences, just as Sonia's experiences with her Quechua heritage, led her to be more empathetic and express more concern for First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and their cultures. For some participants, their connection to Indigeneity translated into them understanding and valuing the resurgence amongst First Nations, Métis and Inuit people that Coulthard (2014) proposes.

I find it very important to encourage Indigenous Peoples to keep their Indigenous identity once they move to other places, whether migrating within or between countries, as this is part of who they are and discrimination should not take this away from them. In the case of Quechua immigrants, I believe it is necessary to strengthen the Quechua community in the Canadian state. This way, people can continue embracing their Indigenous identities and the knowledge and strength of these identities.

So far, I have presented and analyzed the understanding that participants have of Indigenous Peoples, colonialism and its effects on Indigenous Peoples and their resilience to these forms of oppression through cultural resurgence. These views and knowledge have influenced the participants' relations with Indigenous Peoples, as discussed in the second part of this chapter.

Part II: Relations with Indigenous Peoples

I have presented the relations that participants had with Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous lands. Some of the factors that affect participants' relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit were government's actions that divided Indigenous Peoples and immigrants, racism, conflicting interests, lack of communication, the precarious socio-economic positions they hold within the Canadian state, the lack of contact they have with Indigenous communities and lack of knowledge of their position as settlers in Indigenous lands. Participants had limited awareness of

how their settler identity affected their relations with Indigenous communities. However, they were open to learning about it and accepting their complicity in settler colonialism. Most participants described their relations with Indigenous Peoples as distant and expressed a desire to change this. Besides discussing their relations with Indigenous Peoples, participants also talked about their relations to these lands. This point is critical as immigrants are occupying lands that have been taken care of by Indigenous Peoples; therefore, any move to decolonization must discuss the relations that immigrants have to these lands.

Divisions Between Racialized Immigrants and Indigenous Peoples in Canada

Participants discussed how the government fueled the divides between First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and immigrants. In the health sector, scholars such as Allan and Smylie (2015) discuss the health disparities between immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from Canada and the role of the government in these inequalities. Participants discussed government policies and actions that promote "colonization, racism, social exclusion . . . [and] lack of Indigenous self-determination" (p. 7). As stated earlier, these inequalities stem from colonialism, which at times works to favour immigrants and, in this way, places them against Indigenous Peoples (Macdonald & Steenbeek, 2015, p. 65).

According to Anzaldúa (1987), Westernized governments establish socially constructed boundaries that control and cause divisions amongst less privileged groups. Anzaldúa argues that the state brings about division through the construction of borderlands. She states:

> A borderland is a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary where the prohibited, the forbidden, and los atravesados [those who have crossed] live here: the squint-eyed, the perverse, the queer, the troublesome, the

> mongrel, the mulato, the half-breed, the half-dead; in short, those who cross-over, pass over, or go through the confines of the 'normal.' (p. 3)

Anzaldua uses 'borderland' to refer to a place, an emotion, state, etc., occupied by immigrant/ refugee people. They occupy this unsettled place because immigrants/refugees no longer reside in their places of origin. They are neither considered to be from their new home nor their homelands. Consequently, as previously discussed, the state forms structures that isolate and distance racialized people from other groups such as First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people. Some participants argued that having the government allocate fewer resources/funding to Indigenous communities such as reserves strains relations with immigrant communities receiving more resources. Some participants thought that these inequalities could lead to resentment. However, a few participants were hopeful that if Indigenous Peoples were treated better and the disparities dissipated, feelings of resentment could disappear. For example, Jessica stated, "If that was the reality, that the Indigenous Peoples here have the opportunities that we have, they would not think that way because we would be at the same level, at the same educational level, the same opportunities." Jessica's comment suggests that if these injustices and inequalities amongst immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from Canada did not exist, then the two populations would form stronger relations.

Many participants shared Jessica's opinion that immigrants are treated better than Indigenous Peoples, and that Indigenous Peoples should be treated at least the same. However, these wishes for equal treatment would not be doing justice to First Nations, Métis and Inuit people because they are not in the same position as immigrants. As argued by Thobani (2007), "the concept of equality on all subjects, including Aboriginal peoples, enabled it to construct Aboriginal peoples . . . as ingrates who demanded preferential treatment, over and above what

was a fair entitlement of all other citizens" (p. 98). Therefore, concepts of equality can make Indigenous Peoples targets in society for demanding rights as Original people, rights to which immigrants are not entitled. Therefore, aiming for equality amongst Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada is not justice.

If the government offered equitable treatment to First Nations, Métis and Inuit, such a move may strengthen relations between Indigenous immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from the Canadian state. However, equitable treatment would not tackle the complexities of settler colonialism. Equitable treatment would not guarantee that Indigenous immigrants would treat Indigenous Peoples and their lands respectfully. For example, action towards more equitable opportunities does not guarantee that Indigenous immigrants would not try to become the standard 'good citizen,' an identity that supports settler colonialism. Other moves towards justice would need to happen amongst Indigenous immigrants, such as respect and support for decolonizing projects. These social action moves are complex due to the marginalization of Indigenous immigrant groups. Therefore, their struggles and precarious positions may prevent them from supporting decolonizing projects. However, to strengthen the relations amongst Indigenous immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from Canada, the complexities of our relations need to be addressed. These moves towards justice will not likely stem from the government.

A few participants could not see from their personal experience how the government treated immigrants better than Indigenous Peoples. They spoke about their personal experience obtaining help and argued that immigrants like themselves are not receiving help. For example, Rebecca stated that: "they [Indigenous Peoples] think [the government] helps immigrants, but they do not help me." In some ways, Rebecca was calling attention to the stereotypes around immigrants. One of the stereotypes is that they receive help from the government. As Rebecca

pointed out, that is not necessarily the case: not all immigrants are the same nor are they all treated the same or given access to equitable opportunities. Therefore, it is difficult for some immigrants to see how the government treats them better than Indigenous Peoples. Rebecca's point of view also illustrates Thobani's (2007) point, discussed earlier in this chapter, that immigrants' marginalized position prevents them from seeing their complicity in settler colonialism.

Besides the influence of the government in creating division, there are other inhibiting factors, such as their/our settler identity, that affect forming relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit, which will be discussed below. At the individual level, the participants' settler identity influenced the relations that were formed. As I will discuss next, participants were not necessarily aware of their complicity in settler colonialism or their settler identity. Therefore, they had a difficult time recognizing its impact on their relationships.

Effects of Settler Identity on Indigenous-Settler Relations

After participants and I discussed our settler identity and we learned more about our position on these lands now known as Canada, most of them acknowledged their involvement in settler colonialism. Martin stated, "We have invaded their lands . . . we are living a better life . . . [than them]. I think . . . we need to follow the ways of how they live." After learning more about settler colonialism and his settler identity, Martin argued that immigrants need to acknowledge Indigenous Peoples' suffering due to these forms of oppression and support them since these lands are theirs. When Martin was asked to talk about his knowledge of Indigenous Peoples from Canada or his relations with these communities, he had minimal knowledge or relations. Martin had spent most of his life in Canada working to earn a living and had limited opportunities to

learn about these facts. Still, he was very open to learning about the concept of immigrants as settlers and their/our complicity in settler colonialism.

Some existing literature on racialized immigrants claims they are in denial of their settler identity (Thobani, 2007; Tuck, 2016; Tuck & Yang, 2012). My participants were not familiar with this concept, which is a largely academic and activist concept. Furthermore, their struggles with racism and coming from Latin America and being Indigenous themselves also make it more complicated for them to imagine that they are complicit in settler colonialism. However, most of them were open to considering this concept and analysis when I introduced it. The difference in findings may be partly due to the identity of my study population. The participants in this were Indigenous; therefore, all of them shared an Indigenous identity and experiences with colonialism (the next chapter discusses the impact of sharing an Indigenous identity on participants). One participant had questions and contested the opinion of some Indigenous Peoples that immigrants need to dis-occupy their lands. Participant Hugo and I discussed how most First Nations, Inuit and Métis people mainly ask settlers to respect their responsibilities rather than leave. For some Indigenous Peoples, regaining sovereignty may involve taking lands back but not necessarily demanding non-Indigenous people leave.

Hugo raised a common belief amongst immigrants that immigrants provide most of the workforce in the Canadian state and that asking them to leave would be detrimental to this country. Although the state relies on immigrants and always has, Indigenous Peoples and their governments do not. The mistaken belief is that immigrants are key to the progress of Indigenous Peoples and their lands when they are not. In the context of the United States, Dunbar-Ortiz (2021) explains that the claim that we live in a "nation of immigrants is often used to 'counter xenophobic fears'" (p. 19). However, in the process, it erases settler colonialism and Indigenous

Peoples. Even though Dunbar-Ortiz refers to the US context, it is strongly suggested that Canada holds similar views (Chatterjee, 2018, p. 9). These views amongst some immigrants oppose projects of decolonization.

Although most participants accepted their settler identity when they learned about it, most of them were unaware of how this identity affected their relationship-building with Indigenous Peoples. Following, I discuss the experiences of participants forming relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit.

Forming Relations

Participants varied in the types of relations they had with Indigenous Peoples. Ghorayshi (2010) studied relations between the emerging racialized immigrant youth population and First Nations, Métis and Inuit youth in Winnipeg by conducting a study with both communities and service providers working with both groups. As described earlier, Ghorayshi's (2010) study suggests that the relations between racialized immigrants and Indigenous populations are characterized by "racism, misinformation, isolation and lack of inter-connectedness" (p. 91). Therefore, these barriers need to be addressed before proper relations can be formed between Indigenous Peoples from Canada and immigrant populations. Ghorayshi's study suggests that the overall pressures experienced by both communities affected relations. According to Ghorayshi, Indigenous Peoples may be hesitant to share resources with non-Indigenous people, and these attitudes may lead to tensions in their relations. The Indigenous participants in Ghorayshi's study explained that if their people are not receiving the assistance they need, how can they be expected to collaborate with others (p. 90). In general, the pressures that Indigenous populations experience and the needs of racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, may have contributed to the tension between the two groups.

Often, immigrants are unaware that when they migrate to other colonized countries, their presence helps prop up the colonization of the Indigenous Peoples from those lands (Lawrence & Dua, 2005). The systemic racism that racialized immigrants experience makes it difficult to recognize their position as settlers, complicity in settler colonialism and the responsibilities attached to their settler identity (Thobani, 2007, p. 16; Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 1). All these factors contributed to forming relations between these two populations.

Participants varied in the types of relations they had with Indigenous Peoples from Canada. One of the participants, Samay, has a solid connection to her Indigenous heritage and regularly visits the place she considers her homeland. She explained that her strong relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and their lands stemmed from her father's connections with these communities at an early age. Samay also has a strong connection with these lands; she stated: "I was born here in Toronto. They [Indigenous Peoples from Canada] did a ceremony for me. They made me a star blanket. They had a dream. I had a kind of initiation here."

Reflecting on Samay's case, it could be that her strong connection with her heritage and a family that is immersed within Indigenous communities in Canada have helped her form close relations with Indigenous Peoples and their lands. Samay also shared her observations on the relations of Kishwa[28] communities in Ecuador to which she belongs and Indigenous Peoples from Canada. Samay talked about the relations of Kishwa people living in Otavalo with Indigenous Peoples from the North:

[28] As mentioned earlier, Kishwa people make up a different Indigenous group than Quechua people. They mainly reside in Otavalo, Ecuador but share cultural aspects in common with Quechuas from other countries such as Peru (Benítez Bastidas et al. 2016).

> In Otavalo, there is a lot of handmade merchandise that is sold and produced. So, people . . . buy it and sell it. One of the things they [Kishwa people] do is make dream catchers. They do tons of dream catchers, and that's a very controversial thing that we don't bring up. Indigenous People[s] from the North have asked that they [Kishwa people] do not produce dream catchers.

Samay spoke about having challenged Kishwa people in Otavalo for appropriating crafts that are not theirs. Samay identified these behaviours, based on self-interest, as barriers to forming relations between the two Indigenous communities.

Samay discussed similar issues in the relations between Kishwa immigrants living in Toronto with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. She explained that since the Kishwa people are merchants, many carry out their businesses in Canada and participate in the Indigenous arts and crafts festivals. Sharing these spaces has allowed First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and Kishwa people to form working relations and friendships. Samay explained that in craft festivals where these two communities come together, there is tension at times. For instance, some Kishwa merchants take more space than they should in the festivals, creating tension between the two groups. Echoing Ghorayshi's (2010) study discussed above, there is a lack of understanding between racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, and Indigenous Peoples from Canada. The lack of resources Kishwa people have in Canada can also pressure them to try to make the most profit possible in festivals, disregarding the regulations placed by the Indigenous Peoples running the festivals. While acknowledging the financial pressures that may be leading Kishwa people to act this way, it is also essential to recognize the harm they cause.

Most participants had less contact with Indigenous Peoples than Samay. They discussed their lack of relations with Indigenous Peoples and connected it to distrust, settler colonialism

and discrimination. Scholars have argued that settler colonialism and the gap created between First Nations, Métis and Inuit people mainly led by the government (Anaya 2013, in MacDonald & Steenbeek, 2015, p. 66) has made Indigenous Peoples distrustful of immigrants (Davis et al., 2007, p. 114). As participants learned more about the marginalization that Indigenous Peoples from Canada experience, they understood better why they were distrustful. However, they positioned the injustices that Indigenous Peoples experience as a problem of the past. Isabel stated:

> Perhaps . . . because they have gone through so many things, there is a lack of trust with people from the outside. A fear that may exist . . . there is a lack of trust because they [settlers] did not know how to respect them.

Isabel understood why it could take time for Indigenous Peoples to become comfortable with immigrants and form relationships with them. However, she did not know that the disrespect towards Indigenous Peoples continues (Davis et al., 2007, p. 114). Participants were empathetic towards the hesitant attitudes of some Indigenous Peoples from Canada. However, most participants had difficulty forming relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit due to the lack of contact with these communities, as discussed in the following section.

Lack of Contact with Indigenous Peoples from Canada

Many participants expressed a strong interest in forming relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people but had difficulty contacting them. Discussing relations between racialized immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, Ghorayshi (2010) identified that a lack of connection and information about each other led to tension and racism between the two populations (pp. 90–91). Agencies such as the Indigenous-led agency Ka Ni Kanichihk Inc. have sought to address this lack of connection. They have worked at orienting newcomers into their

new life in the Canadian state. The agency moves away from "Western Eurocentric authority" (Gyepi-Garbrah, Walker & Garcea, 2013, 1796) and encourages "intercultural relationships" such as those between newcomers and Indigenous Peoples (p. 1796).

Participants claimed that having no relations with Indigenous Peoples may lead to continuing support for settler colonization. Rosa wanted to establish a closer relationship with Indigenous Peoples from the reserve around her area. Rosa stated, "I hope that my friend takes me . . . Many people in Peru say those who do not know the history are in danger of repeating it." Rosa spoke about her difficulties trying to connect with Indigenous Peoples on the reserves. She wanted to learn more about their way of life and thought this was the place to meet them. Wanting to know about the culture of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people aligns with the Condor and Eagle teaching. Rosa identified her limited access to transportation and language barriers as obstacles to forming relationships. Many participants saw a need to form relations with Indigenous Peoples from Canada to learn about their needs and support their struggles. This point will be expanded in the next section.

We also talked about the responsibility that immigrants have to learn about the issues affecting Indigenous communities instead of having Indigenous Peoples take on the responsibility of teaching us. Except for two people, none of the participants had previously considered that it is the responsibility of immigrants to take on this task. The responsibility to educate ourselves is rarely discussed or encouraged in society. In terms of having more education on Indigenous Peoples and their cultures, this is of "unquestionable value;" at the same time, it is essential to recognize that these actions would not eradicate settler colonialism (Chattarjee, 2018, p 12). Instead, we need to analyze the disconnection between immigrant and Indigenous issues. According to Chatterjee (2018), one of the causes for this disconnection

involves the settler-colonial state, which actively creates vulnerabilities and competing claims amongst Indigenous and immigrant populations to fulfill "their political goals (i.e. Indigenous land and migrant labour exploitation)" (p. 12).

One of the participants who was more informed of the programming accessible to non-Indigenous Peoples talked about the opportunities to establish relations with these communities through activities offered at the various Indigenous centres in Toronto. Isabel stated:

> What is good is that this centre [the Native Centre] has promoted much, much interaction with the [immigrant] communities . . . so when you . . . start to dig deeper and learn more about Indigenous communities you begin to realize that there are similar customs.

Working in social services gave Isabel more opportunities to learn about different ways to connect with Indigenous Peoples. She also saw the need to raise awareness for more community centres, specifically Latin American centres, to build relations with Indigenous Peoples from Canada.

Other participants suggested that when we have more structured Quechua groups, they should have information about Indigenous communities from these lands now known as Canada and ways to contact them. Transnational connections based on respect and an understanding that newcomers are "guests" to these lands before coming to Canada could also help form relations between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. The concept of guest is discussed by Green (2016) who explains that when a guest was "welcomed into a community, they were treated like family" (p. 178) and were expected to respect the ways that their hosts live. Guests also need to take responsibility for how they treat the space. If guests damage the space, they need to return it to its original state, and they need to treat Indigenous space with respect as if they were the original caregivers of the space (p. 178).

Participants discussed the possibility of establishing relations between Quechuas in Canada and those still in South America who are planning to migrate to Canada. These relations would help potential Quechua migrants adjust better to their new places of residence when they arrive and gain knowledge of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, their lands and histories before migrating. Jennifer stated:

> Before a Quechua family migrates to Canada, if there can be groups that are connected with them in Peru . . . they can tell you look, if you are coming here, connect with this family. I think within Latin American people this was happening, especially in El Salvador when people were coming here. New immigrants were connected with families here from El Salvador . . . so they have that connection . . . a connection to tell them about here.

Jennifer proposed transnational relations within Quechua communities in the Canadian state and South America to teach Quechua people even before migrating about Indigenous Peoples' lives and cultures.

Esperanza suggested doing exchange programs where First Nations, Métis and Inuit people could connect with families in Peru and vice versa. Both groups could learn about the other's culture by travelling to each other's place of origin. These ways of relating with each other may be more equitable. Esperanza proposed to have both groups engage in an exchange of resources so that the relationship is symbiotic. At present, as with most immigrants, Quechua immigrants mostly rely on the resources of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people without giving back to these communities.

Thus far, I have discussed relations between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit. However, the relations that participants hold to place are also necessary to

explore as I tackle the primary goal of this thesis, collaboration with Indigenous Peoples from these lands. The participants' potential collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, which is discussed in the next chapter, is influenced by their connection to these lands.

Relations to Place

The type of connection immigrants have to the place they inhabit affects their commitment to that place and the people caring for it. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, I utilize a critical inquiry of place based on Tuck and McKenzie's (2014) model. Under their model, place involves the relations amongst all living and non-living beings, spirits, and the entire universe, and the accountability that people have to place (Tuck & Mckenzie, 2014 p. 65). The place happens in a particular space and time (p. 34). It can symbolize a particular emotion or meaning attached to that space and time. Place includes the concept of land, which involves the "interwoven aspects of land (origin) stories, claims, and identity" (Tuck & Mckenzie, 2014 p. 65).

Critical inquiry of place was used to help Quechua participants situate themselves in relation to their homelands and their now occupied lands. Participants discussed place in connection to their immigration experiences. They discussed the inequalities they experience as immigrants imposed by systems in these lands. At the same time, they discussed how they benefit from living on these lands. According to Massey (1991), people's connection to place is guided by systems of immigration within countries. These systems of immigration either allow or refuse entrance to people depending on who they are. Specifically, Massey discusses the unequal opportunities people have to move through space worldwide as this is guided by their status. Massey argues that the factors making it more common for people to move, such as 'technology,' are not experienced by everyone the same way (p. 25). People have power based

on their status, including their financial status. Some people are "'in-charge of such time-space compression . . . others are doing a lot of physical moving but are not in control . . . rather are on the receiving end of time-space compression" (Massey, 1991, p. 26). Massey uses the concept of "time-space compression" to refer to the high speed at which people and information are now travelling through time and space (p. 25). Some people have the power to control how they move through this "time-space compression," while others do not have that power.

One of the participants talked about her strong connection to these lands and her homeland in Ecuador. Samay was born in both worlds, Canada and Ecuador. She talked about her physical connection to these lands, the need to support Indigenous communities and engage in protests for the right of Indigenous Peoples to their lands. Samay also called on Indigenous immigrants to acknowledge that they are guests in these lands:

> There is much work about the truth and reconciliation, and there are activities planned. However, amongst the Indigenous communities from other places, there is no work of raising consciousness that these are foreign lands for them [Indigenous immigrants].

She acknowledged the deep connection to the land that many Indigenous communities have, and the damage caused by settler colonialism. Samay called on Indigenous immigrants to take on their position as visitors in these lands and support Indigenous Peoples and their fight against the dispossession of their lands.

Samay's strong connection with Indigenous lands and people from Canada was uncommon amongst participants. Samay still expressed some disconnections to this place. When discussing the settler identity that we as immigrants also hold, she expressed her confusion as a racialized settler, not knowing where she belongs. She does not belong with the dominant settler community, and she does not belong within Indigenous communities from Canada because she is

not from here. Samay states: “I do not fit in either of the two. I am not white, but I'm not from here, so where am I from?” Samay questions the place Indigenous immigrants hold since we are not part of the dominant settler group, nor are we Indigenous from these lands. Even though she is connected to these lands, she feels she is not from these lands since she comes from an immigrant family. The disconnection that Samay discusses of not belonging here or there may lead to immigrants feeling disconnected and then disregarding their obligation to the land or its Indigenous communities.

Other participants talked about their connection to these lands and immigration. Esperanza stated:

> How do you rise up, how do you, unfortunately, move forward? In our countries due to the circumstances, the crisis, the situation, the poverty you migrate. . .. Why does one immigrate? For a better treatment, to be in a better situation . . . if not, no one would. You would stay there. There are several factors [why people move] . . . to better yourself . . . you come to improve yourself.

For Esperanza, the Canadian state symbolizes an opportunity for a better life. Most of the participants discussed the benefits they have received as immigrants or moving to the North. As Dunbar-Ortiz (2021) explains, it is common for immigrants to move to North America with the belief in the “American dream” and the opinion that this is a land of opportunities (p. 18). However, supporting these beliefs erases the fact that the Canadian nation is built on Indigenous stolen lands through settler colonialism.

Similar to Massey’s (1991) argument, some participants discussed the unfairness of the migratory system in the Canadian state, which controls who can move to Canada depending on

the power they hold. Resonating with Massey's analysis, Jessica pointed out the inequalities that exist for Indigenous Peoples from the South when they try to migrate to Canada to study:

> Indigenous People[s] [from Latin America] are attacked back home. They are attacked here. Canada, it has sold itself to the world as if they are so good. We thought that it would be simpler to get the residence here . . . It is more difficult than in the US . . . It is harder to obtain the residency here. Even though they say, it is the country that opens its doors for all the immigrants here in Canada. It is very difficult.

According to Jessica, the immigration system benefits some people but excludes others, usually those with fewer resources or status, such as Indigenous Peoples. Contrary to the common belief that North America welcomes immigrants, Jessica brought to light the racism in the immigration system. Although Canada projects a welcoming image, in reality, as Massey (1991 in Tuck and McKenzie, 2014) explains, there is a very selective immigration process that opens its doors to some while rejecting others, usually based on socioeconomic status, class, ethnicity, gender identity and sexuality.

Jessica also spoke about her and her husband's experience as international students:

> We did not come from rich families. And that I see. My [former] classmates came from a lot of money. [They] come from a better social-economic class, they do not go through particular problems or needs. We always have to be working. The truth is that everything is resolved with money if you have it. But if you do not have it, then you are going through a lot of things that they do not go through. Therefore, the other hard part [of being an immigrant] is to be an immigrant from a province in Peru [which translates to having less money].

Jessica pointed out the financial barriers that Indigenous international students experience when coming here. Jessica refers to the fact that Indigenous Peoples coming from the smaller provinces in Peru are relatively poor. Although she and her husband's families could send them to Canada to study under a student visa, their families could not afford to pay for their expenses. Jessica's connection to this place is intrinsically connected to her struggles as an Indigenous international student immigrant trying to make ends meet by going to school and working. Her struggles with immigration to these lands influenced her connection with Indigenous Peoples. In her and her husband's case, they are mainly struggling to make ends meet and pay their debts which means they have little time to invest in what is happening to Indigenous Peoples in Canada.

Other participants discussed place in connection to settler colonialism and how immigrants contribute to colonizing the lands. Sonia spoke about the attitude of the immigrant to take possession of these lands without even asking. Sonia stated:

> But they [Indigenous Peoples from Canada] are right . . . because if the person who arrives is the visitor, they are the ones who should say thank you, the ones who say: can I? but we have never seen them do this . . . instead, they [immigrants] say: I arrive, I work, I want this, this is mine.

Sonia critiqued the attitude of immigrants (including herself) when they come to Canada and pointed out that although we are visitors, we do not act as such. They/we take possession of the land without asking.

Few participants talked about their direct connection to the physical space. Most participants talked about being very thankful to Canada for what they had obtained and what this has meant for them and their families and their hardships. They spoke of the symbolic meaning

that these lands hold for them, including the events that happened in their lives on these lands after they immigrated. Except for Samay, as discussed above, they did not talk about the physical land itself. These testimonials from the participants are very different compared to when they spoke about their connection to the land in their countries of origin. Reflecting on the position of the participants and Quechua people back home in general, they are often displaced within their country of origin and have lost some connection to the lands due to migration. At the same time, participants such as Rebecca discussed her connection to her homeland. She stated:

> In harvest villages, my grandparents had their farms, so we all got together in front of a fire. Under the moonlight, we would peel the corn. The corn would be almost dry for the next day. I ground the corn early morning, and my grandmother made the tamales and coffee to drink . . . We made a fire in the middle with all the grandchildren, seven grandchildren. He [my grandfather] would share it [the corn harvest] with all. He would say: "you sell it, and you buy something you want."

Rebecca had a very intimate connection to the land back home through farming. She talked extensively about the rituals involved in harvesting and her connection to the land while she took care of the crops. Rebecca tried to replicate some of these connections by growing crops typical of her hometown in Canada. She was trying to hold on to her roots in these lands. It could also be that, in the process, she is making a connection to these lands through everyday activities that she practiced back home. She was also interested in making connections with Indigenous Peoples and their culture as she felt identified with many cultural aspects. Her connections to Indigenous land and people were intermingled. At times, it was a way to connect to her own cultures and Indigenous communities.

Conclusion

The first part of this chapter focused on participants' views and understanding of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and settler colonialism in Canada. In the second part of the chapter, I discussed the participants' lack of contact with Indigenous Peoples and knowledge of their position as settlers on Indigenous lands. I discussed participants' connection to place, including land, because collaboration with Indigenous Peoples and decolonization centres on land. I discussed their/our settler identities and complicity in settler colonialization through our uninvited presence on these lands that have been cared for by First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. I also discussed how our position as settlers works as an inhibiting factor to forming relations with First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people. These discussions provide the foundation for exploring how Quechua immigrants can engage in collaborative relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. In the next chapter, I discuss the potential for a decolonizing collaboration of Quechua immigrants with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

Chapter 5: Results

This chapter focuses on participants' thoughts about collaboration between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in Canada. Indigenous Peoples from these lands are asking for settlers to show respect and help them achieve self-determination. They are asking for collaboration to help them obtain these rights; our responsibility as uninvited people to these lands is to support the struggles of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people as we occupy Indigenous lands (Bauder & Breen, 2023, p. 380). In discussions about collaboration, the complexities involved in the relations between racialized and Indigenous Peoples (Lee, 2016) must be considered. Often, racialized immigrants come from states that have been colonized, experience discrimination in Canada for being racialized, and are themselves Indigenous in some cases. At the same time, they are members of the settler population in Canada. All these factors contribute to how racialized immigrants, including Quechua immigrants, collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

As part of the theoretical framework in this study, the Two Row Wampum Belt is brought in to provide guidance on how Indigenous Peoples and settlers can relate based on reciprocity, friendship and respect. Green (2018) expanded on the Two Row Wampum Belt by framing it within the concepts of host and guest. Green explains that settlers are guests in these lands and conversely, Indigenous Peoples are hosts. Within the guest/host relationship, hosts have responsibilities towards their guests and reciprocally, guests also have responsibilities towards their hosts. Being a guest involves following the regulations set out by the hosts regarding how to treat their lands. This chapter explores how Quechua immigrants, as guests who are Indigenous settlers, can fulfill their responsibilities towards their hosts, First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

Guiding this exploration of guest/host relationship are the following questions: 1) How can we move from non-allied settler to settler-collaborator/settler-ally (Schultz, 2017 p. 268) as guests (Green, 2018, p. 171)? In effect, how can the participation of Quechua immigrants be facilitated to become decolonizing collaborators with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people? And 2) How can shared Indigeneity, involving both resonant and dissonant experiences, be used as a bridge to facilitate the collaboration of Quechua people with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in these lands now known as Canada?

As I discuss the participants' views, it is essential to note that the framing of immigrants as settlers complicit in ongoing colonialism was a new concept to most participants. Reframing their own identities in relation to the state and state violence against Indigenous Peoples requires time to process and understand. At the time of the discussions most of the participants were in the process of attempting to understand these topics for the first time, and I believe that their comments reflect this process.

To explore potential for collaboration, I discuss different forms collaboration could take between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people; ways to strengthen collaboration based on relationships; barriers to collaboration; practical ways to engage in collaboration; and how Indigeneity can bridge these relations. Before I begin to present potential forms of collaboration between the two groups, it is essential to reiterate that although most participants had not considered their role in settler colonialism or their responsibilities as settlers, when the participants were informed of their role in settler colonialism, most agreed that they should take on responsibilities that they had not previously considered. Furthermore, I must consider that the power imbalance between researcher and participant, and the general focus of the study, may have impacted the participants' responses. Interviewer influence has been

discussed widely in the literature on qualitative methodologies. For example, Gubrium and Holstein (1995) argue that we treat interviewing as “a social encounter in which knowledge is actively formed and shaped . . . [which] implies that the interview is not so much a neutral conduit or source of distortion as an occasion for constructing accounts” (as cited in Gubrium & Holstein, 2014, p. 8). According to Gubrium and Holstein’s argument, participants and researchers construct accounts through their conversations. In this analysis, I was not neutral in presenting the concept of collaboration or the settler identity. This stance complicates my study because, at times, the conversation became an educational session where participants and I discussed our obligations as settlers in stolen lands. Although I did not anticipate that I was going to lead educational discussions, this is a common practice in research, such as in participatory research practices (Zuber-Skerritt et. al.,2020). In our discussions, I also learned about the gaps in my understandings and questions I had on these topics, and we exchanged knowledge on their understanding of Quechua cultures. At some points in our discussions, I thought it necessary to explain to participants our responsibilities as settlers if I am claiming to work towards a decolonizing collaboration. As stated earlier, the concept of settler identity is also very controversial as it implicates Indigenous and other racialized immigrants within the ongoing colonial project.

When exploring the settler’s position with participants, I also refer back to critical place inquiry. A critical place inquiry model asks settlers to respect Indigenous Peoples, their lands and cultures. Although settlers may share many aspects of First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultures, these cultures are not theirs. Therefore, connections with Indigenous cultures must be done with this awareness and respect and the permission of Indigenous Peoples.

As a researcher, I engaged in dialogue with participants to learn about their understanding of settler colonialism and settler responsibilities. Once I discovered that these were new concepts for most participants, we collaborated to co-create their understanding of these topics. We examined how their knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and colonialism in general could help them understand more about First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, settler colonialism, and their responsibilities for living on these lands. Together, we discussed the differences and similarities between Indigenous Peoples in Canada and Quechua people in South America and how colonialism works in these different settings. I guided this process of co-creation of knowledge by finding out about their understandings on these topics and based on this information and questions they had, opened up discussions. We worked together through questions they had on these topics, questions I had on their understandings and questions we shared in common. The participants also shared knowledge on Quechua cultures, mestizaje, and current problems that Quechua people face, such as the effects of colonialism and imperialism in present days. Education involving knowledge co-creation and knowledge exchange sometimes takes place in the context of conducting research. My participants were not aware of some of this information or analysis before. When they learned about settler colonialism, being a settler and the responsibilities of living in these lands, most were open to this information. According to Thobani (2007), racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, are often unaware of this information because of all the systemic barriers they face as immigrants, and, at the same time, they need to be aware of these factors to contribute to decolonization efforts.

We co-constructed what collaboration and settler identity could mean for Quechua immigrants when we talked about collaboration. There is some evidence that Indigenous immigrants support collaboration if allowed to consider it and engage in it. Delugan (2010)

suggests that Indigenous immigrants living in the North are interested in supporting the struggles of Indigenous Peoples living in what is now considered the US. In 2006, San Francisco's Human Rights Commission held a hearing on local Native American issues to discuss the inequalities and hardships they experienced. Among the people who offered their testimony were Indigenous migrants from Latin America who advocated on behalf of Native Americans (Delugan, 2010, p. 89). Delugan suggests that these actions could be the result of Native American organizations reaching out to Indigenous populations from Latin America to form connections and networks (p. 90).

The first step towards collaboration between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples is looking at the potential forms of collaboration between the two groups. I discussed this move towards collaboration with participants while acknowledging another one of my biases, that I am Chola and consequently have a personal motivation to critique with reservation Quechua immigrants and their opinions, given that I identify with them and their experiences to some extent. I wanted to be careful how I represented Quechuas people and their opinions, since I am aware of the negative stereotypes that Quechua people already experience for being Indigenous and racialized. Therefore, I critique what they say with reservation for fear of offending them or coming across as disrespectful. Part of me wants to protect the participants from being criticized by others who may not fully understand the context of their views.

How is Collaboration to Take Place?

Most participants stated that collaboration requires relations. Similarly, Nishnaabeg scholar Leanne Simpson (2011) argues, “resurgence cannot occur in isolation. A collective conversation and mobilization are critical to avoid reproducing the individualism and colonial

isolation that settler colonialism fosters" (p. 69). Snelgrove et al. (2014) share similar opinions on forms of collaboration. However, Tuck and Yang (2012) argue that collaboration and relationships differ in that collaboration does not necessarily involve a relationship beyond doing collaborative work. There is a potential for a more intimate connection when engaging in collaboration, but this may not occur. Therefore, collaboration may not necessarily involve a relationship, and conversely, a relationship may not involve political collaboration.

As stated in the previous chapter, participants noted that immigrants might find it challenging to feel that they can collaborate without first establishing a relationship. In our discussions, I raised the idea that some Indigenous Peoples may be more concerned about forming collaborative political relationships (collaboration relationships) than developing close relationships with immigrants (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Next, I elaborate on a few forms of collaborative relationships discussed with participants.

Collaborative Relations

When presented with the option of focusing mainly on forming collaborative relationships instead of also trying to develop more intimate relationships, a few participants agreed with this approach. Still, many participants disagreed that this was the best way to engage in collaboration. Tuck and Yang's (2012) and Simpson's (2011) models of collaboration relations differ but are not mutually exclusive. Tuck and Yang advocate for forms of collaboration even in the absence of a more in-depth relationship. Their concept of contingent collaboration, for example, can be limited to meeting the goals of specific projects. It is a shift from lasting solidarities that were more commonly advocated for in the past. As will be analyzed later in this chapter, Tuck and Yang (2012) propose this form of collaboration because "lasting solidarities may be elusive, even undesirable" (p. 28). Therefore, Indigenous Peoples can

intentionally construct temporary political relationships that endure as long as they are mutually beneficial. Tuck and Yang are not opposed to long-term solidarities (a form of collaboration), as will be elaborated later on in this chapter; however, they argue that long-term solidarities are not always feasible, as the groups involved may have different goals that could separate them.

Snelgrove et al. (2014), who also discuss forms of collaboration, argue that the ideal model of collaborative solidarity is that of "place-based relationships," which are localized, land-based, and long-term, and which require a "spatial solidarity" between non-Indigenous and Indigenous Peoples. These relations encompass the "regeneration of Indigenous languages, ceremonial life, living histories, and nationhood. For this reason, spatial solidarities can be a way to localize struggles for Indigenous resurgence" (p. 17). Spatial solidarity would also address how non-Indigenous people can live on these lands now known as Canada in ways that show solidarity to Indigenous Peoples. According to Snelgrove et al. (2014), compared to other forms of solidarities, spatial solidarities are most effective at strengthening First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultures. Snelgrove et al. talk about the need to learn about and respect the protocols of the Indigenous Peoples. There needs to be more follow-up of these protocols amongst immigrants and an understanding of how to engage in protocols regularly. A lack of engagement in protocol will have more significant repercussions in places where Indigenous immigrants and Indigenous Peoples of these lands are more likely to interact, such as First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples' gatherings such as powwows and programming open to the public

Tuck and Yang (2012) and Snelgrove et al. (2014) stress the need for collaboration to focus more on land. Tuck and Yang (2012) believe that decolonizing projects need to centre land, as Indigenous lands continue to be taken away. Snelgrove et al. (2014) argue that all the factors involving lands, such as the regeneration of language, ceremonies and nationhood, are

part of collaborating with Indigenous Peoples. These processes involve non-Indigenous people developing their connection to the land, which requires an investment of time and a commitment from settlers.

Snelgrove et al. (2014) critique short-lived solidarities as "temporarily driven and performative" (p. 24), meaning that they may be relationships of solidarity in appearance only. Tuck and Yang (2012) are promoting short-lived relations because long-term ties have not taken place under conditions of respect. Therefore, it is more obtainable to plan short-term solidarities to engage settlers in projects of decolonization. Resonating with Tuck and Yang's (2012) model of contingent collaboration, some participants thought it was possible to engage in a political collaboration that does not necessarily require an intimate relationship with Indigenous Peoples when developing an intimate relationship is not possible. Jennifer understood the value of having a relationship but did not consider it a requirement:

> One can provide support without having too much of a relationship. It is not ideal, and the best would be to relate with each other . . . Ideally, it is nice. Well, to have relations so that we get to know their problems . . . but if there is no opportunity, one can support a group without being involved with them.

Jennifer proposed this approach as a last resort. Most participants thought that building closer relationships between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people was an ideal first step towards political collaboration. However, as stated in the previous chapter, participants understood why some First Nations, Métis and Inuit people might be hesitant to trust and form more personal and intimate relationships with immigrants. Still, most of them argued for the need to develop closer connections as a start to any collaboration. Participants saw the need for a form of relationship that allowed for a more immediate personal connection to the

land and its people. Overall, Tuck and Yang (2012) take a more cautious approach. They are hesitant to commit to long-lasting collaboration relationships that may not work out because the political work is pressing. They cannot wait on the slow development of intimacies and lasting trust. The following section presents participants' ideas for strengthening relationships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations to build collaboration relationships.

Ways to Strengthen Relationships

Participants discussed ways to strengthen relationships by establishing closer and more intimate connections with people Indigenous to the lands now known as Canada. They also discussed strengthening their ties with their Indigeneity, acknowledging their own settler identity, creating spaces for relationships to grow and applying a self-reflective approach. When participants discussed relationships, they referred to intimate connections, not collaborative political relations. When they were asked about forming collaborative relationships, they saw a need to have personal connections to build these types of relations. This approach could align with place-based relationships because it would involve forming a deeper relationship with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, including their cultures and lands. As discussed next, participants talked at length about the need to have closer relationships and ways to achieve this goal.

Establishing Closer Connections

Many participants expressed that we first need to start forming relations to engage in collaboration. Participants argued that there is currently a significant gap between the present forms of relating and being able to develop collaborative relations. Similarly, Right Honourable Adrienne Clarkson discussed that although there are tensions between immigrant and Indigenous

populations, there was also a curiosity from newcomers and racialized minorities about Indigenous Peoples and a desire to be closer to them (City of Vancouver, 2010, n.p.).

As introduced in the last chapter, participants discussed their interest in getting involved with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people but experiencing barriers to do so. Some participants did not realize the complexities of the relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples. They had difficulty understanding that although they wanted to get closer to Indigenous Peoples, Indigenous Peoples were not obliged to reciprocate. There was a gap between understanding that having close relations is better and understanding the reasons why Indigenous Peoples may be hesitant to inviting immigrants into their cultures. Participants' opinions were also guided by the fact that for some, this was the first time they were exposed to information on Indigenous Peoples, and they were still trying to understand.

Rosa talked about trying to get involved with an Indigenous circle open to non-Indigenous Peoples. Rosa stated:

> The circle is not so friendly. I wanted to get closer to a woman [one of the members of the circle], but she didn't give me more [time] . . . I said I am Andean from the Andes in my country there is also [Indigenous Peoples] . . . but I don't know if she understood me . . . the language . . .. I think that the Indigenous community [in Canada] always tries to preserve its customs in some way . . . but that's okay. Indigenous People[s] here need to become more accessible to the world . . . because otherwise, they are isolated. . .. For me, it is very difficult. I wanted, but I could not.

Rosa argued for Indigenous Peoples to open themselves to establishing relations of friendship with immigrant people such as herself who are also Indigenous. Otherwise, immigrants will have a more challenging time connecting and collaborating with Indigenous communities.

Like many participants, Rosa referred to the impacts of colonialism when she tried to understand why Indigenous Peoples may not want to get close to her. However, Rosa's and other participants' comments show surprise when they talk about their experiences asking for a stronger connection with Indigenous Peoples. There seems to be an assumption that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people will want to establish a connection. Many of the participants also seemed unaware of the importance of Indigenous Peoples consenting to have their circles open to outsiders. Some participants thought they could have access to all Indigenous cultural spaces and have a relationship with these groups. If we connect these views from the participants to the ideologies of Indigeneity, which are based on the concept of Indigenous Peoples coming together and co-existing, we could see how these frameworks influence the way Indigenous immigrants might relate to First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in Canada. Quechua people in Canada may use concepts of Indigeneity similar to those back home, where there is significant mixing amongst Indigenous and mixed Indigenous identities. In this way, the sharing of Indigeneity is something that might bring people together.

Based on teachings such as the Eagle and Condor prophecy, Quechua people may view co-habiting as involving mixing and mutual sharing. According to this prophecy, Indigenous Peoples from the North and South would build relationships as they collectively face the hardships they encounter. This contrasts with the representation of the Two Row Wampum Belt or Guswhenta, which emphasizes that settlers, including Indigenous settlers, and First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples share these lands respectfully without interfering with one another.

In everyday practices and best practices such as the Two Row Wampum Belt, First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people talk about separation between settlers and them; cohabitation happens without interfering with each other (Green, 2018)

From a settler perspective, De Costa and Clark (2011) argue for newcomers to understand that “Canada is a nation-state built on the territories of the original inhabitants largely without their consent; and . . . that the original expropriation must always mark our response” (p. 330). According to De Costa and Clark, we must always acknowledge that Indigenous territories were and continue to be taken away without Indigenous Peoples' consent. Settlers must always consider these violations of land when discussing the decolonization of Indigenous Peoples on these lands.

My observation was that there needs to be more awareness that these relations require the consent of Indigenous Peoples and that they have the right to reject an invitation for a closer relationship. This point was not directly discussed with participants, instead, it was mentioned that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people might reject this invitation due to the history and ongoing settler colonialism that Indigenous Peoples experience at every level. At the same time, it has been noted that relationality is central to Indigenous worldviews, and this is true of Andean Indigenous Peoples as much as it is of those here (Kovach, 2009, p. 56, Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 53). Therefore, relationality may also be influencing Rosa's opinions. One of the challenges becomes how to reconcile relationality while accepting that some Indigenous Peoples may not want to establish a connection. It is important to recognize that Rosa’s experience does not represent all Indigenous participants.

Relationality is central to the theoretical framework for this study as it explains the value for connection amongst people (Kovach, 2009, p. 56). Further, Quechua worldviews claim relationality as one of its main components (Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 53). Quechua worldviews make reference to everything being interrelated (linked or connected) to each other. In this sense, the elements [in the earth] exist in interconnection; hence, they do not completely exist separated

or isolated from everything. The reality (as a holistic everything), only ‘is’ (exists) as connected beings and interrelated events (Estermann, 2006, pp. 126–128, in Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 53).

According to Estermann’s (2006 in Martínez Rojas, 2015) explanation, it makes sense that participants would consider relationality a priority and therefore building relations and solidarity become intertwined. Since all beings are interrelated, all beings need to be respected (Martínez Rojas, 2015, p. 50). Martínez Rojas raises the importance of relationships and respect when various cultures interact with each other. According to the author, relations need to be respectful and take culture into account to maintain Indigenous knowledges and respect for the autonomy of the people.

Often the autonomy of Indigenous Peoples is discussed in terms of politics. For instance, Martínez Rojas (2015) focuses on the need for the state to respect the freedom of Indigenous Peoples in Latin America by making room for Indigenous Peoples to exercise their autonomy in political spaces (p. 37). However, the rest of the population also need to respect the autonomy of Indigenous groups in their everyday lives. In this study, some participants had difficulty appreciating the autonomy of Indigenous groups on these lands. Therefore, it is essential to explore the tension between autonomy and relationality.

Participants, including Rosa, focused on the need to establish relationships. They see the need for relations in order to engage in collaboration. However, in this process, it is forgotten that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people may reject requests for closeness and are within their right to do so. While relationality is central to Indigenous communities, it needs to be developed while respecting the autonomy of Indigenous groups and people. Rosa’s scenario shows us that when trying to understand the responses of Indigenous participants, it is essential to refer back to Indigenous worldviews as they can provide context to understand their individual views better. If

we centre relationality in the analysis, it becomes easier to understand Rosa's point of view. However, if we centre settler power relations, her actions seem rooted in the fact that she grew up with different notions of how to relate with other Indigenous communities that are not necessarily shared by First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

There are norms here that are different than in Peru. This mismatch in norms could lead Indigenous immigrants towards not understanding why Indigenous Peoples in Canada may not want to establish relationships with them. It is also crucial to find out what kind of relationships First Nations, Métis and Inuit people may wish to have with Quechua immigrants and under what terms. It is also important to consider that Rosa is inferring Indigenous Peoples' perspectives based on a single interaction, while the individual Indigenous person may have been responding based on completely unrelated events. This is a limitation of this research as most of my participants were building their understanding based on minimal first-hand experience with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

Participants mainly concentrated on the changes they believed Indigenous Peoples needed to make in order to build relations with non-Indigenous people. There is an erasure of consent in these engagements, where there is almost a demand for First Nations, Métis and Inuit people to be responsible for building relations. Some participants lack an understanding of why Indigenous Peoples from these lands may place protective boundaries. When participants learned about the history of the Canadian state, they agreed that it is necessary for immigrants to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples. Still, they did not understand the work necessary to gain the trust of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people due to colonialism. Colonial relationships have created "tensions" among marginalized communities, and the participants may not be aware of this (Dhamoon, 2021, pp. 873, 879). Quechua participants wanted friendship, but some lacked a

practical understanding of the oppression Indigenous Peoples experience. Also, very few brainstormed changes immigrants could make to build a bridge and form relations. Another way that participants talked about strengthening relationships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people were by maintaining our sense of Indigeneity.

Strengthening Indigeneity

Participants talked about strengthening the relationships between Quechua and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people by learning to respect their own Indigenous roots. However, respecting one's Indigenous heritage can be particularly difficult when the country they come from does not. Indigenous migration presents a unique political interconnectedness. According to Blackwell et al. (2017), neoliberal policies that support the deregulation and privatization of the market "engineer dislocation and dispossession of migrants, not only as laborers but also as Indigenous Peoples. These policies create migrant populations that are forced to encounter new and old structures that seek to manage and erase Indigeneity" (p. 127).

As explained in the last chapter, through processes such as assimilation, some Indigenous immigrants try to assimilate to their new country of residence by giving up their Indigenous roots. Pressure to assimilate into the Canadian state works in conjunction with the pressure to assimilate exerted from the hegemonic non-Indigenous Latine or Peruvian migrant cultures. In this way, Indigenous Peoples are pressured to assimilate into mainstream Canada and mainstream Latine or Peruvian migrant cultures.

Indigenous immigrants from Latin America experience intersectional discrimination in that they come from Latin America and have Indigenous roots, making it more challenging to connect with their Indigeneity (Blackwell et al., 2017, pp. 127–128). In general, discrimination towards Indigenous heritage in Latin America and North America are very harmful (Blackwell et

al., 2017; Soria Choque, 2009). Consequently, to achieve respect towards their own Indigenous culture, there needs to be significant changes in how South and North American societies view Quechua people.

Some participants shared their difficulties in maintaining their Indigenous identity in their countries of origin and Canada because their identities are not commonly acknowledged. Jessica compared the invisibility of her Indigenous identity in Canada and back in Peru:

> When I was applying for a job [in Canada] . . . I want to put Indigenous [when they ask where you are from] . . . if I want to say I am Indigenous and there is nothing, here you lose the category. . . Same as in Peru, if you say I am Indigenous because I want to. I want to be Chola. In Peru, they [people] question from what community do you come from. Where is your community?" Peruvian people say: "No. That is a lie [that you are Indigenous]. It's because now it is popular, that's why you want to [be Indigenous]".

Jessica experienced the invisibility of her Indigeneity in both Canada and Peru. In Peru, the Indigenous identity is dismissed through scrutiny or homogenization. People question who has the right to claim Indigeneity, even though a significant part of the population in Peru has Indigenous heritage. Jessica shared how her Indigeneity in Peru is questioned based on the requirement that she be connected to her Indigenous community. Indigeneity is established by supplying proof that one comes from an Indigenous community instead of through ancestry. Essentially, Indigenous identity is centred on the community, including its lands. The way we connect to the community is the deciding factor in whether we are considered legitimately Indigenous. In this way, Indigeneity is place-based, which is also racialized. In the case of Indigenous Peoples from Peru, Indigenous identity is erased by claiming that we are all Peruvian. This erasure happens back home and once people migrate to Canada. The construction of

Peruvian identity is one of constructing a sense of shared identity or homogeneity; we are all considered Peruvian, regardless of our Indigenous heritage. Therefore, there is no difference between us. In Canada, Indigenous immigrants are identified as Latine or Peruvian, and, in this way, the diversity within Peru is erased. Homogenizing ethnicity in Canada happens differently because it explicitly minimizes the possibility of being from Peru and Indigenous.

These discussions also happened with some of the participants in the study who talked about their experiences with their Indigeneity after migration and the stereotypes they face from the Latin American communities in Canada. Ely and his wife Jessica spoke about these issues. Ely stated: "they [Latin American people in Canada] wait for you to speak differently or leave in different ways. They assume that you will tell them how many llamas you have." Jessica added:

> They expect that you are a poor person. Suppose you say that you come from a region where there are predominately Indigenous People[s], but you do not share that dressing or the accent [from the region] because the accent is different. In that case, you can recognize the accent instantly if someone speaks Quechua, but others like you and me, who don't have that accent, then you are told you are not Indigenous. The same thing happens with our friends [from Latin America in Canada]. You do not sound like a Peruvian [with an accent from the Andes]. And I say, how does a Peruvian sound? You sound more like you are from Lima [non-Indigenous person] but they don't say that exactly. So what exactly are you referring to [Elli is asking his friends] – a darker-skinned person? Still, I am darker. I tell them that. They say no, I am not referring to that.
>
> But I understand that because we have these questions ingrained in us.

Indigenous Peoples are constantly questioned about their Indigeneity and have to face stereotypes even within the Latin American community in Canada.

Another participant talked about her disconnection with Latin American communities as people assume she identifies with the general image of a Latin American person, forgetting that many people in Latin America have Indigenous roots and live lifestyles guided by their Indigeneity. Samay stated:

> In my work and artistic life, I don't work with Latin American people. I do not see myself reflected in the Latin American community. I grew up on my mother's side, with the Kichwa side. I have more in common with them [Indigenous Peoples] from here. Little things are understood [by Latin American people] as being general knowledge for everyone in Latin America. I say, no, my mom never did that. I have some general references because I also grew up in a Latine family [her father is Mestize], and I can pass as a Mestiza. That is a privilege.

Samay brings to light the dominant views held by people who identify as Latin American and assume everyone shares similar beliefs, disregarding the various cultures in Latin America. In this manner, Indigenous immigrants end up experiencing intra-racial discrimination for being Indigenous. During these times, they also show agency in challenging discriminatory views imposed on them.

To exalt Indigeneity from a trans-continental perspective, the people from the land (North and South) would need to start with mutual respect. However, there are multiple barriers to achieving this. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, there is much hatred amongst people from the South towards Indigenous heritage. There is also a lack of understanding of the adversities Indigenous groups face worldwide as well as the similarities that exist in Indigenous struggles. In the case of Canada, although there are many similarities between Indigenous Peoples from the North and Indigenous immigrants from the South, Indigenous immigrants are

uninvited settlers inhabiting Indigenous lands on behalf of the colonial state. Therefore, it is crucial that Indigenous immigrants understand their positionality before they can establish decolonizing relationships that involve collaboration and solidarity.

Returning to the claim that there is a lot of hatred towards Indigeneity in the South, participants shared their views on Quechua people's respect for their Indigenous heritage. Some of the participants talked about the disrespect towards Indigenous traditions back home. Rosa highlighted the need to learn about their cultures and not participate in their exoticization. Rosa also spoke about how Peruvians do not respect their Indigenous culture. She is basing her opinions on her experience as a teacher of primary students teaching traditional dance in Peru. Rosa stated:

> I always tell them . . . We are going to present a Balicha dance from Cuzco.' The students say, 'We are going to wear this costume?' I tell them, 'that is not a costume, and no, that is a dress. Don't say costume, but dress.' And I tell them, 'don't say costume.'

Rosa critiqued the exoticization that Indigenous Peoples from Peru adopt. For example, calling a dress a costume erases the fact that Indigenous Peoples' clothing is different than the dominant culture's. Some Indigenous Peoples may not be aware that this is their regular dress and therefore call it a costume instead. However, by referring to Indigenous dresses as costumes, Indigenous Peoples participate in exoticizing their own traditions. Rosa calls for a shift in Indigenous Peoples' relationships to their traditions to learn more about their cultural practices and to respect them.

Similarly, Miguel argued for the need to respect one's own Indigenous culture before trying to respect someone else's. Miguel talked about gaining respect for your own culture by developing a relationship with it. He refers to Quechua immigrants living in Canada when he

states: "[you] have to go back to where you are from to find ancestral knowledge because it is not lost." Miguel expressed hope in this journey to discover our own cultures and encouraged people to do so. Miguel's call is to have Quechua immigrants learn to respect themselves and their culture first before being able to respect another Indigenous culture. He questions how they can respect other Indigenous cultures while not respecting their own Indigeneity. However, coming to respect their own Indigenous heritage can be a difficult process considering the discrimination in their homelands and Canada against Quechuas and other Indigenous immigrants from Latin America. Jennifer spoke about how discrimination against Indigenous heritage in Latin America made it difficult to connect with Indigeneity. Another factor that makes accepting their Indigenous heritage more challenging is the lack of Quechua communities in Toronto. According to participants, there are no formal Quechua communities, so Quechua people learn about each other informally, making it more challenging to meet other Quechuas. As discussed further on, when asked whether sharing Indigeneity with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people could strengthen their relations, Jennifer stated, "That depends on whether the Indigenous person identifies as Indigenous, because if they don't, then no. But if they identify as Indigenous . . . then yes." Jennifer brings attention to the complexities of being Indigenous. Not everyone with Quechua heritage may identify as such or connect with their Indigenous community. Due to colonialism, Quechua people may not readily identify as Quechua. Therefore, for some it is essential to engage in a personal process of critical self-reflection (or reflexivity as mentioned earlier) in order to connect based on shared Indigeneity.

Cárdenas González (2012) talks about strategies of emplacement when marginalized populations are displaced from their lands. Cárdenas González focuses on the displacement of Afro-Colombian populations and contests the idea that this "forced displacement has simply

disarticulated Afro-Colombians' ethnic identity and undermined their ability to make and defend their place in the world" (p. 165). Cárdenas González (2012) focuses on how Black people re-route and establish new notions of being Black when they are displaced:

> What is perhaps different about emplacement at this particular historical moment is that self-conscious struggles to make and defend a place for oneself must be played out on a game board of global dimensions. Place-making is therefore … a statement about how one inhabits, moves through, and is connected to others all across the world. (p.168)

Based on the concept of emplacement, displaced populations re-construct their identities "from this condition of dislocation" (p.198). If we examine the displacement of Quechua peoples from their lands and their migration to Canada through this concept of emplacement, we would centre how Quechua people settle and find a place in these lands and how they establish relations with others. All these factors would contribute to the re-constructing of Indigenous identities of Quechua people living in Canada.

The ideal situation would involve rebuilding a relationship with one's own Indigeneity in order to build relationships with other Indigenous groups. However, shared Indigeneity does not preclude obstacles. Non-Indigenous people can also connect with Indigenous Peoples without sharing an Indigenous identity, so for those immigrants with Quechua roots who feel that they identify more with their Peruvian or Latin American identities, there is still possibility for connection and relationship-building. Another route to building and strengthening our relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people includes acknowledging our settler identity.

Acknowledging Settler Identity

As discussed in the previous chapter, not many immigrants to these lands now known as Canada have seriously considered their settler identity.[29] Participants had not considered their ethical responsibility to engage in collaboration as settlers. This ethical responsibility is based on the relationships established through agreements such as the Two Row Wampum Belt and the treaties entered into by Indigenous Nations and the Crown. These agreements place ethical responsibilities on settlers/immigrants in these lands (Fortier & Hon-Sing Wong, 2019; Snelgrove et al., 2014; Tuck & Yang, 2012). In his reflections in Snelgrove et al. (2014), Corntassel states:

> Awareness of colonial realities . . . is a call for justice and the return of stolen lands/waterways to the Indigenous Peoples who maintain special relationships to these places. Ultimately, we are arguing for a responsibility-based ethic of truth-telling to identify and act upon new pathways to Indigenous resurgence. (p. 4)

Corntassel claims that settlers need to have settler awareness, acknowledge the ongoing settler colonialism of Indigenous Peoples, and take on the ethical responsibility to support Indigenous Peoples' justice, autonomy and self-determination.

Indigenous and racialized authors have discussed the need to reflect on how immigrants and Indigenous Peoples can live in the same territories and the nature of the relationships they can build. Snelgrove et al. (2014) discuss the need for people to realize their position when entering lands that are not theirs (p. 5). They ask, "how do we carry our community consciousness and responsibilities with us even when we're not on our territories? When visiting

---

[29] I am using the word identity for the reasons explained in chapter one. As I stated, I acknowledge that it is a controversial term that some people may contest. Other alternatives that have been used instead of identity are positionality and status.

another Indigenous nation's territory, as Cherokees and Indigenous nations, we carry our communities and sense of place with us" (p. 4).

Snelgrove et al. (2014) argue that as immigrants move from their homes of origin to another place, they need to be made aware that they are settlers because there is still resistance to admitting "their roles and responsibilities" as settlers (p. 16). Corntassel (in Snelgrove et al., 2014) discusses how some settlers may feel offended by this term while demonstrating its use in building settler-Indigenous relationships. Corntassel states:

> The most effective times I've used the term settler have been in spaces where folks are most resistant to it. And then it creates these tensions, but it also creates these great conversations about what is their role and responsibilities. (p.16)

Using the word "settler" opens discussions on the implications of being a settler and their impact on Indigenous-settler relationships. Corntassel looks at alternatives to using the term settler: "using Indigenous words to describe settler relationships can help to re-center the discussion and potential action of solidarity back into the community" (p. 17). This alternative may take some time but may be more acceptable to settlers. Either way, there needs to be a focus on decolonization and changing settler-Indigenous relationships.

Snelgrove (in Snelgrove et al., 2014) added that when we use the word settler, the focus needs to move to Indigenous Peoples. Otherwise, we are supporting settler colonialism. Snelgrove stresses "the importance of centering Indigenous resurgence" to break the ongoing cycle of colonization and guide decolonization (p. 17). Further, immigrants need to learn about place and land in relation to the Indigenous Peoples whose territories they are entering and the protocols they need to follow to make these relationships prosperous (pp. 4–5, 17). Similarly,

Green (2018) researched how to behave in other people's lands as a guest by talking to various Indigenous teachers:

> The teachers all situated their teachings on responsibilities and respecting of protocols. It is expected that when in a new territory, one is to behave and learn the protocols of that territory. As Sakoieta told me, 'When you are away from home, you accept the teaching even if it is not your teaching.' The protocols of an individual's Nation are not to be forgotten; however, it is one's responsibility to learn and follow the protocols of the hosts. This creates a space where different Nations share teachings and build relationships as the Traditional person and new community share the importance of respecting protocols. (Green, 2018, p. 171)

Green (2018) and Corntassel (in Snelgrove et al., 2014) show the importance of learning and respecting other Nations' protocols, not as a choice but as an ethical responsibility. The challenge is how to respect these protocols when state institutions are intermediaries.

The state intentionally misinforms and under informs immigrants about Canadian colonialism in order to maintain the state. There are discussions in the literature on the lack of awareness immigrants have of our complicity in colonialism and how this affects collaborating with Indigenous Peoples. As stated previously, De Costa and Clark (2011) urge newcomers to learn about the history, colonization of Indigenous Peoples, and ongoing violations of consent regarding their autonomy and lands. These realities need to be accounted for when addressing issues affecting Indigenous Peoples (p. 330). De Costa and Clark (2011) call settlers to be aware of our settler identity, which means knowing the history of the Canadian state and settler colonialism. Davis et al. (2017) criticize the current initiatives undertaken by immigrants to support Indigenous Peoples. Although they focus on bringing awareness to the situation of

Indigenous Peoples amongst settlers, they continue to be extensions of settler colonialism (p. 398).

Davis et al. (2017) conducted a study to identify initiatives taking place to address reconciliation and by May 2015, they identified more than 200 documented initiatives aimed at "transformation of settler consciousness" (p. 404). The initiatives ranged from "workshops, conferences and art exhibitions, to elementary school curriculum reforms and faith-based efforts toward reconciliation" (Davis et al, 2017, p. 402). Based on their observations: "very few of the initiatives address questions of land reclamation, reparations, Indigenous sovereignty and jurisdiction, or Canadian sovereignty on stolen Indigenous lands, a finding echoed in the research of Denis and Bailey with self-identified allies involved in reconciliation processes" (p. 408). As Davis et al. state, the initiatives put in place to assist Indigenous communities are not offering the assistance that Indigenous communities are requesting (p. 407).

Regan (2010) argues that racialized people need to recognize their settler identity and their occupation of Indigenous lands (p. 235). They need to question what this means regarding the responsibilities that racialized immigrants have towards Indigenous Peoples and their lands. In my view, recognizing our positions as settlers can be the beginning of forming more just relations. In our discussions, most participants had not previously addressed their settler position, and therefore, were unaware because of the systemic barriers placed by the government to make this knowledge not easily accessible. It is convenient for the state to not have allies supporting Indigenous Peoples and, in this way, the status quo is maintained. Most of my participants were therefore unaware of their responsibilities as settlers.

Following are fragments of the discussions with participants regarding their settler identity. Before describing the participants' points of view, it is important to recognize that

concepts such as settler identities and settler colonialism are very complex and more so when the discussion involves Indigenous immigrants. It will take time for Indigenous immigrants to fully understand their identities in this context. This research was an introduction to understanding how Indigenous immigrants are complicit in ongoing settler colonialism. It is unrealistic to expect some participants to move from ignorance to taking a clear, concise stand against a government that they previously understood as benevolent and responsible for improving their own quality of life.

Elliana was aware of settler colonialism, but she identified settlers in past tense and distanced herself from them:

> [Settlers] were the ones that hurt them [Indigenous Peoples] . . . almost like the Incas [were hurt]. They [Spanish colonizers] hurt them [Incas] just the same. They did things to them [Indigenous women back home], and it made you feel sorry for them [Indigenous women back home]. If I put myself in their shoes [Indigenous Peoples from Canada], people from my country [Peru] should also come to support this country because I came here. They [Indigenous Peoples in Canada] helped us. Because my dad came here, and they gave him opportunities until now. And my little siblings came so that it would be a form of gratitude.

Elliana agreed that immigrants need to assist the stewards of these lands because of everything we are receiving by coming to Canada. Elliana was aware that we have a moral responsibility to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples in Canada as immigrants. According to her, we should collaborate to show gratitude for what we receive. Elliana did not frame this as an obligation we have as settlers and that Indigenous Peoples are demanding. There was a lack of awareness of her settler identity and Indigenous teachings on host/guest responsibilities and rights. Within a

relationship based on concepts of hosts and guests, settlers are guests to these lands and, as such, need to act accordingly.

Elliana recognized Indigenous Peoples as the caretakers and original people of these lands but still felt she owes the Canadian state for allowing her to migrate here. She appeared confused about the role of the Canadian state in the oppression of Indigenous Peoples. The participants showed confusion about the histories of Indigenous Peoples on these lands and how they are continuously affected by settler colonialism. Through our conversations, participants became more aware of the state's role in settler colonialism, the realities that Indigenous Peoples currently live, and their own identity as settlers. This information translated into having some participants, such as Elliana, express a duty to support Indigenous Peoples. These participants stated that they owe a debt to the rightful caretakers of the land for allowing them to come here.

Martin also struggled to incorporate this new information about the Canadian state with his new understanding of his relationship to Indigenous Peoples. He expressed gratitude for the Canadian government's opportunities and would like to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples for all that he has received. Martin stated:

> It is not the same as when you are in your land. Here the country welcomed you. It gave me all the things. I just had to study a course here, but I am already where I am [working and with a good salary]. I know there are Indigenous Peoples here. What is missing here is . . . information and then people collaborating on anything they can, right? This country gave me, and now I can also offer. Without any problem because I know that I have come from another country to grow, and I am growing.

Martin accepted that since this country has offered him financial opportunities and other forms of wellness, he has a responsibility to collaborate. Although Martin was in complete support of

collaboration, he was unaware of who he should be in debt to. As mentioned in the previous chapter, he was unaware that the resources he is given are stolen resources or of his position as a settler. Before our conversation, he had not heard the word settler, let alone understood its implications.

Other participants were aware of the abuse that First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people experience through settler colonialism but have not been exposed to the term settler. Samay stated:

> It's complicated. It depends on the conversations I have had with the Indigenous People[s] here. The term settler is different for [different] relations, no? The European immigration in Indigenous lands. It is different from the relationships of the Indigenous People[s] [from Canada] and [racialized] people from other parts of the world. Now it is the same, but they are different . . . When they talked about the relationship of settlers and Indigenous People[s], [I did not realize] it was about Indigenous (and settler) relationships, including me.

Samay is trying to understand the implications of being a 'racialized immigrant' or a racialized settler, as she stated it. In this interview, she heard the term 'settler' used for racialized immigrants for the first time. Samay had not been exposed to the framing of racialized immigrants as settlers, having thought that the settler identity only referred to white people. Her previous understanding was based on conversations where Indigenous Peoples meant "white people" when using the word settlers. The language of settler colonialism is very particular and relatively recent. The term settler does crucial political work to underscore the ongoing nature of land, sovereignty and dispossession. However, it is not something that people may know even if they support Indigenous Peoples.

Allies such as Samay, who are very knowledgeable of Indigenous Peoples and their culture and are strong supporters, may still not be familiar with the most recent settler-colonial language or discourses. This language mostly circulates within academic circles. Samay agrees with racialized settlers' responsibilities as people living in stolen lands. At the same time, she sees Indigenous immigrants as sharing similarities with the Indigenous Peoples from these lands. As stated earlier, given the geopolitics of North/South relations, we could say that people from the global South share distinct but resonant experiences of colonialism, dispossession, economic exploitation, and racism, both globally and upon settlement in the global North. These distinct but resonant experiences may be making it more difficult for my participants to shift their identities to include their complicity in ongoing settler colonialism.

As immigrants seeking to improve their lives by migrating to the Canadian state, this new information about ongoing settler colonialism likely troubled their relationship with the state. Most participants acknowledged that they are in debt to Indigenous Peoples as the rightful caretakers of the land while expressing gratitude to the Canadian state in the same statement, demonstrating their attempt to reconcile this new information with their experiences and identities.

Looking through a lens of intersectionality, the oppressions of Indigenous immigrants intersect with their conflicting position as accomplices to oppression within a settler colonial state. An intersectionality model explains how "differences such as gender, race, class, sexuality, gender identity . . . lead to relationships of power and control that arise in every social location and are affected by both macro systems (institutional) and microsystems (individual and psychological)" (Ramsay, 2014, p. 456). The very same system that makes racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, accomplices to settler colonialism (macro system)

as they strive to fit into the Canadian state also creates the lack of power that people hold due to their racialized immigrant position (macro system) (Thobani, 2007, p. 95). Indigenous immigrants with minimal resources and power in their countries of origin look to the Canadian state as an opportunity for personal advancement (microsystem). In this way, their oppression as racialized and Indigenous is their motivation for (unknowingly) participating in settler colonialism.

Indigenous immigrants risk not recognizing their complicity in settler colonialism by not considering their dual identity as Indigenous (oppressed) and settler (oppressor). This lack of consideration, intentional or not, can increase the chances of collaborating with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in ways that actually support colonialism (De Costa & Clark, 2011). According to most participants, we need to collaborate based on gratitude. However, there is a difference between thinking that collaboration is a form of gratitude — voluntary and based on emotion — for what we receive and viewing it as an obligation based on our position as settlers. We need to collaborate because it is our responsibility as settlers (TRCC, 2015, p. 9); recognizing this responsibility can help establish just relationships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Another way to strengthen relationships is by making spaces where both communities can share.

Creating Spaces for Relations

Participants talked about connecting with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people by forming Quechua groups and inviting them to participate. Casuncad (2020) supports the need for both groups to get to know each other. Recognizing the differences between racialized and white settlers is also essential to frame the types of relationships that can be established (p. 6). As Thobani (2007) explains, white supremacy is viewed as the difference in power amongst

racialized and white settlers. The relations between racialized immigrants and Indigenous Peoples are inhibited by white supremacy and the discriminatory systems it reproduces. Casuncad (2020) places the responsibility on governments to create programming that supports the connections amongst Indigenous and immigrant groups, particularly newcomers since they are unlikely to know Indigenous Peoples (p. 6). However, this expectation is problematic considering the state's interest in maintaining colonialism. Casuncad discusses barriers to initiatives that support Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships, such as the different priorities between municipalities and federal and provincial governments. As Casuncad explains, municipalities are faced with this challenge as they incorporate programs to strengthen newcomer and Indigenous relations.

Usually, the federal government creates immigration policies that support newcomers to settle in Canada and municipalities have no choice but to follow them (Casucand, 2020, p. 8). Casuncad argues that municipal governments must change their institutional structures "to make long-term collaborative planning possible between Indigenous and non-Indigenous urban communities for a better-balanced surface of power relations" (Casuncad, 2020, pp. 7–8). However, municipal government's focus on deliverable outcomes in project management becomes a barrier to Indigenous-newcomer relations. Goal-oriented (or outcome oriented) models are problematic in regard to initiatives that aim to strengthen relations. Further, there is a tendency to move away from doing so with communities because it takes a "long time to work with community members to identify the purpose and ultimate goals" (p. 9). Participants proposed an alternative to outcome-based projects during individual and group discussions. When the participants were asked about ways that Quechua people could move towards collaboration, some of them proposed having information sessions held in Spanish for Quechua

immigrants that would teach them about First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. According to the participants, information sessions would provide them with language-accessible information in familiar group settings, which would make information on First Nations, Métis and Inuit people more readily available. Building on this participant proposal, information sessions could also be offered in English for second-generation Quechua immigrants who may not speak Spanish.

Wilson et al.'s (2015) study on an arts-based intervention with youth provides an example of how community level initiatives can build understanding, respect and relationships. Wilson et al. (2015) researched possible spaces to build community alliances by conducting a study with youth from the African Diaspora and First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities (p. 76). They studied the "decolonizing potential of collaboration" between these two communities to address HIV (p. 77) through the creation of a collaborative mural representing their alliance. From the interviews with both sets of participants, the participants could "identify with the struggles of colonialism and marginalization experienced by youth from different communities and cultures" (2015, p. 87). Wilson et al. recommended this format of working together in a project to establish connections. Africa's resonant experience with European/white colonialism creates a locus for the establishment of a shared experience with Indigenous Peoples. The resonant experiences allowed racialized people to form a unique connection with Indigenous Peoples. These youth connected based on shared experiences of racism and colonialism; it is unclear whether other forms of shared oppression and marginalization such as poverty could create similar connections.

Furthermore, this HIV-focused mural opened dialogue on possible forms of collaboration (Wilson et al., 2015). During the group discussions, Indigenous participants made a few observations. They noticed how much racialized participants felt sorry for what was happening

to Indigenous Peoples. However, Indigenous participants expressed that they were not looking for sympathy, instead, they were looking for actions against these injustices. Both groups talked about their traditions and how they have used art as a way "to mobilize social movements, promote healing and challenge oppression" (p. 90). They talked about exchanging cultural knowledge on the topic of healthy sexual relations. Non-Indigenous participants also tried to understand the importance of land and nature for Indigenous Peoples through their stories.

While this project did not centre on land, but on social experiences and shared histories, it did show a commitment to acknowledging these are Indigenous lands. African and African-diasporic participants wanted to learn about the intimate connection Indigenous Peoples have to land and nature, as manifested through their artwork and stories. This interest was created through a project based on principles of contingent collaboration (Tuck & Yang, 2012). The relationship was established for the development of the mural and the research project instead of focusing on establishing long-term relations. Wilson et al. (2015) recognize that "such partnerships between Indigenous and African diasporic peoples are fraught with tensions, conflicts and contradictions that require decolonization in mutual respect of where communities are at" (p. 99). Following Tuck and Yang's (2012) model for collaboration, these relations may continue until they stop working. At the same time, this allyship might also result in more secure and longstanding relations and land-based traditions and knowledge (Snelgrove et al., 2014). Without disregarding the tensions at the macro level, the two groups of youth formed intimate relations as they were "seeking ways of working together as a source of mutual empowerment and resistance" (Wilson et al., 2015, p. 97).

Participants in my study likewise talked about forming groups and reaching out to First Nations, Métis and Inuit people to see if they would be interested in joining them. In the previous

chapter, I discussed participants' suggestions to form relations with each other transnationally and do international exchanges to nurture collaboration, and participants also talked about forming relations between the two groups within Canada. For example, Rosa suggested:

> That should be done . . . to have a place to meet up . . . turn that into a discussion [between Quechuas and First Nations, Métis and Inuit] for the people who are interested because there are some that . . . are not interested. If we were to have a Quechua group to get together, we could invite them.

Rosa called for Quechua people to create formal groups amongst Quechua immigrants in Toronto. Rosa recommended that these formal groups reach out to First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities. She realized that there is a possibility that some Indigenous Peoples are going to reject the invitation, as they may not be interested in forming relations with the Quechua people. She was advocating for long-term collaboration. In her invitation, Rosa was considering the need for the consent of Indigenous Peoples to take part in the group. She worded it as a matter of interest. Rosa was trying to understand the boundaries Indigenous Peoples may have when engaging in relations with immigrants. A few of the participants struggled to understand this position. According to Rosa, there needs to be greater intimacy to have closer relations and collaboration. She held the belief that greater intimacy will create solidarity, but this is not necessarily the case. Overall, Rosa and other participants may have been talking about cultural exchange rather than political solidarity when suggesting the formation of meet up-groups with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Therefore, the commitment to collaboration is not necessarily the main priority here.

Sonia mentioned the need to have meetings where we exchange information and educate ourselves about each other. She stated, "maybe to have information nights. . . . Perhaps to show

the parallelism amongst these cultures and . . . be able to identify with each other a bit more." Sonia specified the need to have activities where Quechuas and Indigenous Peoples from this land now called Canada could get to know each other. She believed that sharing Indigeneity could help form this connection (this point is further discussed later in this chapter). Sonia and Rosa both seem to be advocating that Quechua people do the work to enable these connections and invite First Nations, Métis and Inuit people to join. This invitation is based on a consensual model of relationality rather than one of demanding access. These meetings between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people would involve learning about each other through information exchange. As these meetings would be based on a culture exchange, whether they would lead to political solidarity or collaboration in decolonization is unknown.

Speaking of the feminist movement, Scholz (2009) argues that having an intimate relationship is not enough to form solidarity and collaboration. Scholz discusses the creation of political solidarity and its foundation as stemming from a "commitment by individuals to form a unity in opposition to injustice or oppression" (p. 205). This commitment to solidarity stems from a commitment to the cause, to "relations amongst members of the solidarity group, and the relationship between the solidarity group and the larger society" (p. 205). Scholz argues that merely focusing on the communities of women obscures the differences amongst them and ignores how women with more privilege engage in the ongoing oppression of women with less privilege. Similarly, resonant experiences of colonization have distinct dynamics and effects that do not erase the privilege Indigenous immigrants experience at the expense of the oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. This point does not take away from the fact that Indigenous immigrants experience various forms of oppression such as racism, classism and misogyny. In general, it is essential to acknowledge the commonalities and differences in our

oppressions and, to move forward, we need to make political connections, not just connections that explore our self-awareness of another group's suffering (Marso, 2006 in Scholz, p. 207).

Shared experiences must be accompanied by political solidarity to effect change (Scholz, 2009, p. 207). It is necessary to have a "change in consciousness brought about by our shared experience before uniting for collective change or political action." (Marso, 2006 in Scholz, 2009, p. 207). Marso (2006) calls for the need "to strike a balance between solidarity and sisterhood or shared commonality" (in Scholz, 2009, p. 207). In order to work collaboratively with First Nations, Métis and Inuit, Quechua immigrants need to strike a balance between building political solidarity and building intimate relations. As Marso states, "forming community based on our commonalities will not lead to political change" (in Scholz, p. 207). Most participants believed that greater intimacy would create solidarity, but when participants were talking about relationships, they were not talking about solidarity.

As Tiessen & Heron (2012) state, programs that involve some cultural exchanges are opportunities for personal growth for the people involved. However, these activities do not necessarily involve equal gains (p. 52). Tiessen and Heron (2012) explain that volunteers that do placements in third world countries gain more than the recipient countries where the programs take place. On these occasions, the placements and cultural exchange opportunities do not necessarily translate into political solidarity with the host countries (p. 50). Instead, volunteers claim to gain knowledge that was helpful to their original country of residence (p. 52). In the context of Quechua participants, a cultural exchange could improve relations and increase understanding, which may benefit the individuals involved, but it cannot be assumed that cultural exchange necessarily leads to political solidarity. Therefore, political solidarity and collaboration with Indigenous struggles must be seen as a moral obligation and not as a matter of choice or

confused with cultural exchange. However, this relies on Quechua immigrants deciding to engage in this process and understanding their relationship with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people within the context of ongoing settler colonialism, as settlers who have a moral obligation to the original peoples.

During the interviews and discussion groups, we discussed multiple processes for strengthening the relationships of Quechua immigrants with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. These included establishing closer connections, strengthening their relationships with their own Indigeneity to be able to honour another group's Indigeneity, acknowledging their settler identity and the responsibilities attached to it, and creating spaces for Quechua immigrants to learn about First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. In order to implement these approaches in a respectful and meaningful manner, it is necessary to also engage in self-reflective approaches.

Reflecting on Relationships with Indigenous Peoples

Participants discussed engaging in self-reflection to build relationships with Indigenous Peoples in ways that honour their space and ways of life. In discussion, a few participants reflected on how the relationships between Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous immigrants could work. Amelia compared the relationship between immigrants and Indigenous Peoples to a romantic relationship. Amelia talked about the way that a relationship with a partner unfolds. When a couple begins to live with each other, they need to agree on how they would like to live. Amelia states:

> When you start a relation at home, between the two people who are going to unite, in the beginning, he is my love, takes me to the movies. . .. Later, the days go by. You see that the husband left the socks under the table or has a somewhat strange attitude. Then the spirit changes, you are always fighting and fighting, and you never come to an end. And

> then come the separations. So, if you two speak from the beginning sweetly with love about what you expect [things can be different].

Amelia reminds us that we are engaged in a partnership; hence we need to communicate what we want from this partnership. However, unlike a romantic partnership, where both parties have equal power, settlers are guests on Indigenous lands within a settler colonial state. Guests enter without the consent of Indigenous Peoples since, at this point in time, it is the state that decides who enters these lands. This should not be the case, since these are not the lands of the state. Consequently, Indigenous immigrants are unaware of the rules and wishes of Indigenous Peoples and therefore need to learn about and adopt their rules and wishes for a relationship while learning to engage in a political solidarity with them.

Sonia indicated that we need to communicate what we would like to see from our relationships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. According to Sonia, "They [settlers] need to think about their relations with Indigenous People[s] and know what they would like from these relations." Sonia argued for settlers to know the purpose of these relationships to determine what steps we need to take to form connections. Sonia suggested that before going ahead and forming relations, including sharing groups, a planning phase is needed to determine their purpose. Having a vision is critical to guide the partnership, particularly when there is a history of oppression in allyship work carried out with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Interestingly, her use of "they" suggests that she did not include herself as being part of these discussions. This choice could be because some racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, do not see themselves as belonging to any group in Canada besides their ethnic group. They may not imagine that anyone would conceive of them as settlers and therefore, they do not participate in discussions about the relations between Indigenous Peoples and settlers.

Nonetheless, including Indigenous immigrants in these conversations is necessary to create just relations.

Immigration Canada defines the relationship between immigrants/settlers and the state, disregarding their differences and emphasizing their allegiance to the state. However, as Green (2018) states, the difference amongst settlers can determine the type of communication and collaboration that is possible with Indigenous Peoples. For example, I assume that Indigenous-settler groups such as Quechua would communicate and relate to Indigenous populations differently from white/European settlers because they share an Indigenous identity. This sharing of Indigeneity could lead to a potential collaboration. As settlers were brought here by the state, I recognize that it is not the work of Indigenous Peoples to take the lead on forming allyships with them. It is the work of the different settler groups to make each other aware of what Indigenous Peoples are asking from their relationships with settlers and respond accordingly to the positions and identities they hold. There are already agreements such as the Two Row Wampum Belt that outline some of the terms for settlers and Indigenous Peoples living together in Indigenous lands that can guide settlers in this process. However, this information was new or unknown to most participants I interviewed.

Participants discussed ways to build relations through direct communication and awareness of the positions that Indigenous immigrants occupy on Indigenous stolen lands. Overall, Indigenous immigrants may not realize that to form relationships with Indigenous Peoples in the Canadian state, we first need to understand our own identity as settlers. However, some participants did not assume this identity, while some outright rejected it — indicating that this may be a difficult identity for Indigenous immigrants to adopt. While the concept of settler has its benefits as it opens up conversations about the role and responsibilities of settlers towards

First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples, it could be argued that it is inadequate to impose this identity upon them. Having said that, building just relations for political solidarity requires understanding and accepting the existence of, and their complicity in, ongoing settler colonialism.

Considering the implications of the settler identity means considering what a colonizer identity might mean for them; this is an identity directly in conflict with their own experience because, as some participants explained, they immigrated because they were themselves displaced from their lands. Some participants expressly rejected the identity of colonizer, which is implied by the word settler. However, as Thobani (2007) and Tuck and Yang (2012) argue by virtue of the structures of settler colonialism regulations, living on these lands reinforce its theft. Whether Quechua people see their immigration as a choice or not, their settlement on Indigenous People's lands still has detrimental consequences to Indigenous Peoples because they are participants in state legitimacy and supremacy over Indigenous lands and people (Thobani, 2007; Tuck and Yang, 2012). Reflecting on a settler identity entails considering how settler colonialism affects Indigenous Peoples and our complicity in it.

As we discussed forming closer relationships, participants and I also discussed how to engage in relationships of collaboration specifically. Although developing closer relationships and engaging in relationships of political collaboration are intrinsically connected, they are not the same. As mentioned earlier, forming intimate connections does not necessarily mean taking on the settlers' responsibility to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples towards decolonization. In the following section, I focus on ways to build collaborative relationships.

Building Collaborative Relationships

A decolonizing lens that focuses on challenging the status quo and involves direct actions to challenge settler colonialism is necessary for building collaborative relationships between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Based on Indigenous methodologies, participants and I discussed raising conscientization amongst settlers and finding ways they can take action and engage in advocacy work. Building collaborative relations would involve identifying steps for Quechua immigrants to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada. To engage in conscientization, I will use a model involving reflection and action as presented by Freire (1970a, 1970b).

Conscientization

In order to move forward with collaboration, participants talked about the need for settlers to have a level of conscientization about what is happening to Indigenous Peoples. Freire (1970b) coined the term conscientization to refer to "the process in which men [people], not as recipients, but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality" (p.27, in Lloyd, 1972, p. 5). It cannot stay at a level of awareness, but it needs to involve a process of transformation. According to Freire (1970a), this level of conscientization is meant to involve reflection as well as action (p. 35). The knowledge that one obtains by realizing how social structures maintain oppression is the basis for the process of transformation. As it will be discussed later on in this chapter, participants such as Esperanza and Samay also talked about the need to raise awareness at governmental levels, so politicians know what is happening in Indigenous communities.

There are many pathways to transforming consciousness to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples within a decolonizing framework. As stated earlier, it needs to begin with a recognition that settlers are on Indigenous homelands, and their mere presence perpetuates settler-colonial practices (Davis, 2017, p. 410). According to Davis (2017), conscientization can involve the following:

> Building just and decolonized relationships with Indigenous Peoples, the land, and all beings. Engaging in an ongoing, complex, and dynamic process grounded in a lifetime commitment to Indigenous Peoples occurs at the level of the individual, family, community, and nation. (p. 402)

To move forward, it is essential to denounce the oppression of Indigenous Peoples and urge for more conscientization from settlers. Chazan (2020) argues for the need to shift into a settler consciousness that acknowledges that the problem in Canada is a "settler problem" (p. 37) as opposed to an Indigenous issue. Under this conceptualization, 'settler consciousness' centres on addressing a settler problem. According to Chazan, this process involves "challenging settler ways of thinking, senses of entitlement, assumed belonging, and epistemological superiority, and ultimately altering colonial structures, infrastructure, and governance models" (p. 36). Shifting settlers' consciousness starts to address the settler problem (p. 36). As we saw earlier, some participants inadvertently carry a sense of entitlement to accessing Indigenous Peoples and their cultures when trying to form relationships.

Similarly, one of the critiques made by Jafri (2020) is that even though there have been cross-racial relations, including collaborative relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations, settlers have formed these relations without challenging the status quo of colonial society (Jafri, 2020, p. 112). Jafri proposes raising consciousness of the need to refuse

the status quo. For instance, Jafri talks about using an Indigenous politics of refusal to come up with ways for racialized immigrants to partake within and at the same time oppose white settler societies (p. 111). Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson (2014) discusses politics of refusal as an alternative to having Indigenous Peoples seek the recognition of others, particularly the government. It is used as a “political and ethical stance that stands in stark contrast to the desire to have one’s distinctiveness as a culture, as a people, recognized” (p. 11). As Simpson explains:

> The ongoing conditions of settler colonialism have forced Kahnawa'kehro':non to take an offensive position not just against the settler nation, but in some ways against themselves. This position then manifests in calculated refusals of the “gifts” of the state, and in vexed determinations of “membership: and belonging in that state. (2014, p. 12)

Simpson (2014) clarifies that this form of refusal differs from ethnographic refusal (p. 12). Ethnographic refusal consists of having researchers and participants refuse to share certain information and experiences in research settings.

Similar to Simpson’s (2014) use of refusal politics, Jafri (2020) claims that “by refusing the state’s structures of social and cultural organization, practices of refusal enable the (re)production of new forms of community” (p. 113). In this way, refusal leads to more than just negating the status quo regarding settler colonialism; it opens up opportunities and “generates alternative forms of nationhood, sovereignty and belonging” (p. 111). However, as I stated earlier, raising consciousness is only the first step towards decolonization, and actions of collaboration need to be attached to consciousness-raising. The principles in the politics of refusal align with those guiding solidarity relationships between Indigenous immigrants and Indigenous Canadians. A politics of refusal means forming collaborations which the state does nothing to support. In general, there is state support for separation as opposed to collaboration. In

this case, the politics of refusal is about refusing the separatism of the state. Therefore, a politics of refusal for Quechua people could mean resisting the status quo where there is no space for collaboration and engaging in these practices. Raising consciousness and engaging in collaboration are part of the processes of engaging Quechua immigrants to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Participants also talked about the need to have more conscientization of settler colonialism, its effects on First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and implications for settlers. Samay talked about the need for people to be conscious of the injustices settlers commit against Indigenous Peoples in Canada. She encouraged immigrants to take the initiative to learn about the issues that they are facing. According to Samay, this step was imperative to engaging in collaboration. In the context of selling arts and crafts, Samay encourages immigrants to be conscious of Indigenous Peoples' histories and ongoing oppressions when engaging in businesses with these communities. Samay stated:

> Initiative needs to be taken by people from other parts of the world; they need to take on this [social consciousness]. If there is no such kind of awareness, you cannot do that work [to sell arts and crafts with First Nations, Métis people and Inuit].

Samay highlighted the importance of immigrants learning about Indigenous Peoples and working with them with this awareness.

Hugo talked about the need to have a general conscientization about the role of capitalism in oppression. Hugo called our attention to make more time to think and reflect on societal problems. He stated:

> [This is] a moral call for those who believe in equal rights and opportunities for all. There should be empathy. Unfortunately, there are many barriers to these ends. We live in a society where there is not much time for contemplation or free time to reflect and

start thinking about our severe problems in society; we are overwhelmed by the need to make more money to pay for material needs here.

Many Indigenous Peoples would challenge the idea that equality is the goal of decolonization. As original peoples that have stewardship of these lands, Indigenous Peoples ask for different rights than equal rights. Indigenous struggles consist of having rights to their lands and having autonomy and sovereignty over their people (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Snelgrove et al., 2014). When understanding Hugo's comments, it is essential to acknowledge that he relies on Marxist philosophies such as Marx's theory of alienation in the quotation above.

Hugo talked about productivity, the need to make money, and how it has consumed people and made them lose their priorities and connection with themselves and others. As a result, settlers are motivated to disrupt Indigenous rights, autonomy and sovereignty to obtain more resources. The ambition for more resources overrules people's morals leading to the ongoing colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. According to Marx, in this desire to produce, human beings end up alienating themselves, alienating from themselves. According to Marx 1844/1964), the more people produce, the more they become alienated from the product they produce. As the worker produces more, "the more his production increases in power and extent. The worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more commodities he produces" (p. 42). With the power gained, "the object that labour produces, its product, stands opposed to it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer" (p. 42). In this way, the product becomes alienated from the producer. However, beyond the alienation of the worker to his product, there is alienation of the worker from himself:

> Estrangement [alienation of the worker] manifests itself not only in the result [product], but also in the act of production, within the activity of production itself. How could the

> product of the worker's activity confront him as something alien if it were not for the fact that in the act of production, he was estranging himself from himself? After all, the product is simply the resumé of the activity, of the production. So, if the product of labour is alienation, production itself must be active alienation. (Marx, 1844/1959, p. 44)

This process of self-alienation happens as human beings aim to produce more. As human beings focus their lives on productivity, they become more distant from others, themselves and what they produce.

According to Marxism, as humans end up alienating themselves by focusing on productivity, they become indifferent to other people's oppression (Smith, 1937, in Marx, 1844/1959, p. 21). Throughout the interview, Hugo talked about the alienation caused by productivity. Hugo explained how this phenomenon is seen more often as we distance ourselves from the processes involved in the production, including the materials used. In doing so, people disconnect themselves from what they produced and their "creativity," which is the essence of humankind (p. 421). Consequently, work becomes alienating.

People's reliance on work and money alienates them from themselves and leads to alienation from others. I agree with Hugo that a focus on production is one of the causes of human alienation. As stated earlier, alienation and desire for production can lead to the support of settler colonialism. The need to acquire more land to extract resources can lead to supporting mechanisms of oppression against First Nations, Métis and Inuit people as sovereignty over land is one of the foundations of decolonization. Hugo called for more conscientization on how settler colonialism is exercised in order to engage in decolonization. Hugo argued that immigrants must remain accountable for how settler colonialism has transformed throughout history. Hugo also discussed settler colonialism using an invader and hostage analysis. He stated,

> What I see . . . from being invaders, they [immigrants] become hostages; and now they are claiming: "I am supporting you and you want rights? I am wanting to support you, and you don't do anything [to support yourself].

Hugo critiqued the position that immigrants have taken against Indigenous Peoples. Besides being invaders and taking over these lands, they have moved to create a narrative where they are the victims and Indigenous Peoples are taking advantage. Hugo was uncovering the false narrative being created by immigrants and urged immigrants to reflect on the position they are taking to address this problem. A move towards collaborative relationships and allyship require immigrants to shift their conceptualization of who they are as settlers in these lands and what their roles and responsibilities are, and of who First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people are. As it will be expanded below, there would need to be a shift in how 'support' is being offered to Indigenous Peoples as it is presently seen as a favour instead of a right. Beyond conscientization, participants also talked about taking action towards collaboration. Although most of the participants did not use the word "allyship," they talked about allyship.

Taking Action Towards Collaboration

According to a few participants, we need to determine how we can take action beyond needing to reflect on our position as settlers and the responsibilities that come with it. At times, taking action has been done through the concept of reconciliation and its subsequent implications. As mentioned in the previous chapter, The Calls to Action from the TRCC reiterates the need to collaborate. In these calls, Indigenous Peoples are demanding immigrants take action and support them in all sectors of society (TRCC, 2012). However, there has been little success implementing the Calls to Action (Jewell in Martens, 2019, n.p.). While Prime Minister Justin Trudeau described it as "a blueprint to reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples,"

he has failed to implement these Calls to Action, including implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (Jewell in Martens, 2019, n.p.).

There seem to be a lot of Indigenous groups who essentially gave up any hope of reconciliation in response to the ongoing violence perpetuated by the construction of pipelines under Trudeau's government (Brake, 2019; Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2016). Oil companies have invaded many Indigenous territories. As Arnie Jack of the Secwepemc Nation explains, the government has tried to gain the support of a few elected Chiefs that have given consent to pipelines disregarding the opinions of the rest of the community members from the territories. Jack explains that:

> Canada does not have a deed to Secwépemc (known in English as the Shuswap people) . . . Canada does not have the consent of our Shuswap Nation Elder's Council to put a pipeline through our territory . . . agreements with leadership whose authority was established under Canada's Indian Act do not equate to consent from the Nation. . .. You can stand up to all of the elected chiefs that you want and say that you have consent, but you do not have consent from the people on the ground. . .. What you did to the Unist'ot'en — that is a national disgrace. (In Brake, 2019, n.p.)

Jack is voicing many Indigenous Peoples' views towards Trudeau's actions and policies. Trudeau's actions illustrate how far we are from decolonizing the systems in place and fulfilling the Calls to Action.

Despite most participants being unaware of the Calls to Action, they discussed the need to take action when talking about collaborating with Indigenous Peoples. Samay spoke about her family's ongoing participation in actions that support Indigenous Peoples in the lands now known as Canada. Samay stated:

> I think it is necessary. It is necessary to have awareness and not only that but also to take action. I am lucky because I learned it from my mom and dad [to take action]. My dad has been in a position to be in solidarity with a group of Kichwa people from Otavalo, [participating] in the Okra crisis. I was in my mom's belly . . .

Samay had the knowledge and the example of her family supporting First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Other participants also had much to say about how to support Indigenous Peoples actively. Esperanza suggested that we could collaborate by supporting their arts and crafts and allocating a portion of our taxes to Indigenous populations and projects that benefit them. Esperanza stated:

> How can you support them? Maybe when they sell their merchandise? By buying it . . . We need to provide support . . . if they say for a project we need two million, then from the taxes, we can determine one part. You are cooperating through the taxes . . . that could be one way.

Esperanza suggested cooperating in ways that rely on central state organizing, which is complicated because the central state supports settler colonialism. According to some participants, such as Elli, support could begin by forming partnerships between leaders from both groups, Quechua immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada. Elli suggested that the leaders from these populations talk about how Quechuas could engage in advocacy work to support First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and form pacts to formalize these commitments.

Collaboration can also be examined through the philosophy of the oppressed by Freire (1970a), introduced earlier on. Based on Freire's philosophy of the oppressed, oppressed people are the best positioned to understand oppression and fight for liberation. In Canada, the

oppression of Quechua and other racialized immigrants is connected to the oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Suppose we assume that the dominant structures in place are oppressing not only First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, but also Quechua immigrants along with other racialized groups. Quechua immigrants would fight for the liberation of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people as well. However, fighting for freedom poses many challenges. According to Freire (1970a),

> The oppressed, who have adapted to the structure of domination in which they are immersed, and have become resigned to it, are inhibited from waging the struggle for freedom so long as they feel incapable of running the risks it requires. Moreover, their struggle for freedom threatens not only the oppressor but also their oppressed comrades who are fearful of still greater repression. (p. 47)

Freire identifies some of the fears people have and encourages them to overcome them to achieve their freedom.

In this section, I examined ways collaboration has been discussed in Canada, i.e., through the Calls to Action. I discussed the participants' views on the Calls to Action and their suggestions on how Quechua immigrants could collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. For instance, participants suggested having Indigenous leaders from the South and North form partnerships. Based on Freire's (1970a) philosophy of the oppressed, I identified ways to frame collaboration as a way to freedom for everyone involved in the partnership. If we see our struggles as intrinsically linked, our fight for oppression benefits all the groups involved. Later on in this chapter, I discuss the process of forming collaborative relationships based on Indigenous teachings and the complexities involved. First, I discuss advocacy work and its implications.

Advocacy Work

When participants discussed collaboration, most of them saw the need for immigrants to engage in advocacy and protests. At the same time, participants urged collaboration partners to consider the complexities involved, particularly for people with negative past experiences with these forms of collaboration. Davis (2007) has studied allyship work with the guidance of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Davis states that settler colonialism and ongoing forms of oppression against First Nations, Métis and Inuit people need to be considered when forming allyship: "alliances and coalitions need to be entered into with awareness of the past and the present if they are to meet the mutual goals of their participants" (p. 114). These alliances need to address the normatively paternalistic attitudes of non-Indigenous people in order not to repeat them (p. 114).

Schultz (2017) also discusses the need for settlers to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples. Schultz argued for people to engage in a "productive discomfort" that makes settlers reflect on how we are helping to maintain settler colonialism. In this journey, we constantly question how we can work towards decolonization in our everyday lives (p. 267). According to Schultz, a settler collaboration also involves a "productive comfort" that allows for the discomfort to become tolerable. We are making the discomfort tolerable; in this way, "discomfort and comfort may coexist" (Schultz, 2017, p. 269). Under this model, the settler moves to a "productive comfort" by taking on the information learned from reflecting on the discomfort as settlers and engaging in decolonization through everyday practices. In this way, settlers lie between comfort and discomfort (p. 271). Schultz encourages us to become comfortable with discomfort because feeling discomfort is the first step towards transformation. It allows us to question ourselves regularly on our implication in settler colonialism. As mentioned in the previous chapter, a few

scholars such as Casuncad (2020) and Chatterjee (2018) have called attention to the lack of education immigrants have on Indigenous Peoples' struggles and how this creates barriers to forming respectful relationships.

Participants also identified challenges in engaging in some forms of advocacy work, such as protests. Since protests are the conditions of allyship work that many participants were most acquainted with, our discussions centred on their participation in protests. Elli, who had come here originally as an international student, talked about his time constraints that did not allow him to partake in protests as he worked a lot. Elli talked about alternative work that he could do to collaborate. Elli stated: "I understand the purpose of the protests, and now I have no time. But there are different ways to collaborate. For example, speaking to our relatives in Peru [about the hardships that Indigenous Peoples in Canada experience]." Elli was aware of the lack of information people have regarding the situation of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Therefore, he identified the need to bring more awareness of these realities back to his country of origin. Similarly, some participants, such as Martin, advocated having more information for people outside the educational system. Having information sessions run by community centres where people could get a chance to learn about Indigenous Peoples so they could engage in collaborative work. Martin stated:

> The community centres have no information about them [Indigenous Peoples]. Where can I go and hear the info? Perhaps the community centres should be in charge of posting information because there is none. Right now, only because you are talking to me about the issue is that this information comes out. As you say, they are the first people to come. I always assume that they have to have the first preference because they are from here. It

> should be like that. As we were talking about . . . we have invaded their lands. Because we are living a better life . . . we are choosing Canada. And they live here.

Sonia also advocated for informing immigrants about what Indigenous Peoples need to facilitate advocacy work. She stated:

> I think there has to be an education for both and more closeness . . . but how . . . I would have to educate myself . . . know the needs . . . how I get into the reserves . . . I am not a social worker . . . I have to educate myself on what you need . . . if they tell me how to help, then I can do that . . . how to help. There would have to be an approach . . . but if I don't know . . .

Sonia was trying to figure out how to learn more about Indigenous Peoples and their needs to assist them properly. Like other participants, Sonia raised a few issues connected to entitlement and consent. I do not think Sonia realized the protocols to be followed for immigrants to enter the spaces of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Sonia's understanding echoed that of other participants. As mentioned earlier, some participants lacked awareness of the need to have permission to access these spaces and people. Some participants implied that if a non-Indigenous person is willing to work with Indigenous Peoples, they are entitled to do so. They dismiss the factors that need to be considered to work with Indigenous communities based on decolonizing approaches, such as considering local ethics of co-existence and histories of Indigenous Peoples and their impact on their present relations with immigrants.

When discussing collaboration, most participants raised similar points focusing on the need to have more education on Indigenous Peoples and their experiences to engage in acts of collaboration. Samay spoke about the need to engage in advocacy work and encouraged immigrants to partake in these activities, including Indigenous immigrants. She also shared her

disappointments when carrying out activist work. Samay ran a group where she spoke to Latine immigrants about Indigenous Peoples' histories and cultures. She expressed how difficult it was to have regular attendance in the group. Samay stated:

> There was also someone who was one of the most connected participants with the people from here [First Nations, Métis and Inuit] . . . and that frustrated me because there have been certain people in the Latin community who asked, "how can we get involved?" But at the moment [when there is a group to help us get involved], there is no one there attending. So, for me, that was like the end. I said, I can't do this.

Samay reflected on her experience teaching Indigenous immigrants from Latin America about Indigenous Peoples in Canada and exploring ways to form allyships. Samay expressed her frustration, particularly about this person already connected with First Nations, Métis and Inuit. She expected them to have a stronger commitment to attending a Latine education group since the group's goal was to support Indigenous Peoples from these lands called Canada. The Latine communities' overall lack of participation forced her to give up this project. Instead, she searched for other ways to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. It is also crucial to consider that lack of attendance does not necessarily mean lack of interest. There could be many reasons, as they will be described later in this chapter, why Indigenous Peoples are not participating.

Participants brought up other complications related to advocacy work. Some participants talked about their hesitations in advocating for or engaging in protests to support Indigenous Peoples based on their past experiences with activism. Participants talked about how their past experiences advocating for their rights back home affected their future decision to engage in activism in general. Participants talked about fearing the possible criticism by the Latine

community over engaging in protests and other advocacy activities. The participants felt that they would be labelled radical and dangerous for engaging in this work. The pressure on racialized immigrants to fit the image of the exemplar national citizen (Thobani, 2007) may interfere with collaborating with Indigenous Peoples.

Participants who lived through the years of the Shining Path in Peru had some reservations about participating in protests. As stated earlier, the Shining Path punished anyone who protested their actions (Degregori, 1991, p. 25). Similarly, the military took harsh measures against any public supporters of this extremist group (Degregori, 1991, p. 25; Mantilla Falcón, 2006, p. 335). Sonia talked about these experiences of repression during the Shining Path and argued that they shaped people's views on speaking out publicly in protests. Sonia stated: "As an immigrant, you may fear to do activist work that will get you in trouble if you have a history of that." Sonia wondered what other options there were to engage in collaboration. She stated: "With no places to meet, where can we start talking about collaboration?" Sonia is referring to a perceived lack of accessible organized movements involved in collaboration.

Jessica, who also lived through the years of the Shining Path, explained her fear of speaking up in public spaces when she stated:

> I don't like to question political things on the train. Yes, because what if there is someone who listens to me and says something to me, and I do not want to have problems and argue on that issue. If we talk to a friend . . . In the subway, we talk about things that can be heard but not about intense things where someone has their point of view, and it is radical. And what if he [a passenger] has his point of view and insults me [for not agreeing].

Jessica brings attention to the possibility of being attacked for expressing what may be considered a radical point of view. Indigenous struggles are normalized as radical and highly criticized because of that. Being Indigenous in Peru also made people a target of the Shining Path just as much as the military. Both parties aimed to recruit Indigenous Peoples for their support. Indigenous Peoples were more desirable because they were considered more disposable than Mestizes or privileged whites (Mantilla Falcón, 2006, pp. 323–324). In general, the traumatic circumstances that people may experience in their countries of origin and the negative labels associated with fighting for their rights may affect their engagement in activist work to support First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people here in Canada. Therefore, their experiences with advocacy and political participation need to be considered when discussing collaboration with Indigenous Peoples. As a participant also mentioned, other forms of engagement may be better suited for people experiencing the above circumstances.

Another issue to consider when discussing activist work is the immigration status people hold. All the people I interviewed had status at the moment of our interviews. However, I am uncertain if they immigrated as refugees and then obtained the status or moved here with a landed status when they immigrated to the Canadian state. I had the impression that some of them came here as refugees fleeing the Shining Path. I did not enquire about how they came to Canada because I felt it was a very personal question about their lives, and they may feel I was invading their privacy. When they agreed to do the interview, they were not told that they would be asked personal questions about their status since that was not the focus of the interview. I was also concerned about the strong stigma against refugee people that may make participants feel uncomfortable sharing this information. However, during my analysis, I realized that their perspectives on my study topics are in part influenced by their immigration journey. For

example, if they came to Canada as refugees, engaging in protests and activist work that involves these formats may intersect with past experiences of oppression. As immigrants they may also be responding to the precarity of their position in Canada and the possibility of deportation (real or imagined) if they are arrested while taking part in a protest.

Two participants spoke about coming to Canada with student status and the financial pressures they faced. Elli and Jessica paid international tuition fees for university, which meant they had to dedicate most of their time working to make ends meet. Even after they finished school and received their landed status, they had to work a lot to pay the debts they had accumulated while they were students. Jessica and Elli identified financial pressures as one of the reasons they have very little time to engage in more activist work. Therefore, lacking financial stability and having precarious citizenship status could both act as barriers to engaging in social action. In the next section, I expand on the barriers to collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Participants and I first discussed some of the barriers to forming relationships in general and then we specifically identified barriers to collaboration.

Barriers to Forming Relationships

One of the main barriers to forming relations involved Quechua participants feeling like outsiders disconnected from First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Participants also perceived a lack of interest on the side of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in forming relations with Quechua. Another barrier that will be discussed in this section is the complicated connection to their Indigenous roots that some Quechua people have as a result of colonialism and their journey of Indigeneity as discussed above. Colonialism has led many Quechua people to reject their Indigenous roots. Consequently, this disconnection may be a barrier to then use Indigeneity as a bridge to build collaboration and solidarity with Indigenous Peoples in Canada.

Quechua Immigrants Treated as Outsiders

As a barrier to relationship building, participants identified the label of 'outsider' given to them by Indigenous Peoples. Some participants felt that Indigenous Peoples grouped them as outsiders with the rest of the dominant settler groups. 'Outsider' in this context refers to being non-Indigenous to these lands, and therefore, they are outsiders to Indigenous communities in the Canadian state. However, some participants felt that they did not deserve this distinction. These participants rejected the 'outsider' label as they felt it was unfair considering the role that racialized immigrants played in building Canada; in effect, participating in the oppression of Indigenous Peoples through settler colonialism. As discussed in the previous chapter, some racialized immigrants want recognition for their contributions to the Canadian state demonstrating their alliance with the state while dismissing how this implicates them in the oppression of Indigenous Peoples. Their difficulty understanding how this position put them in opposition rather than alliance with Indigenous Peoples and therefore actually reinforced their position as outsiders created cognitive dissonance for participants. There is a contradictory consciousness in wanting recognition while disregarding how these contributions serve to oppress First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Participants were consistently confused about how their actions and desire for acceptance by the state created a barrier to their full participation in decolonizing efforts; this complicated truth likely requires much more time to untangle and fully understand than participants had during this study.

Some participants talked about their lack of knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and their histories, resulting in their support of colonialism. For example, Elli and Jessica talked about supporting laws and regulations that they thought collaborated with Indigenous Peoples. They did not realize that dominant systems establish structures and legislations to benefit the dominant

population, often at the expense of Indigenous Peoples. In our conversations, Elli began to question who they are helping when they are following the laws:

> When we got here . . . We know that Canada has its laws. We know that we have to follow the laws from here . . . Now I assume there are more laws about the Indigenous People[s]. It is not like before when there were only treaties. Now there must be more laws supporting the Indigenous People[s] from here. When we came here, we were already pre-determined what we had to do. You come here. You know that Canada has its laws. Amongst those laws, there are laws specific to certain groups. And that is how it is. We have to.

Elli raised the point that before arriving to Canada he accepted that there were laws and regulations he needed to follow that were determined by the state. Immigrants know they need to follow the state's regulations as a condition of their immigration. However, he began to question who immigrants are supporting when they follow the state's laws and regulations. Prior to this research, he blindly accepted his role in Canada by following the law, not realizing that these laws are to the detriment of Indigenous Peoples. Elli's testimony shows how immigrants come to Canada as part of the colonial project, unaware of how supporting the state contributes to the ongoing oppression of Indigenous Peoples and positions them in direct opposition to decolonizing projects. Therefore, autonomous community organizing, not connected to the state, is a more productive and straightforward path towards collaboration in decolonizing projects.

Maria and Rebecca shared their confusion about whether they should be loyal to the government or Indigenous Peoples. They stated: "[we have] responsibilities [to Indigenous Peoples] and also need to work hand in hand to be able to help in the development [of the] country." After our conversations, some participants debated whether it was the right choice to

follow Canadian laws. Most participants lacked knowledge on how the rules and all systems created by the Canadian state contribute to settler colonialism. They felt some loyalty towards the dominant society because it is the system that brought them here, they have benefited from the system, while also paying their share to it, and they have agreed to follow its laws. At the same time, they agreed on the need to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples, as they began to understand how Indigenous Peoples continued to be harmed by the state. Inadvertently, in their goal to become insiders to the Canadian state, participants become outsiders to Indigenous Peoples by participating in the settler colonial project.

Participants also talked about how they were being treated as part of the white dominant settler population, despite not being white. Lee (2016) addresses the complicated position of racialized settlers in settler colonialism. Lee argues:

> Nonwhites share with Indigenous Peoples a violent history of displacement, segregation, dislocation, and internment enacted through racialized and gendered violence. They also share relations of kinship and friendship. Complexity, messiness, paradox and conflict mark these relations, as they do all intergroup relations constituted in colonizing conditions. (p. 20)

Lee expresses the complexities that embody the relations between racialized and Indigenous Peoples. As stated earlier, many Indigenous immigrants have been colonized and, at the same time, are accomplices in settler colonialism. Therefore, Indigenous immigrants are in a different position than white immigrants. Casuncad (2020) elaborates on heterogeneity amongst immigrants and their experiences — they are not all the same. Simplifying the situation by ignoring the injustices experienced by racialized and Indigenous immigrants and placing them in the same category and with the same privileges as white immigrants will not move us towards

greater involvement in decolonizing projects (p. 6). The relationships between racialized and Indigenous immigrants, and the state and Indigenous Peoples is complex and has resulted in the complicated alliances referred to by scholars like Tuck and Yang (2012). However, these alliances are possible and there is room for racialized and Indigenous immigrants to navigate their complex position towards building alliances with Indigenous Peoples.

Bhatia (2013) argues that solidarities between Indigenous and 'aliens' (referring to racialized immigrants) are not natural but are full of complexities (p. 45). Bhatia claims that there "are no automatic solidarities between '[Indigenous people]' and 'aliens,' but that these relationships must be forged" (p. 32). The settler identity of Indigenous immigrants influences their relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people because they live on stolen lands. Indigenous writers have also asked themselves how to make sense of the position of racialized settlers living in the North (p. 46). Amadahy and Lawrence (2009) pose the question: "Where do racialized settlers fit in the vision of Indigenous sovereignty?" (p. 130). The authors acknowledge the need to consider the complexities in the position of racialized immigrants in relationship building. Amadahy and Lawrence urge grassroots Indigenous leadership to recognize the position of marginalized immigrants. "The disempowered and dispossessed from other parts of the world who were forced and/or coerced into being here on Turtle Island (a global phenomenon in which Canada shares culpability)" (in Bhatia, 2013, p. 46). Amadahy and Lawrence (2009) recognize that racialized immigrants and other immigrants may be disempowered and removed from their lands. They are in a different position than white immigrants who have not experienced these forms of oppression. According to Amadahy and Lawrence, First Nations, Métis and Inuit people need to consider the adversities racialized immigrants face in their plans for Indigenous sovereignty. In other words, Amadahy and

Lawrence are saying that when Indigenous Peoples plan for the futures of their people, lands, and sovereignty, which involves taking power back from settlers, they will need to consider the position of racialized immigrants, since many have also experienced colonization and oppression.

Similarly, Green (2018) argues that when thinking about the relations between immigrants and Indigenous Peoples, there needs to be consideration of the events that have brought racialized immigrants to live in Indigenous lands. Green argues that some people may move to Canada because they had no choice: "slavery, exploitation, and colonial histories and current realities across the globe have impacted settlement and how the 'original' treaty makers engage with newer Guests" (p. 173). Green calls for acknowledgement of the hardships some immigrants have experienced and how the state regulations and laws guiding newcomers and settlers violate the treaties. According to Green, these regulations can be highly oppressive, and they stand in opposition to Indigenous Peoples' beliefs. It would make sense to follow Indigenous guidelines to support these relations and move away from state involvement as much as possible. In the case of Indigenous immigrants, I see the challenge being that in recognizing the oppression of Indigenous immigrants and acting accordingly, which I see as necessary and urgent, Indigenous immigrants may lose focus and move away from their responsibilities. Therefore, it may not be a choice between one action and another, rather they are complementary actions that must be addressed simultaneously.

The participants discussed the problematic position of Indigenous immigrants such as Quechua people. Some participants discussed the image of outsiders that Indigenous Peoples from Canada had of them and how they felt it created a barrier to forming relations. They felt

their experiences are more similar to Indigenous Peoples in the Canadian state than the white populations. Rosa stated:

> Well, they [Indigenous Peoples] interacted with them [white people] . . . but we have another vision of the Indigenous People[s] . . . so treat us in another way to relate in another way, to see how we can relate.

In our discussions, Rosa highlighted that being treated as a white immigrant poses a significant barrier to Indigenous immigrants. According to Rosa, through these acts of invisibility, dominant societies and Indigenous Peoples may be enacting systemic discrimination and oppression by denying the injustices experienced by Indigenous immigrants. Rosa claimed that the denial that Quechuas are different from white people creates a barrier between the two groups. Indigenous immigrants may start distancing themselves from Indigenous Peoples in Canada if they feel their identity is misunderstood. In taking this position Rosa was placing the responsibility on the oppressed group rather than taking responsibility for her role in their oppression. However, the state has a key role in creating this division through its assimilation process as a mechanism of furthering the colonial project, in effect making racialized and Indigenous immigrants complicit in the ongoing oppression of Indigenous Peoples.

One of the problems is that the racist colonial system that pushes for assimilation of marginalized people treats everybody as white or tries to make everyone whiter. Indigenous Peoples are concerned about their land and sovereignty being stolen from them by a machine that requires the ongoing settlement and creation of Canadian citizens loyal to the state, regardless of where they come from. In this case, although Rosa placed the responsibility on Indigenous Peoples for not having relationships with Indigenous immigrants, she also understands what the state does under the banner of liberal multiculturalism. For example, by treating everyone the

same and trying to assimilate them to the dominant culture, the needs and experiences of Indigenous immigrants become invisible.

Rosa illustrated a tension between having Indigenous immigrants blame Indigenous Peoples from these lands for not wanting to get close to Indigenous immigrants as they are considered white immigrants. At the same time racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, are treated by the Canadian state as white people and expect them to assimilate to dominant society. In some way, Rosa duplicated the invisibility that Indigenous immigrants experienced from the government. Rosa and other participants did not consider Indigenous Peoples' needs and experiences in collaboration discussions. Perhaps this is the result of having discussions that did not include First Nations, Métis, or Inuit people. It may be unrealistic to expect Quechua immigrants consider the needs of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people when they were not represented in these discussions. These actions are resonant of other instances of Indigenous Peoples being depicted as "Canadians" or held responsible for how Canada has treated them or seen them. For example, as I mentioned above, participants initially thought that following Canadian legislation was respecting Indigenous laws without realizing that Canadian laws were imposed on and used to oppress Indigenous Peoples.

Hugo also had difficulty accepting that Indigenous Peoples might see immigrants as outsiders. He urges First Nations, Métis and Inuit people to depart from these discourses because "nationalism" only leads to more divisions worldwide:

> Now I believe that these ideas manifest themselves with nationalism . . . this is a way to sustain nothing, it is just a way to have us in conflict . . . they [Indigenous Peoples in Canada] know that they have no reason to [say this] . . .

As mentioned in the previous chapter, in Hugo's opinion, there is no reason for Indigenous Peoples in Canada to keep immigrants at a distance since immigrants have contributed to building the Canadian state. Hugo demonstrated his acceptance of the colonial state's legitimacy by implying that the state and Indigenous Peoples have shared main interests.

It is also true that his prescription for a way to counter colonialism and capitalism erases the specificity of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people's experiences, suggesting that everybody should be considered equal and similar in their resistance to the state. Hugo believes that we must overcome internal differences to be united against the oppressors. This way of thinking erases the difference between decolonization, which is what Indigenous Peoples are fighting for, and equal rights within the state, which is what racialized immigrants are fighting for — two very different goals. Hugo's statements demonstrate a lack of knowledge of the place that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people hold in the ongoing history of colonization in Canada. Assertions that immigrants built this country directly contradict notions of Indigenous sovereignty and decolonization.

The underlying assumption of this research is that there can be solidarity based on shared histories of colonialism while acknowledging that these experiences are also different. Hugo demonstrated diversity within Indigenous immigrant populations' understandings of these relationships and the importance of not assuming alliances are inevitable based on a shared identity of Indigeneity and shared history of colonialism. Overall, participants felt that they were treated as outsiders. Some of them had strong opinions about this treatment as they thought these attitudes were not helpful to forming collaborative relations; they also erroneously felt their contribution to the Canadian state earned them status as insiders. Amongst these groups, there was little awareness of how cooperation with the development of the Canadian state did not

benefit Indigenous groups. There was also limited understanding of the differences amongst Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people that needed to be acknowledged to establish collaborative relations. I believe the existing complexities do not cancel out that these two Indigenous groups from the North and South have resonant experiences such as colonialism, annihilation of their cultures, genocide, imperialism and exploitation by multi-national and transnational companies. At the same time, they share agency shown through projects of cultural resurgence, resilience and ongoing efforts to stand up against operations from transnational companies. Sharing all these experiences can contribute to strengthening their relationships. However, even with these resonant experiences, participants still need to do work in order to build alliances with First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people as their very presence on this land makes them automatically complicit in the ongoing colonization of Indigenous lands.

Another barrier to collaboration and solidarity involves Quechua people's connection with their Indigenous identity. It is stated above that for Quechua immigrants to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, they need to first connect with their own Indigeneity. However, respecting one's Indigenous heritage can be particularly difficult when the country they come from does not. In fact, the person might want to leave their Indigeneity behind, partly because of the hatred towards Indigeneity experienced back, as discussed earlier in this dissertation.

As Soria Choque (2009) argues, the colonization of the Quechua people established a pervasive self-hatred amongst Indigenous Peoples, particularly towards their Indigenous heritage (Soria Choque, 2009, p. 88). In South America, the Mestizaje project and the stratified divisions it brought based on one's closeness to Indigenous heritage and distance from European heritage continued after the independence of Latin America during the 1830s. Most colonizers left, but

the ‘colonialism of the mind’ had taught Quechua and Mestize people to believe they occupied a lower status (p. 31). In countries with high Quechua/Kishwa and Mestize populations, colonial mentality and structures continue to denigrate Indigenous ancestry. Instead, they force the assimilation of Indigenous Peoples into white society. Although the percentage of white people is minimal in countries with Quechua populations, the white/colonial mentality is encouraged mainly by Mestizes, who believe in the superiority of European ancestry. Since Mestizes have become the largest population in Latin America (Soria Choque, 2009, p. 88), they can create detrimental barriers. It is important to highlight that not all Mestizes act in discriminatory ways towards Indigenous Peoples. Furthermore, Latine communities in North America continue to perpetuate racism and prejudice against Indigenous immigrants. As Barillas-Chon (in Blackwell et al., 2017, p. 128) explains, once racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, move to Canada, they have difficulty connecting with who they are. Depending on age, Indigenous immigrants experience different challenges to their Indigenous heritage and identity. Barillas-Chon argues that:

> Racism and prejudice against Indigenous Peoples [from Latin America] by mestizos and Ladinos are exemplified by the recent anti-hate speech campaign aimed at Latino youth who had been bullying their Oaxacan peers in the city of Oxnard as well as in other parts of California. (p. 128)

In this case, an intersectional analysis offers a more detailed view of the challenges Indigenous immigrants may experience. It is not only anti-Latine xenophobic racism from non-Latine people in North America but also anti-Indigenous colonial racism from Latine communities. To add to this complexity, Indigenous immigrants are “settlers in other Indigenous Peoples’ lands” (Blackwell et al., 2017, p. 128). All these factors complicate the migration experience for

Indigenous Peoples who were once marginalized in their own countries but are now indirectly contributing to the marginalization and ongoing colonization of Indigenous populations here. In summary, some of the participants' perceptions that they are considered outsiders by First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people do not want to form relations with them are barriers to collaboration. Although these are not barriers to collaborative relations per se, they are barriers to forming relationships that would affect the possibility of collaboration. In the following section, I specifically discuss the barriers to collaborative relationships.

Barriers to Collaborative Relationships

In this study, barriers to collaboration involve the discrimination faced by Indigenous immigrants for being racialized and, at those times when their Indigenous identities are recognized, for being Indigenous as well. Participants identified barriers related to the discrimination experienced by racialized immigrants in general from white people and Western-based systems and also, as pointed out earlier, the dominant discourse within the Latin American context undermines Indigenous and African-descendant identities /cultural heritage. Other barriers discussed were personal discomfort in collaboration, systemic forms of discrimination against First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, and stressors in the lives of Indigenous immigrants.

Effects from the Discrimination of Racialized People

Participants argued that it is challenging to offer support and fight alongside Indigenous Peoples from Canada when you are discriminated against and face the barriers of dominant systems of oppression. The challenge in addressing this barrier is to relate the forms of oppression that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and Quechua immigrants face and consider the different layers of oppression each population experiences based on their identities and social

locations. As discussed in the previous chapter, racialized people's anti-racist activism tends to work within the framework of the Canadian state in order to access rights and this approach inadvertently supports the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous Peoples (Thobani, 2007, p. 74). Between trying to be considered equal citizens and being marginalized for their racialized immigrant identity, racialized immigrants tend not to recognize their role in colonialism. They may choose to remain silent against the injustices stemming from the colonialism of the Canadian state (Thobani, 2007, p. 16). Thobani highlights how the precarious power of racialized immigrants contributes to their role in settler colonialism.

Snelgrove et al. (2014) highlight that a lack of accountability from settlers makes it difficult for First Nations, Métis and Inuit people to trust them. According to Snelgrove et al., settlers must be accountable and trustworthy to move forward with solidarity and collaboration (p. 19). Tuck and Yang (2012) also discuss how racialized immigrants position themselves or make "moves to innocence." The authors call attention to claims by racialized immigrants that "we are all colonized" (p. 17) as a way to avoid their current complicity in the colonialism of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Tuck and Yang recognize that racialized immigrants might have experienced colonialism in their homelands however, they argue that "calling different groups 'colonized' without describing their relationship to settler colonialism is an equivocation" (p. 18). These moves to innocence prevent racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, from accepting their settler position in Canada and the responsibilities that come with it. Therefore, accepting Indigenous immigrants' complicity in settler colonialism is essential for decolonization.

Chatterjee (2018) studied how the government recruits and exploits racialized immigrants for their labour as part of ongoing settler colonialism. Chatterjee explored migration and labour

exploitation and how these two processes make up the critical political-economic foundations for settler nationalism. Chatterjee claims that labour exploitation is used for the "expansion of settler colonial property" (p. 3). Likewise, participants also discussed the Canadian state's lack of appreciation of their skills and questioned how they could collaborate from their subordinate position.

Recently, some attention has been placed on the systemic discrimination of racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants. The US began to include "the new ethnoracial census category "Hispanic American Indian" allowing Indigenous Peoples to be distinguished from the umbrella referents "Latino" and "Hispanic" (Delugan, 2010, p. 89). The city of San Francisco has become one of the places that Indigenous communities in the US settle. At local and national levels, the government of San Francisco has also recognized the presence of Latin American Indigenous immigrants and acknowledged their knowledge concerning Indigenous-related issues (Delugan, 2010, p. 89). For example, the city of San Francisco's Human Rights Commission working group was reviewing the status of Native Americans in San Francisco and the issues affecting them. Indigenous immigrants from Central and South America were part of the discussions as they were included under the umbrella of Native Americans. San Francisco has also been the hub for:

> The International Indian Treaty Council, formed in 1974 by the American Indian Movement. The Treaty Council is accustomed to long-distance advocacy for people throughout America. The widespread activism generated around the 1492 quincentenary was a tremendous catalyst for its efforts to network Indigenous People[s]. (Delugan, 2010, p. 89)

The International Indian Treaty Council carries out events in San Francisco that support the various Indigenous populations across North, Central and South America and tries to form networks and relations with them (Delugan, 2010, p. 89). Indigenous immigrant communities have also tried to strengthen their communities and form relations with Native American people. As Indigenous Latin American communities strengthen, they are better prepared to form strong ties with Native American organizations and support each other (Delugan, 2010, p. 90).

According to Delugan (2010), recognition of shared Indigeneity creates more opportunities for collaboration. However, there are mechanisms put in place by the Canadian government that make creating a shared identity more difficult. One of the participants, Jessica suggested that the state uses racialized immigrants for employment and, in the process, places them in opposition to First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. In this way, racialized people, including Indigenous immigrants, may end up taking up the jobs of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, contributing to their oppression.

Participants also spoke about how the state devalues their skills, making it more difficult to obtain financial security and negatively affecting their personal resources for collaboration. For example, Olinda feels less valued here than in Peru, where she could do more things with less education. Olinda stated: "In my country, I could work selling fruits, cooking, [but] because I am not a professional, I am nothing [here]. But in that way [back home], I can make ends meet in my family." Olinda described how her opportunities to work in Canada are reduced because the requirements for various enterprises are stricter than back home. Devaluing her skills and restricting her ability to generate income present barriers to Olinda's belief in her ability to collaborate with Indigenous populations here. Still, Olinda tried to develop ways to collaborate with Indigenous populations and support them. Olinda stated:

> Indigenous People[s] have to be respected because it is their country. In order to support [them], I don't know what I would do. If they tell me there is an older woman that I have to take care of for a day I do it . . . because she is giving me the space, a place to be with my children, and that is the way that would be the only way because another way I could not help, I would do that as a way of thanking them. I can go to visit Indigenous People[s] and volunteer with them. I could go to Indigenous People[s] to meet them and support them.

Olinda shows her vulnerability in the Canadian workforce due to her lack of professional credentials. She expresses her lack of confidence in her ability to help Indigenous Peoples because she feels that she has little to offer. Olinda's experience shows that it is crucial to acknowledge Indigenous immigrants' barriers when considering their collaboration. In the case of Olinda, she feels her skills are not helpful in Canada. Still, she recognizes that her vulnerability does not take away her accountability for being a settler in these lands now known as Canada and advocates for respect for and collaboration with Indigenous Peoples.

Immigrants' power and value (or lack of) in this country play a role in their collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. As Chatterjee (2018) states, there is a hierarchy of racialized immigrants' skills, and they are treated accordingly. Participants also expressed that they had very little power to advocate for Indigenous Peoples. When I asked participants what would have to happen for Quechua immigrants to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples in Canada, Esperanza stated:

> To turn the page . . . someone has to die or something bad needs to happen. Humans would need to have the ability to have a vision . . . [know] what is happening to the

> Indigenous People[s] and raise it with the government . . . because we as immigrants, what can we do? If they [the government] will not listen to us, we can't do much.

Esperanza calls attention to the cruelty Indigenous Peoples face in these lands now known as Canada. One of the many examples is MMIWG2S as discussed in the second chapter. Esperanza raised the point that even if immigrants like her, racialized and Indigenous, want to help, their ability to affect change at government levels is limited. Esperanza argues that the injustices Indigenous Peoples experience requires change at higher levels. As stated by Thobani (2007), racialized immigrants, in their position as others, find it challenging to advocate for others because of the oppression they face from 'nationals' and their desire to gain more rights in their position as oppressed people. However, she also says that while experiencing oppression makes it difficult to engage in actions due to fewer resources (time, financial, political agency), the belief that their own oppression is separate from the oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit is a perceptual barrier (Thobani, 2007). For instance, the YWCA has taken a stance and offered many opportunities and recommendations for non-Indigenous people to engage in everyday activities to support MMIWG2S (Kwan, 2021). The assumption that the oppression that First Nations, Métis and Inuit experience is beyond what racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, can help with becomes a barrier to collaboration. From this point of view, collaboration cannot take place. Another barrier to collaboration that participants discussed was their discomfort with engaging in this process.

Discomfort in Collaboration

As participants and I talked about their settler identity and collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, they questioned how this collaboration might happen. A few participants thought that Indigenous Peoples would reject them if they attempted to collaborate

due to their role in settler colonialism and that this would cause them discomfort. Participants and I reflected on what it may mean to be a settler for them. Some participants expressed discomfort or shame with being involved in the settler colonialism of Indigenous Peoples. Recognizing these challenges settlers have, Davis et al. (2017) advocates that immigrants partner with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in decolonizing efforts. Davis et al. (2017) examines the discomfort of settlers with their settler identity and their role in settler colonialism (p. 406). The label of 'settler' can be deeply discomforting. At times, people become defensive about being labelled 'settlers.' According to Davis et al. (2017), settlers, assuming they are aware of their settler identity, may become defensive if they have not yet moved on from the 'shame' attached to a settler identity and settler colonialism (p. 402). In this case, shame is portrayed as an emotion that paralyzes us; therefore, we need to move away from it. According to Davis et al. (2017), "we understand the transformation of settler consciousness to be an uncomfortable but necessary first step" (p. 402). In this context, shame can carry some positive aspects. Shame can make us defensive, but it can also make us reflective, as it has been used in Indigenous restorative justice literature, suggesting that shame is at least potentially transformative (Sinclair, 2021, p. 6). Focusing on how people are affected by their settler identity becomes questionable when it results in privileging comfort over the ongoing oppression of others — requiring overcoming bad feelings before having any agency or accountability. Regan (2010) explains that settlers prefer to deny their complicity in settler colonialism than oppose settler colonialism. To do so appears to be more challenging for settlers (pp. 83–110). Regan urges settlers to address their discomfort for collaboration and move forward with reconciliation.

Watson (2020) speaks of the discomfort settlers experience in connection to the abuses Indigenous Peoples faced due to colonialism (p. iv). According to Watson, if there is no

recognition of the abuses perpetrated against Indigenous Peoples, the Calls to Action cannot be carried out. Moving forward, Davis et al. (2017) argue for anti-racist practices that embrace a "pedagogy of discomfort" (p. 400). Schultz (2017) argues that although a politics of discomfort is helpful, "too much discomfort" (p. 267) may stop people from moving forward. Schultz's focus on quantity, i.e. "too much discomfort," may not necessarily be the best approach. For example, when we are "too ashamed" of the ongoing colonial violence, we do not necessarily stop from acting. Instead of focusing on quantity, the focus could be on the type of discomfort that settlers experience—whether we experience a form of shame that motivates us rather than stops us from acting. Either way, the main issue is that these experiences are barriers to participation.

Schultz (2017) argues that settlers need to accept and explore their discomfort as they learn about their complicity in settler colonialism and our position as accomplices. At the same time, Schultz suggests that discomfort alone may not necessarily lead to change. Discomfort needs to come with an added commitment to care. Schultz proposes the term "settler ally" (p. 268) as an essential component of settler identity. It helps Indigenous Peoples in Canada and settlers move "towards imagining each other in relation with one another" (p. 269).

Participants point out their hesitancy to engage in collaborative relations with Indigenous Peoples based on the lack of history of their interactions. In the conclusion, I discuss what could be some ways to get this work started. For example, having knowledge exchange groups where Quechua people and First Nations Métis and Inuit people meet and share space to learn about each other. As stated earlier, Rosa shared wanting to invite First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people to gatherings but worried they might not be interested. Other participants were also aware that Indigenous Peoples might not be interested in such collaborations. Olinda justified the possibility

that First Nations, Métis and Inuit might not want to collaborate based on the disrespect they experience:

> Indigenous People[s] [from Canada] are not respected. They won't be supported, right? . . . Indigenous People[s] are not being respected. They [settlers] are doing a lot of [harmful] things to them. . .. Right now, there is no union.

Olinda argued that the lack of respect towards Indigenous cultures from non-Indigenous populations makes it challenging for Indigenous Peoples in these lands to form relations. Although Olinda does not consider herself Indigenous from these lands, she describes settlers as a group to which she does not belong. Based on these segments of their interviews, Rosa and Olinda appeared to be self-reflecting and learning about their complicity in settler colonialism and what to do about it.

Samay, the participant who had the most involvement in activist work with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, talked about how engaging in collaboration with these groups may provoke discomfort for immigrants/settlers. Samay recommended that people persist in offering support and working through the discomfort. Samay claimed that being willing to provide support is critical in collaborative relations with Indigenous Peoples. She stated:

> You have to go through that uncomfortable point and persist in not giving up. Keep supporting. Stay, stay. Not giving up. Keep going. Keep supporting. It doesn't matter what they tell you. Always be there. And because not all of them do it [reject you]. There are people who feel uncomfortable and treat you in a certain way. But some people also don't. [Some Indigenous Peoples] invite other people to get involved with them. My daddy did that because he identified with that Indigenous voice. Trying to get back to his roots, he is Mestizo; he found himself identified in that group. So he never gave up. . . .

> You have no choice. In the way, they will treat you. . . . So that persistence of always being here. I think that is necessary. So that's what I have tried to do.

Samay shared her views based on her experiences in trying to support Indigenous Peoples. At times, Indigenous community members rejected Samay, but other times they welcomed her as well. It is helpful to learn about the possibility of discomfort so that it can be addressed instead of letting it prevent settlers from moving forward with collaboration. Another barrier to collaboration is how the state and non-Indigenous society reinforce systemic discrimination against First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, making collaboration more difficult.

Systemic Discrimination of First Nations, Métis and Inuit People

I talked with participants about the actions and beliefs that inadvertently contribute to settler colonialism. Sylvestre et al. (2019) argue that lack of inclusion of Indigenous knowledge leads settlers to collaborate in ways that do not support the interest of Indigenous Peoples. Although there is a solid consensus to collaborate at times, there is also the issue of doing it correctly. Sylvestre et al. (2019) talk about this in the context of medical students. Although medical students wish to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples, they lack the tools and skills to do so in a decolonizing manner (p. 2).

Sylvestre et al. (2019) studied the curriculum in medical schools and their "taken-for-granted embeddedness in settler-colonial social formations" (p. 2). Sylvestre et al.'s study suggests that medical schools need to examine the systemic discrimination in the principles and values of their schools. In Sylvestre et al.'s study, students were not aware of these forms of systemic discrimination when discussing Indigenous health in the medical school curriculum or brainstorming ways to improve the material taught (p. 2). In response to this lack of consideration, Sylvestre et al. suggest involving Indigenous knowledge when making changes in

the health care services for Indigenous Peoples (p. 1). It is essential to make health care services available to Indigenous Peoples and decolonize medical practices based on Indigenous knowledge as part of the decolonization process. This study shows that collaborative actions also need to be informed by understanding Indigenous Peoples' knowledge and including them in the solutions. This lack of knowledge is a barrier to decolonization.

As I discussed earlier in this chapter, immigrants need to know the history and present conditions under which Indigenous Peoples live; otherwise, they can hold the mistaken belief that they support Indigenous Peoples when they do not. Indigenous immigrants may need help accessing this information, especially if language barriers exist. Still, it is important to acknowledge that there are multiple platforms where information on colonialism is readily available, such as films, documentaries, websites, etc. In this respect, Chatterjee (2018) asks: "What does their lack of knowledge, or non-knowledge, or certain selective knowledge allows them to do or get away with? Who or what does this disengagement benefit?" (p. 2). The combined lack of knowledge of immigrants and the systemic discrimination in all sectors of society maintain the colonial machinery of the state and pose barriers to collaboration between Indigenous immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples in these lands now known as Canada.

Some participants were confused when trying to understand the systemic discrimination against Indigenous Peoples in Canada. They assumed that the leaders in the state were Indigenous and referred to corruption amongst the Indigenous leaders in Canada. Miguel made little differentiation between Indigenous leaders and settler colonial state leaders. He claimed they are the same people and, therefore, assumed corruption from both the dominant state leaders and Indigenous leaders:

> They [Indigenous leaders] would need to talk to each other, but there is corruption from the people, the leaders, everyone tries to get their portion from the plate, and they do not care about the rest of the people. It is what is happening in Peru. . .. So, something historical has to happen for them to come together. A decisive shift . . . then the leaders can see how we can come together.

This assumption may be based on the fact that many Indigenous leaders are also government leaders in Peru. However, this reality does not apply to the Canadian state. As it will be elaborated later on, although Miguel agreed that sharing Indigeneity has the potential to bring Indigenous Peoples together, in his opinion, the government and Indigenous leaders' corruption would get in the way of this collaborative relationship. Through Miguel's explanation, we see how a lack of knowledge leads to the assumption that he can transplant knowledge of the situation back home to the situations here, resulting in misunderstandings. At the same time, the assumption about the corruption of state leaders is a reality here, as seen in the examples of the MMIWG2S and pipeline disputes. Furthermore, we see also how the government places racialized immigrant groups and Indigenous groups from these lands in precarious circumstances, making them compete for resources (Thobani, 2007). Another barrier to collaboration involves life stressors for Quechua immigrants.

Life Stressors as Barriers to Collaboration

Participants were open to the idea of engaging in collaboration. However, personal barriers such as lack of time, language, transportation, and stress made collaboration difficult. There is limited literature on immigrants' challenges in collaborating with Indigenous Peoples in Canada. The literature that does exist concentrates on immigrants' barriers to engaging with Indigenous Peoples — but not necessarily in a collaborative manner. For example, Casuncad

(2020) points to language barriers, as some immigrants may not understand English (p. 10). Consequently, it becomes harder for them to acquire this knowledge. Casuncad also speaks to the time commitment that this process of establishing relations requires (p. 9). In the case of newcomers, they may not have the opportunity to connect with Indigenous People[s] because they are faced with many other challenges as part of their "integration and settlement and, often, relationship building, specifically newcomer-relationship building, falls on the wayside of becoming a priority" (Casuncad, 2020, p. 10).

In the previous chapter, participants spoke about the lack of language skills and transportation as barriers to relationship-building. Furthermore, when asked about primary barriers to collaborative relations, similar to Casuncad's (2020) findings, participants mentioned the lack of resources and time when building relationships. The financial stresses that immigrants experience force them to work long hours, limiting their time available to collaborate. Samay stated: "For us [people from Ecuador], we have a US dollar, and if you send [money], you get less. So you have to keep working and working, and you think of nothing but just that." Samay explained that as people aim to send money to their families, many Indigenous immigrants spend most of their time working. Consequently, they are left with little time to devote to other matters.

Similarly, Jessica talked about her financial stressors and how this impacts her ability to collaborate. As explained earlier, Jessica and Elli came to Canada as international students, which resulted in financial stressors. When asked about the theme of collaboration with Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada, Jessica stated: "There will come a time to support. Right now, I am fighting my struggles. Because we are just coming out of financial stress. But as much as possible, we see what we can do." Jessica discussed the limitations she and her partner face due to their financial stress, including lack of time to engage

in other activities and the mental stress of earning enough money to make ends meet and pay debts. To move forward, participants and I discussed Indigenous teachings that would help to support collaborative relationships between these two Indigenous groups.

Ways Forward into Collaboration

When discussing collaboration within the Quechua community, I suggested the Two Row Wampum Belt, or the Guswhenta in Mohawk, covenant and the legend of the Eagle and Condor as frameworks to guide these collaborative relations. As it will be discussed next, the Two Row Wampum Belt teaching provides a guideline for current and past relations of Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada and immigrants from elsewhere. During the discussion participants brainstormed living together in the same lands in ways that are supportive of the original peoples.

Two Row Wampum Belt

I discussed with participants the Two Row Wampum Belt, or the Guswhenta, an agreement between Indigenous Peoples and settlers dating back hundreds of years (Green, 2016, p. 31). Most participants had not previously heard of the Two Row Wampum Belt; however, they were all open to learning about it. Some participants disapproved of how settlers had violated the agreement. Since only a few participants had previously heard of the Two Row Wampum Belt, they had many questions on how it could work as a guide to support collaboration amongst these two populations from the North and South. Indigenous researchers such as Green (2018) have shared how they use the Two Row Wampum Belt to guide the relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. As stated in the theoretical framework, under this agreement, Indigenous Peoples and settlers travel together on a canoe and a boat, respectively, parallel to each other and without interfering with each other's autonomy.

Green talks about her use of the Guswhenta when she meets her students for the first time. She explains that she does this “as a way to open up relationships that situate Peace, Friendship and Mutual Respect as central premises to the educational relationship” (Green, 2018, p. 179). According to Green, a key principle of her pedagogy is the understanding that establishing a relationship is vital for settlers to comprehend colonization and its application to “individuals and structures” (p. 180).

Green (2018) elaborates on the teachings associated with the Guswhenta. Green uses the Guswhenta to ground her teachings on host and guest relations. She explains the hosts’ responsibilities to offer the guests what they need in their stay. Reciprocally, guests are responsible for following the hosts’ regulations and supporting the hosts in exchange for what they receive. In the Guswhenta, the canoe and boat do not interfere, reflecting the need for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to respect each other and not interfere with each other’s autonomy and sovereignty. Therefore, as guests and with the principle of Indigenous sovereignty there are multiple changes, we need to make in order to bring our relationship back to one of mutual respect, care and appreciation for our ability to live on these lands. The Guswhenta guides how settlers and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people should carry out their relationships based on respect, friendship and reciprocity. As stated above, Green shows how the Guswhenta can be used to guide interactions and collaboration.

The Guswhenta has also been used as a guide to developing research relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Hill and Coleman (2019) describe the principles gathered from the Guswhenta within the context of building healthy research partnerships (p. 339). Amongst their principles, there is the principle of dialogical relationships. Hill and Coleman state:

> Based on the Two Row Wampum belt, in order to share the river in a way that respects each other's autonomy, we need to have dialogical relationships where each other's differences are valued, and Indigenous knowledge is respected as opposed to being assimilated to mainstream society. (2019, p. 341)

Green (2018) and Hill and Coleman (2019) show how the Guswhenta can be used in various settings to establish a relationship between First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and Quechua immigrants.

Some participants spoke about their opinions on the Guswhenta and had questions about their own relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Sonia agreed with what the Guswhenta is asking from immigrants. In particular, she elaborated on the need for immigrants to show respect towards Indigenous Peoples. She stated: "Someone who comes to my house—is not their house—it is your visit, and he has to have a suitable behavior and ask 'May I? can I?' Not: 'I want.' But: 'can I have it?'" Sonia called for immigrants to be humbler in their position as settlers living on Indigenous lands and believed the Guswhenta can be used as a tool to help them reach that point. Jessica tried to understand the agreement and whether it has been respected: "This is not what they [colonizers] did, the pact . . . it was not a friendship pact . . . they did not honour it. Yes, I know." Jessica had some understanding of the Guswhenta before our conversation. After discussing its principles of friendship, reciprocity and mutual respect, Jessica realized how immigrants had not followed this agreement. In her opinion, immigrants continue to take advantage of Indigenous Peoples. Sonia also spoke about how immigrants are more likely to follow the Guswhenta because there is more access to information. Sonia has a professional job that gave her more access to information about Indigenous Peoples since she worked with them. According to Sonia, people can learn about the history of Indigenous Peoples

through information online. However, very few participants agree that it was easy to access information about Indigenous Peoples. Many participants expressed that our interview was the first time they learn about Indigenous Peoples in Canada and their histories. It is difficult for immigrants to learn more about a group and search for information if they do not know they are lacking this information. Also, it must be acknowledged that some lacked interest in learning about Indigenous Peoples in Canada.

Participants questioned the relationships the Guswhenta allows them to have with Indigenous Peoples from Canada. Jennifer asked:

> But that covenant does not allow for interactions? Do the ideals of each culture intersect [under this agreement]? Or is it, this is your culture, and this is mine? Let's keep to ourselves, our cultures, no crossing. How can that work if we want to unite?

Jennifer questioned how much of a relationship two populations can have when we are supposed to not interfere with each other's paths. Jennifer posed a legitimate question, however, the Guswhenta is not necessarily guiding us to stay away from each other. As Green (2018) explains, "In our conversation, Sakoieta [Elder] tells me that Guswhenta also explains for both parties to come together with Peace, Friendship and Mutual Respect, each group must be operating from these values within themselves" (p. 169). Non-interference is not a lack of relationship, it involves acknowledging that Indigenous Peoples are the original people from these lands, and as such, they need self-governance of their Peoples and lands, and settlers should not interfere with that. There is also a responsibility that settlers have towards them. There is tension in this relationship because settlers, when conceptualized as 'guests' (Green, 2018), are responsible for behaving as such; however, they do not do so. Some participants interpreted this agreement as settlers and Indigenous Peoples from Canada keeping distance from each other as they share

these territories. A few participants agree that it is crucial to mark lines of division between First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people and immigrants because this would help them preserve their cultures.

Participants also discussed how likely it is for immigrants to follow this agreement, and if so, how it would work. Jessica, stated: “it would work in theory, but in practice there is greediness.” According to Jessica, there is much greed amongst immigrants, leading them to place their needs above those of Indigenous Peoples, disregarding what Indigenous Peoples are asking for and disrespecting their wishes. In the case of Indigenous immigrants, intersectionality provides a way of understanding how Indigenous immigrants’ struggle to overcome their own oppression, through engagement in state sanctioned activities. In this way, they become active oppressors of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people. The motivation for their actions may be to overcome their own oppression; however, this does not rule out greed, and further, they remain responsible for their actions.

Jessica saw the Guswhenta as more of a set of rules for social engagements rather than a formal agreement between sovereign states when she stated: “This agreement works better as a social rule [so that people] relate to each other, not as a law to apply to every setting.” However, Indigenous Peoples have used agreements such as the Guswhenta to guide their relations and govern Indigenous nations in these lands now known as Canada. The interpretations by participants need to be understood in the context of a general lack of in-depth knowledge about the Guswhenta as well as various types of formal agreements used by Indigenous Peoples throughout history.

Most participants had doubts about whether Quechua and other immigrants would use the Guswhenta to guide their collaborative relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in

Canada. For example, some participants thought it might be challenging to change the way people relate to each other already. Participants explained that both populations might have set ways of living; therefore, changing them to better relate to each other may be unrealistic. However, this thinking creates a position of helplessness that may need to be challenged. As discussed earlier on, there are many barriers to Quechua people engaging in collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people such as language, transportation, and financial constraints. These factors must be accounted for as we consider options for collaboration.

The Eagle and Condor prophecy is another Indigenous teaching that discusses collaboration. The Eagle and Condor prophecy is a visionary legend that shows the connection and relationships that will happen between the people from North, Central and South. This study proposes that Quechua immigrants and Latine people in general take Guswhenta as a guide, together with the teachings of the Eagle and Condor, to move forward with their relationships with Indigenous Peoples in these lands.

Eagle and Condor Prophecy

Participants and I discussed the Eagle and Condor prophecy. Under the Eagle and Condor prophecy, Quechua elders believe that when the Condor and Eagle unite, they will bring up a new spirit responsible for uniting the North, Central and South. As discussed in the Methods chapter, the Eagle and Condor are complementary to each other, where the Eagle has "the power of the mind," and the Condor is the "gift of the heart" (Noriega Rivera, 2010, p. 121). Highlighting the need to unite and support each other's struggles, participants discussed how immigrants could use the prophecy to guide their collaboration. Some participants suggested that Quechua leaders and Indigenous leaders from these lands now known as Canada come together to make the connection between the two groups to guide collaboration.

North and South Indigenous communities have applied this prophecy and carried out ceremonies to establish a connection. For example, there were North and South ceremonies conducted during the 2017 Onjisay Aki International Climate Summit in Turtle Lodge, Sagkeeng First Nation (Cameron et al., 2021). During this summit, Indigenous Peoples from the North and the South used the Eagle and Condor prophecy to guide their teachings and share their knowledge (Real People's Media, 2016). The summit centred on finding ways to live in harmony with nature and follow nature's laws. These discussions involved various international community leaders. First Nations, Métis and Inuit people had an Eagle and Condor ceremony to honour the coming together of these two Indigenous populations. This union was also engaged "in an Inca ceremony to plant corn seeds from Peru at the Turtle Lodge, a symbol of alliance and sharing between Indigenous Nations in the Americas" (Cameron et al., 2021, p. 14).

In this setting, Indigenous leaders from the North and South could share and communicate their knowledge through ceremony as well as address the problems at stake. This collaboration can serve as an inspiration for collaborations between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. However, both Indigenous communities participating in the summit resided in their respective places of origin. When examining the application of this prophecy to relations between Indigenous Peoples from the North, Central and South, when the Indigenous Peoples from the South are living in the lands now known as Canada, it is important to recognize that they become accomplices of settler colonialism by their very presence.

The participants and I discussed the meaning behind the prophecy, and they agreed with the need for Quechua people from the South to join with Indigenous Peoples from the North to help each other. From the few participants aware of this prophecy, they agreed with what the prophecy proposes — that change needs to take place so these two populations can unite and

create something new. In this way, they can join forces to fight their struggles, which may share resonances. Like the Guswhenta, the Eagle and Condor prophecy guides how Indigenous people from the South and Central America and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people must form healthy and respectful relationships. Unlike the Guswhenta, the Eagle and Condor teaching is about forming relationships specifically between the people from the North, Central and South. It also does not necessarily address the issues in these relationships as Indigenous Peoples from the South migrate to the North and occupy the lands of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Hugo believed that this union between the Eagle and Condor could happen in Canada, where Indigenous Peoples from the North and South live together. Hugo valued the guidance of Quechua legends and prophecies and used Indigenous knowledge to shape his way of thinking.

Other participants had also heard of the Eagle and Condor prophecy. Quechua immigrants with roots in Peru but with children born in Canada passed the Eagle and Condor prophecy on to their children. Some participants discussed the challenges in forming relations between the Indigenous Peoples from the North and South who remain in their countries of origin because of the long distances. Still, participants thought that it was helpful for Indigenous Peoples living in the South to establish relations with Indigenous Peoples living in the North. Having these transnational relationships can help with developing collaboration on global issues affecting them. Further, it can also be helpful for the Indigenous diaspora that has been migrating to the North to guide the formation of respectful relationships based on an understanding of their settler status once they migrate.

Some participants saw the union between the Eagle and the Condor as representing their collaboration. The focus of the collaboration shifted depending on the participants involved. Some participants wondered how this partnership could benefit Indigenous Peoples in the South

who are suffering at the hands of transnational companies. The detrimental effects of transnational companies are ongoing. At times, the Peruvian government attempts to protect the lands and water that mining companies are exploring irresponsibly, interfering with agriculture and the lives of Indigenous Peoples (Ruiz Leotaud, 2021). At the same time, the government recently decided to allow requests from mining companies seeking to extend their mining operations even though these requests had been previously denied due to environmental concerns (Aquino, 2021).

The exploitation of the lands and its people in the South by Canadian transnational companies may provide a bridge to unite with the struggles here against diamond mining, pipelines, and oilsands. Jessica talked about how this collaboration could benefit Indigenous Peoples in Peru:

> This union would be fantastic, especially with what is happening in the Amazons now. There are times that I cannot see the news from Peru because of what is happening in Tingo Maria. It worries me that the poor Indigenous People[s] are protesting because they do not want a mining company to come into their lands.

Jessica and her partner Elli are very connected and loyal to their original homelands. Therefore, when they thought about collaboration and the Eagle and Condor prophecy, they also thought about how Indigenous Peoples from their homelands could receive help. Participants also highlighted the responsibility of the Canadian state to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples in Latin America since Canadian companies exploit many of their Indigenous towns.

A few participants saw the need to have more Indigenous leaders involved in building the union between the North and South in these lands now known as Canada. As stated earlier in this chapter, I discussed one example of this union taking place where Indigenous groups from Peru

came together with Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada to address environmental concerns. However, this event examined relationships with Quechua people in South America and Indigenous Peoples from the North. The Indigenous leaders did not include discussion on Quechua or other Indigenous immigrants living in North America and how these relationships could work. Esperanza stated: "More representation is needed to make the union between the Condor and the Eagle happen [here]." Esperanza discussed having leaders from the Quechua and First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities come together. However, it is challenging to find a Quechua leader when the Quechua community is still developing.

Based on what the participants stated and my search for Quechua groups, Quechua culture revolves around folklore music, special celebrations and the Catholic religion. If Quechua immigrants do not participate in those activities, finding other Quechua circles in Toronto becomes harder. There are Quechua people in Toronto, but they are spread all over the city and its surroundings. It is also difficult to identify them as Quechua since some Quechua immigrants use their country of origin and not their Indigenous identity as their main identifier. Therefore, there is yet to be a Quechua community that is easily accessible and caters to Quechua people with various interests. This current situation makes it more difficult for Quechua immigrants to engage in collaboration, as there is no easily accessible Quechua community where discussions on our settler identity and collaboration could take place. Although a few Quechua immigrants may take on leadership roles, there is a lack of connection within the Quechua people in Toronto. At the same time, it is essential to remember that people may not need a more structured group to act against injustices and engage in collaboration. In 2006, Angela Davis gave a speech at the University of California entitled, "How Does Change Happen?" (cited by Coleman, 2017). In her speech, Davis explains how the Civil Rights movement was started by "ordinary people like you

and me" well before Martin Luther King became involved. Davis talks about the significant contributions of ordinary people that formed movements and caused a change, unlike what we usually hear in history, which "privileges heroic individualism" (Davis in Coleman, 2017). Therefore, we need to look at the possibilities that exist without an already established leadership.

The Guswhenta and the Eagle and Condor prophecy are meant to guide the relations between settlers such as Quechuas and Indigenous Peoples in these lands now known as Canada. The goal is for participants to apply these teachings to their relations with Indigenous Peoples from these lands because although these two groups are very different, they share resonant experiences. Below I discuss how sharing an Indigenous identity may contribute to the collaboration and relationship between the two groups and how the above teachings can guide these relations in particular.

Indigeneity as a Bridge

Participants and I discussed whether they thought that sharing Indigeneity would prompt Quechua immigrants to engage in collaboration. As briefly mentioned in the previous chapter, participants thought sharing an Indigenous identity would help Quechua immigrants empathize with Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada and collaborate with them. Overall, participants thought that worldwide Indigeneity needs to be appreciated more and encouraged more solidarity between Indigenous groups.

There have been documented efforts by Indigenous Peoples to try to establish more relations of worldwide solidarity with each other. Whitinui et al. (2015) discuss Indigenous Peoples working towards a common goal in Indigenous education. World Indigenous groups are working towards establishing commonalities between various Indigenous groups and finding

ways they can move forward "to survive and thrive as Indigenous Peoples in the 21st century" (Whitinui et al., 2015, p. 8). One of the main goals of the World Indigenous Research Alliance was to create a space for Indigenous Peoples to share their knowledge and contributions at national and international levels. Niezen (2003) discusses the work Indigenous Peoples abroad are doing in collaboration to address their everyday struggles (pp. 70-1). Niezen explains some factors influencing the working relations between Indigenous Peoples from developed and developing countries:

> The extent to which there is agreement on fundamental issues in international Indigenous caucus meetings is probably a product of necessity . . . Indigenous Peoples and organizations still stand on the outside looking in, and major disagreements are potentially fatal to their chances of entry at high levels in the U.N. system. (p. 70)

Niezen points out tensions arising when Indigenous Peoples abroad work together to address the everyday injustices they face.

Similarly, it is essential to acknowledge the differences between Indigenous Peoples from Canada and those from other parts of the world (Tuck & Yang, 2012) and the tensions that come from those differences. Although sharing an Indigenous identity can bring Quechua and other Indigenous Peoples closer and encourage Quechua people to collaborate, their experiences cannot be equated. As a result of sharing an Indigenous identity and sharing origins in "America," there have been some efforts to identify the needs of Indigenous Peoples in the US and Indigenous Peoples from North and South America have been grouped under the same Indigenous category. For example, San Francisco set out to study the status of Native Americans in their city. The group used the term Native American to refer to "people with Indigenous North, Central, and South American heritage as well as Native Hawaiians, Samoans, and

Indigenous Peoples of Guatemala (whether enrolled, federally or nationally recognized, or not)" (Delugan, 2010, p. 89). However, grouping Indigenous Peoples from the North, Central and South together can lead to the invisibility of particular Indigenous groups. It assumes the sharing of similar experiences that may not necessarily be the case. This example shows that although San Francisco is attempting to strengthen the Indigeneity of Native Americans and Indigenous immigrants, more changes need to happen. Although Indigeneity could be a bridge to collaboration amongst these populations, it is essential to acknowledge that it cannot equate their experiences. Making these assumptions can contribute to the invisibility of Indigenous Peoples from Canada and maintain settler colonialism.

Participants discussed their thoughts on whether or not sharing Indigeneity brought Indigenous Peoples from North and Latin America together. A few participants thought it might not have an influence. Elli and Jessica thought that the sharing of similar hardships more than the sharing of Indigeneity was the fundamental factor that helped strengthen the relations between the two populations. Elli and Jessica stated:

> Whether you identify or not as Indigenous [is not important], but [for example, if] you are an immigrant and you have suffered [because of it], it then becomes easy to understand their struggles. So, you can see that what they are going through is unfair. Then, I think it is . . . feasible to collaborate with their struggles. . .. If one has not gone through hardship, one cannot empathize.

Elli and Jessica claimed that it did not matter whether the immigrant person was Indigenous. If that person had suffered for being an immigrant or any other reason, they could empathize with the pain of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. They focused on experiencing immigration because that is where they have experienced hardship, but they also include any hardship that

people may have experienced. However, at another point in our discussion, Jessica mentioned how sharing Indigeneity could contribute to the relations between Quechua immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada.

Some participants thought it might be difficult for Indigeneity to serve as a bridge, while most thought that sharing an Indigenous identity could contribute to collaboration. As mentioned earlier, Miguel pointed to the structural barriers that would not allow Indigeneity to serve as a bridge and support a collaborative relationship between these two groups. Miguel stated: "there is a corrupted hand that does not allow Indigenous People[s] to be accepted." Miguel was referring to the corruption that exists in the government that targets Indigenous Peoples. He argued that the Canadian state would get in the way of Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people working together because it does not accept or support Indigenous beliefs. Therefore, it would not encourage this relation.

On this topic, Miguel's daughter, Elliana, stated: "there should be a leader [an Indigenous leader from both populations] to talk to each other. The leader of each group tries to form agreements." Elliana advocated for Indigenous leaders to help build the bridge between the two populations so that collaboration can occur. In her statement, Elliana implied that she is waiting for someone to lead this change; the underlying belief being that Quechua immigrants need someone to come and lead them before they can engage. However, as explained above by Davis (in Coleman, 2017), "common people" are more than capable of leading change.

Rosa talked about Indigenous groups working together to address a mutual concern. She stated that dominant groups are constantly attacking Quechua people based on their Indigenous or immigrant identity. Therefore, First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and Quechua immigrants are experiencing a crisis that could encourage them to unite; however, on their own terms. This

shared reason for collaborating could be another model for collaboration, a shared political concern that affects both groups centrally but differently. This basis for collaboration is not only based on Indigeneity or socioeconomic status per se. Rosa stated:

> The crisis can help unite us. That may be a good reason to unite because it is not only the Indigenous People[s] [from here] that [the Canadian state] is hurting and taking away from. It is taking away from all of us. So that is a good reason. Because if they don't join together, if they don't form a strong group, unfortunately, they [government] won't listen.

Rosa focused on the shared experiences of exploitation of Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada and Quechua immigrants. According to Rosa, the oppression that Indigenous Peoples from the North and South experience at the hands of the Canadian government can unite them. Samay agreed that being Indigenous serves as a bridge because Indigenous Peoples worldwide suffer the exploitation of transnational mining companies. There is collaboration on this front, as witnessed in the world's largest mining fair, which took place in Canada (Mining Watch Canada, 2022). Indigenous Peoples across the world came together to protest against this fair. There are various forms of alliances forming amongst Indigenous Peoples worldwide, such as the Global Alliance of Territorial Communities (GATC) which is "a coalition of Indigenous and community organizations from Asia, Mesoamerica and the Amazon Basin that advocates for the respect of their rights and the inclusion of forest peoples in global negotiations on forests and climate change" (Global Alliance of Territorial Communities, n.d.). This coalition is made of four organizations working together: "the Indonesian Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN); the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB); the Articulation of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (APIB); the Coordinator of

Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon Basin (COICA)" (Global Alliance of Territorial Communities, n.d.). As stated earlier, mining brings about many disputes between mining companies and Indigenous groups because of the environmental violations that happen in the process. Therefore, although different, going through these experiences could help to encourage allyship. Samay stated:

> Yes. I went to an event about a group that has a mining court case . . . they were [Indigenous] people from here. They had invited a Maya group from Guatemala. I went to that, and it's nice to see that because people from there [South and Central America] are doing similar things than Indigenous Peoples from here . . . They [Mayan people] realized that not all [people in Canada] are white. And the people here can see that the Indigenous Peoples abroad are also involved in all these things [mining trials and protests].

Samay was speaking about the need for Indigenous Peoples to come together worldwide to learn about each other's experiences with exploitation and the activist work that these experiences have prompted. Perhaps, learning about the injustices and activist work of various Indigenous Peoples will help build solidarity worldwide.

Chapter Summary

Through discussions of the potential for collaboration of Quechua immigrants with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, all participants agreed that collaboration should occur. Three main collaborative processes were discussed. One is engaging in a collaboration that stems from strong relations between the two populations. The second is contingent collaboration that focuses on the work at hand and will continue as long as the relationship between the two groups is meaningful. The third form of collaboration is based on a shared Indigeneity and resonant yet

different struggles they experience in Canada and, in the case of Quechua immigrants, in their countries of origin. These struggles include fighting against multinational mining companies, abuses from Western-based systems worldwide and systemic discrimination and forced assimilation from the Canadian state. All three forms of collaborative relationships also involve forming a relationship with these lands now known as Canada, since they are a part of the Indigenous communities.

Participants focused on ways to engage in collaboration based on relationship-building. They suggested strengthening the relations and, once these relations were strengthened, Quechuas would be better able to collaborate. Some ways to strengthen these relations involved Quechuas learning to acknowledge and respect their own Indigenous heritage, acknowledging their settler identity and responsibilities and creating spaces for both groups to get to know each other. At the same time, participants discussed barriers to collaboration, such as being labelled and treated as outsiders by Indigenous Peoples from these lands and a perceived lack of interest from Indigenous Peoples to form relations with Quechuas. Participants had little to say about contingent collaboration.

After discussing the barriers to forming relations between these two groups, participants talked about making these relationships work. Participants moved on to discuss steps towards collaboration. As the first step to collaboration, they discussed the need for immigrants to conscientize what is happening to Indigenous Peoples and their role in it. Then they brainstormed how collaboration could look in action. We engaged in conversations about the TRC and the Calls to Action, a shift in education to involve Indigenous Peoples and their histories and allyship work.

Participants also discussed the barriers to collaboration, such as distrust from Indigenous Peoples due to histories of exploitation with settlers; discrimination towards Indigenous immigrants by white nationals; discomfort involved in collaboration; the effects of misinformation about Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism and life stressors that Quechua immigrants experienced that make it challenging to collaborate. Participants and I discussed theoretical frameworks for the potential of collaboration and decolonization. These theoretical frameworks consist of two teachings that might guide collaborative relations: the Guswhenta and the Eagle and Condor prophecy. Lastly, participants shared their views on the role of Indigeneity as a bridge to collaboration between Quechua immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from these lands. In the following chapter, I reflect on these themes and draw conclusions based on my views and those of the authors already discussed.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This section is divided into two parts: what I did in the study, including a summary of the results, and the implications. In this research, I wanted to explore how Quechua immigrants could collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. To do that, I began with an exploration of Quechua people's understandings of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and any relationships Quechua have with these Nations. I also enquired into how the Indigeneity of participants affected their relationship with collaboration — if it was a factor that assisted in collaboration, if it was irrelevant to collaboration, or if it restricted collaboration. Then, with this understanding, I explored how collaboration could take place. The overarching questions for my research were:

1) What are Quechua people's views and understandings of the Indigeneity of First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and their relations to these populations and the lands?
2) How can these understandings facilitate decolonizing collaboration between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples?
3) How can their own Indigeneity be a bridge to facilitate this potential collaboration?

Other studies examine racialized immigrants and their relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit. I focused on Indigenous immigrants within the racialized population because they share resonant experiences of Indigeneity with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. By resonant experiences, I mean sharing experiences of colonization and imperialism, even though the way these are experienced differ based on the specific Nations, tribes or communities involved. I wanted to see how these two Indigenous populations who share resonant experiences of Indigeneity could form a collaborative relationship.

Examining the Indigenous identity of Quechua people after they immigrated to Canada was important because their Indigeneity and immigration affects their connection with the Indigeneity of other people. This examination gave insight into how Quechua immigrants felt about their identity and how it had been affected by immigration, specifically by the assimilation they experienced in Canada after immigration. In addition, this study examined the colonial experiences of Quechua immigrants in their countries of origin, and these narratives continue to inform discriminatory practices of immigrant Latine communities in Canada. This information also helped in the process of addressing the discrimination that Quechua immigrants experience in these lands. As restated later in this chapter, to address the potential collaboration between Quechua immigrants and other Indigenous Nations, we need to consider the challenges and discrimination that Quechua immigrants are also experiencing in terms of their own identities.

One of the barriers to collaboration involves the lack of self-consciousness of settlers around their role in settler colonialism (Davis et al., 2017; Tuck & Yang, 2012). This study contributes to shifting the consciousness of Indigenous immigrants so they do not intentionally contribute to settler colonialism. I initiated discussions with Quechua participants without knowing their relations and understanding of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people. Soon after, I realized this was a relatively new topic for most of the participants, and many were not aware of what settler colonialism is, our complicity in it and our responsibilities towards First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. I therefore became intentional in raising consciousness around these issues. Following Thobani (2007) and Tuck and Yang (2012), I believed that informing Quechua people on these topics that most had not been exposed to was important work, and I took it upon myself to take this work to Indigenous immigrants.

This shift can be started by validating Quechua people's experiences with oppression while acknowledging their/our position in settler colonialism. In this process, it is important to validate Quechua people's experiences with ongoing colonialism, coloniality and imperialism. The colonialism that Quechua people experienced from the Spaniards left a lasting legacy in the colonized countries. This legacy has infiltrated policies that lead the government and dominant societies to support the oppression of Indigenous peoples by fostering hatred towards Indigenous heritage. Consequently, people with less Indigenous heritage often become the oppressors of those with more Indigenous roots. The systems in place continue to harm Indigenous well-being and favour those with fewer Indigenous roots. In this way, the oppression of Indigenous Peoples persists under these mechanisms established after colonialism. Similarly, imperialism continues to attack the Quechua people as foreign countries exploit their resources and transnational companies are allowed to take over their lands without giving fair compensation to the people affected by these changes. In addition, Indigenous peoples across the world are targeted by coloniality, which aims to establish global powers that oppress them by enforcing the superiority of Western views and knowledge. These views underestimate Indigenous knowledge, leading to oppressive global forces such as racial capitalism, displacement of Indigenous peoples and human rights violations.

Understanding the complexities of positioning can help to develop an approach that facilitates the collaboration of Indigenous immigrants with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples. To accomplish this goal, the study engaged Indigenous methodologies and knowledge, together with Western approaches to research. It is grounded in Quechua and Indigenous worldviews, the Guswhenta and the Eagle and Condor prophecy, and Tuck and Mckenzie's (2014) Indigenous critical inquiry of place and land.

In our conversations, interviewees proposed initiatives aimed at collaborating with Indigenous Peoples from these lands. They spoke about preparing Quechua immigrants to engage in collaboration by providing them with information about the Indigenous communities of these lands. This includes informing them about some of their struggles and encouraging participation in decolonizing efforts. Participants began to consider how they could contribute to this process, such as creating spaces for information exchange and relationship building. Forming these relationships could help Quechua immigrants learn about the areas where Indigenous Peoples need support and understand how to provide better assistance. Another initiative involves having pre-immigration sessions for Quechua people who are going to migrate here. They can learn about the history of Indigenous Peoples before arriving in order to mitigate their participation in colonization. Participants also discussed the possibility of having Indigenous leaders communicate with one another to explore solutions to the challenges they face and support each other. This process has to recognize that when Quechua immigrants arrive in Canada, they are guests on these lands. Therefore, they must adhere to the protocols of these lands and respect the wishes of the Indigenous people from these lands, as it is their lands that Quechua immigrants are living on.

The study contributes to understanding Quechua settler identity and provides a snapshot of how they live their Indigenous identities after migrating and settling in the Canadian state. This information can be used to better support Quechua immigrants and their Indigeneity, as well as facilitate their potential collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. The present study adds to efforts in supporting the well-being of Quechua immigrants living in Canada as it brings visibility to their existence and challenges. It also presents knowledge on Indigenous identity formation in a transnational context. The study identifies some of the complexities and

contentions in allyship and solidarity, as well as raising awareness among Quechua people of the need to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples. In so doing, it helps to address the Calls to Action that resulted from the investigation carried out by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. This study's results can be expanded to help understand other Indigenous immigrants and racialized groups and contribute to improving the relations between racialized immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

The present study works towards decolonizing social work practice and research by pointing out the rooted beliefs and practices that maintain settler colonialism in Canada. This research becomes an act of resistance by focusing on a population that is often rendered invisible. Indigenous immigrants are usually grouped with other racialized settlers without acknowledgement of their Indigenous identities. In social work practice and research, the Indigeneity of migrants is frequently overlooked. In this way, this study aims to resist the erasure of Indigeneity and highlight the importance of Indigenous knowledge carried out by Quechua immigrants. This information can inform direct social work practice with Indigenous service users from these lands. The study can also guide activism and advocacy work in social work that supports Indigenous communities in Canada as it looks at ways that non-Indigenous people can form relationships of collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples.

It can help teach a new generation of non-Indigenous settler social workers to understand the intricacies within Indigenous identities in transnational contexts and connect these complexities back to their work with Indigenous immigrants, thereby providing more culturally appropriate services to Indigenous immigrants. This study can also contribute to community-building amongst Quechua immigrants who are still trying to establish a community in Tkaronto. This research becomes an act of resistance by focusing on a population that is often rendered

invisible. It calls attention to the practice of grouping Indigenous immigrants with other racialized settlers without recognizing their Indigenous identities. The Indigeneity of migrants is frequently overlooked in research. In this way, the study resists the erasure of Indigeneity and highlights the Indigenous knowledge possessed by Quechua immigrants.

My study involved 16 participants who I recruited through word of mouth. Fifteen were Quechua and one was Kichwa. The participants I recruited were 18 years old or older and identified as Quechua, Kichwa or Mestize (with Quechua and European or other roots). From those that identified as Mestize, all identified as Indigenous Mestize based on the working definition of Indigenous Peoples. Most were between 40–50 or 60 and above, and more than half were female. All the participants spoke Spanish and had lived in the Canadian state for a minimum of five years. Before moving to the Canadian state, they lived in their homelands or other countries where Quechua/Kichwa people originate. Each participant took part in two opened-ended interview discussion sessions, the majority of which were individual sessions, and two were conjoint sessions with two participants who asked to be interviewed together. I decided not to analyze the first series of the interview sessions due to the enormous amount of data I had. As a result, this study focuses on the second discussions, which explored how Quechua people understand First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations and their relationships with these communities and these lands now called Canada. These discussions also included the collaboration of Quechua immigrants with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, considering that both populations are Indigenous.

I used an Indigenous methodology based on Kovach's (2009) and Wilson's (2008) conceptualizations. I combined aspects of Western and Indigenous methodologies following Kovach's (2009) approach. I chose a discussion format to ask participants open-ended questions,

which allows people to tell their stories as they answer. As Kovach argues, we find knowledge in relations. This process requires a "reflexive narrative by the researcher" (Kovach, 2009, p. 102); therefore, when presenting the testimonials of people based on the questions I asked, I tried to make connections to their broader personal stories and the literature. To analyze the data, I used coding and thematic analysis. Kovach (2009) explains that these Western practices have been used for data analysis in Indigenous research because they are compatible with Indigenous conceptual framing (p. 206).

In this study, I drew on Indigenous worldviews to guide collaboration between Quechuas and Indigenous Peoples from these lands. I also engaged in an inquiry into Indigeneity to reflect on my mixed Indigenous heritage, the complexities in my connection with Quechua culture as a mixed-race person and how I engage with it. I use the Guswhenta teaching from the Haudenosaunee because it speaks about the relations between settlers and Indigenous Peoples.

I also use the Quechua prophecy of the Eagle and Condor, as it discusses the coming together of Indigenous Peoples from the South, Central and North. It calls for a transformation to happen so that divisions end and the Condor can reunite with the Eagle again (Cameron et al., 2021). The concept of rematriation/repatriation of the land, as discussed in Green's teaching on the guest and host, offers an alternative to forcing immigrants to leave and still protects the rights of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. The guest and host model provides guidance on how Indigenous Peoples and immigrants can live together in these lands by ensuring that the sovereignty and autonomy of Indigenous Peoples are respected. Based on this teaching, immigrants would also adopt the values of peace, friendship and reciprocity towards Indigenous Peoples and collaborate with them in decolonization projects. I also follow the critical place and land inquiry model developed by Tuck and Mckenzie (2014) to discuss the relations of Quechua

people with place and land once they migrate to the North. In this context, land involves the cultural stories, identities and claims attached to a particular land (p. 65).

I worked on establishing a rapport with participants before I engaged them in conversation. At the beginning of our meetings, I played a song known in Peru as the anthem of Indigeneity for the Quechua participants. It talks about colonization, its impact on the people and taking pride in being Indigenous. This step was a way to place our conversation in context and to help the participants connect with their Indigeneity and the Indigenous communities from these lands now known as Canada. I also cooked Peruvian dishes for our discussion meetings to foster relationships.

The themes of my discussion sessions are based on the participants' views and understandings of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and settler colonialism in Canada. Participants shared how and what they learned about Indigenous Peoples. They came to know about Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism in various ways, including as trustworthy sources they accessed on their own, our conversations, their own experiences with colonialism and stereotypes they had heard. In discussing their understandings of settler colonialism, they talked about the government's involvement in settler colonialism through assimilation processes and the institution of citizenship, religion and poverty. Participants discussed trauma as a pervasive effect of settler colonialism.

Participants talked about settler colonialism and colonialism in their homelands and discussed similarities and differences, particularly around issues related to the TRCC and the inclusion of teaching about Indigenous Peoples and their histories in the educational system. Some participants were not aware of how discrimination and stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples influenced their views of these populations. Nor were they aware of the resilience of

Indigenous Peoples against all forms of colonialism. Participants also shared experiences with building a connection with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and the lack of opportunities they had for contact and forming relations. As participants shared their connection to these lands now known as Canada and their connection to their homelands, there were noticeable differences in how they connected to these two places. These discussions informed the question of how Quechua immigrants can collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

The collaboration of Quechua immigrants with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people is discussed based on three main collaborative processes. The first is engaging in collaboration that stems from solid relations between the two populations (Snelgrove et al., 2014). The second is a contingent collaboration that focuses on the work at hand and will continue for as long as the relationship between the two groups works (Tuck & Yang, 2012). The third form is based on a collaboration that stems from resonant yet different struggles First Nations, Métis and Inuit people experience in Canada and, in the case of Quechua immigrants, in their countries of origin. It is based on Wilson et al.'s (2015) study with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and the African diaspora. These moves to collaborate also include land as a central component of collaboration.

Participants valued relationships highly as a main component of establishing collaborative relationships. In their views, we need to strengthen relations and then collaborate. Meanwhile, some Indigenous Peoples from these lands now known as Canada are suggesting that collaboration needs to be prioritized (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Participants suggested ways to strengthen their relationships with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, such as learning to acknowledge and respect the Indigenous heritage of Indigenous Peoples on these lands. We also reflected on what it might mean to consider oneself a settler and the implications of being a

settler. We reflected on how it would be to refuse to support the status quo and engage in decolonization by recognizing one's identity as a settler, with the responsibilities and implications this entails, and creating spaces for both groups to get to know each other. At the same time, participants discussed barriers to collaboration, such as being labelled and treated as outsiders by Indigenous Peoples from these lands, and a perceived lack of interest from Indigenous Peoples in forming relations with Quechuas. These views exemplify the complexities of forming relations between Indigenous Peoples from these lands and Indigenous immigrants such as Quechua immigrants. Because there is a shared Indigeneity, there is an assumption that there is a relationship that should be formed without considering how settler colonialism influences that relationship. Although the Quechua participants understood why First Nations, Métis and Inuit people might be hesitant to open themselves to racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, some still expected Indigenous Peoples from these lands to establish relationships and welcome them to their cultures. As discussed in the previous chapter, this is not an expectation that considers the ongoing colonization of Indigenous Peoples and lands, and the key role settlers play in these processes.

Some key contentions from my discussion sessions involved the conflicting position that Quechua immigrants embody. Participants talked about the conflicting position of Indigenous immigrants in these lands, feeling that they are not from here or there. Participants questioned the place they hold since they are not part of the dominant Latine immigrant group, are not part of the white settler group and are not Indigenous from these lands either. The critical place and land inquiry model helps to engage in this search for identity connected to the land. According to this model, land involves the "interwoven aspects of land (origin) stories, claims, and identity" (Tuck & McKenzie, 2015, p. 65). Participants engaged with land differently depending on where

they were. Some participants connected to land's cultural, emotional and physical aspects when discussing their relationship to their homelands. They connected to these lands now called Canada emotionally in matters related to their immigration experiences and the opportunities this land and its people symbolize for them.

However, these views of Canada as a place of opportunity are problematic because they assume that the Canadian government is also representing the wishes of Indigenous Peoples when it welcomes immigrants. Therefore, the gratitude to the Canadian state inadvertently erases the colonizing moves behind immigration. As explained in previous chapters, this erasure is deliberate on the part of the Canadian government to foster thankful immigrants who will follow their regulations. Furthermore, the disconnection that most participants showed to the physical lands is also a move towards colonization. Learning more about the lands, their histories and the relationships that Indigenous Peoples have to their lands will bring more awareness to the colonization that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people experience. This knowledge also has the potential to prompt immigrants to question how they belong and connect to these lands. Once they migrate, their experiences in connection to the land and cultural distinctiveness could change the nature of their identities as Quechua. As mentioned earlier in Chapter 5, Cárdenas González (2012) discusses the concept of emplacement to describe how marginalized people, such as Afro-Colombian people, have the agency to re-construct their Black identity when they are displaced. This reconstruction can be based on how they can find a place for themselves in the new lands they inhabit, live in these lands and form relationships with others (p. 168). Similarly, Quechuas might re-construct their Indigeneity based on their connection to the land they co-habit, how they move in these spaces and their relations to others.

Some participants also wondered where they belonged. They felt that they did not belong here because this was not their original culture, but they also did not feel they belonged back home, because they were also seen as foreigners there. This borderline is the space that many immigrants occupy, as Anzaldúa (1987) explains. So, the question becomes, how do Indigenous immigrants engage in collaboration with people from these lands when they are not from here and they are unsure whether they belong here?

Another contention was based on the concept of settler identity as it applies to Indigenous immigrants. Participants tried to understand how the concept of settler also applied to them. Some participants were resistant to the idea that as settlers, they/we are also accomplices to settler colonialism. A few participants were aware of the abuses that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people experience through settler colonization but have not been exposed to the term 'settler' in relation to Indigenous immigrants. Some participants were hearing the term used for racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, for the first time. They had not been exposed to the framing of Indigenous immigrants as settlers, having thought that the settler identity only referred to white people. The language of settler colonization is very particular and relatively recent and is surely more freely circulating in certain academic and activist spaces than elsewhere. However, the term 'settler' does crucial political work to underscore the ongoing nature of land/sovereignty dispossession as much as the struggles for Indigenous self-determination. It would not necessarily be something that participants had been exposed to at all, even if they support Indigenous Peoples. Despite this, most participants were interested in having conversations about what it means to consider being a settler and to understand and accept what responsibilities and entitlements come with co-habiting these lands with Indigenous Peoples.

Participants and I discussed the roles that they have as settlers based on Green's (2018) teachings. Green expands on the teachings of the Guswhenta and talks about the roles of the host and guest. She explains that the host's responsibilities are to offer the guests what they need in their stay. Reciprocally, guests are responsible for following the host's regulations and supporting the host in exchange for what they receive. Based on these teachings, Indigenous Peoples are cordial to guests and help them in their stay. However, as Green explains, the problem is that the guests need to reciprocate and not claim these lands as their own at the expense of Indigenous sovereignty, so guests must understand and accept their responsibilities and entitlements.

Lastly, another contention involved sharing Indigeneity, which has the potential to help in the relationship building between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. However, it can be misinterpreted. For example, some Quechua participants thought First Nations, Métis and Inuit people needed to open their cultures to them. Some participants urged Indigenous Peoples to open themselves and establish relations of friendship with immigrant people such as Quechuas, who are also Indigenous, otherwise immigrants will have more difficulty connecting and collaborating with Indigenous communities. Going back to the Indigenous worldviews discussed above, the Eagle and Condor prophecy is used to centre relationship-building between Quechua immigrants and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples based on a shared Indigeneity. According to the prophecy, the North, Central and South were united before colonization. However, the prophecy also calls for the need to challenge and transform colonizing mechanisms that have separated us (North, Central and South) so we can overcome our divisions and unite again. Unintentionally, participants showed a lack of awareness that forming relationships with Indigenous Peoples from these lands needs to consider

the suffering that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people have experienced and continue to experience due to settler colonialism. Much Indigenous resistance has involved maintaining close community connections and sharing teachings and practices with one another in order to curtail assimilation, which in some instances necessitates excluding outsiders. Therefore, these realities can impact whether they would accept an invitation for a closer relationship with immigrants, including racialized and Indigenous immigrants. Most importantly, Indigenous Peoples have the right (and often exercise this right) to refuse this invitation.

The testimonies shared by the participants were insightful as they suggested the need for immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants to know the histories and present issues of these Nations and communities; understand their positionality as settlers, Indigenous, and immigrants in their relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and the lands; follow what Indigenous Peoples from these lands are asking; and learn about the protocols of the Indigenous Peoples so that they can live on these lands respectfully. As Davis et al. (2017) discuss, settlers can be critical of the injustices Indigenous Peoples go through, but they have difficulty seeing how they benefit from the dispossession of lands that Indigenous Peoples experience. Davis explains that "one of the successes of settler colonialism is its power to 'naturalize' settlers to the land while invisibilizing Indigenous" Peoples and sovereignty (Davis & Shpuniarsky in Davis et al., 2017, p. 410).

Implications for Collaboration

Based on these interviews and study results, to make the collaboration of Quechua immigrants work, several barriers need to be addressed. These include the oppressive relations that Quechua people endure from white people and Eurocentric structural forces in place, other racialized immigrants and immigrants from their communities in Canada. In my study, I discussed a triad

set model to explain how settler colonialism is perpetuated within the Quechua immigrant population living in Canada. To recap, the triad set model that I proposed comprises: 1) Indigenous settlers, 2) First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and 3) white settlers. Under this triad set, white settlers benefit from the colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and the processes that keep racialized settlers such as Indigenous settlers marginalized (Thobani, 2007). These oppressive relations rely on the structural forces set up to maintain them. As a result, these forms of oppression happen automatically. Therefore, settlers, in this instance, white settlers, are complicit in settler colonialism without actively engaging in it. It is important to realize that these forms of oppression are "systemic" or "structural" issues. Colonial relations/configurations of power also play a significant role in preventing settler societies from engaging in full recognition of Indigenous sovereignties. However, there are still different ways for white people to navigate these social structures. Some white settlers actively fight against these systems of oppression, for example, by engaging in a politics of refusal and forming allyships with BIPOC communities even though they are automatically complicit in them through their mere presence. Still, none of these suggestions brings white people innocence from complicity.

These oppressive social structures work at keeping a distance between Indigenous settlers and First Nations, Métis and Inuit people (Thobani, 2007). Furthermore, Indigenous settlers inadvertently cooperate with and benefit from the colonization of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people through complicity or unawareness of their settler identities and the responsibilities that come with these identities (Tuck & Yang, 2012). In this dissertation, the participants and I took a reflective stance to consider what it means for Quechua people to settle in these lands and, from these positionalities, explore forms of collaboration that might be more suitable for Quechua people. Based on the proposed triad set, we need to address the following:

1) Oppression perpetuated by white people, which means that racialized people are continuously marginalized. In this case, white allies need to address these forms of discrimination towards racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants.
2) Discrimination from various racialized immigrants against each other. Some racialized communities discriminate between Indigenous and non-Indigenous immigrants from the same ethnic group, as exemplified by Quechua and Mestize and Latine immigrants in these lands now known as Canada.
3) Oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people by racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants. These forms of discrimination and oppression need to be addressed within racialized and Indigenous immigrant communities through practices such as refusal. As discussed in Chapter Four, Jafri (2020) encourages racialized people to disrupt the status quo. This move might involve refusing the state's social structures aimed at disempowering Indigenous Peoples while coming to terms with a settler identity, taking on responsibilities as guests and engaging in activities to assist Indigenous Peoples in regaining sovereignty.
4) Addressing white people's oppression will be more challenging as it has its roots in the beginning of colonization. White settlers, specifically nationals, have planted the roots of systemic racism in the Canadian state. Therefore, to transform it, there needs to be significant shifts in well-established policies, structures, institutions and practices, as well as from every non-Indigenous person, especially from white settlers.

One of the main goals of this thesis is to strategize ways in which Quechua people can be allies who work in partnership with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples. From the discussion on triad sets, we can see the difficulties in the decolonizing projects. We would have to address

all the destructive links involved in this triad set to address decolonization. True decolonization may only happen if, at the same time, there is work done to address racialized immigrants' oppression. It would be complicated for Indigenous immigrants such as Quechuas to engage in decolonization when they are also being oppressed. At the same time, Thobani (2007) states that racialized immigrants are implicated in the maintenance of the system. In the context of Indigenous immigrants, we need to address their parallel struggles, which is to say, to acknowledge their oppression while also exploring ways for Indigenous immigrants to engage in collaboration.

I contend that if the oppression of Indigenous immigrants is not addressed, it becomes difficult for them to cope even when they are also complicit in settler colonialism. I agree that, in general, Indigenous immigrants' oppression must be addressed while they also take on their responsibilities to collaborate. I think these processes need to be parallel: their oppressions and their responsibilities to Indigenous Peoples of these lands must be addressed at the same time. Their oppressions need to be addressed with the support of white settlers to dismantle the racist systems white people have established. At the same time, they/we need to be accountable for our part in the ongoing colonization of Indigenous Peoples and their lands. These decolonization moves must be discussed and coordinated with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people, and ideally with other racialized and white ally settlers. According to Jafri (2020), moves such as "refusing the state's structures of social and cultural organization" (p. 113) open space for new forms of relating to each other.

As Green (2018) explains it, teachings such as the Guswhenta can guide relationships between settlers and Indigenous Peoples based on its values of peace, friendship and reciprocity. Under the teachings from the Guswhenta, Indigenous Peoples (the canoe) and settlers (the ship)

would respect each other's journey and co-habit these lands in ways that respect the sovereignty of Indigenous Peoples and do not interfere with each other's paths. This does not mean that relationships cannot be formed between individuals. However, it would be necessary to understand how Indigenous Peoples from these lands envision what these relationships could look like. As stated earlier, there are differences in perspectives on how Quechua immigrants can relate to the Indigenous Peoples of these lands. In this study, Quechua immigrants frequently emphasized the need to build relationships to engage in collaboration, whereas Indigenous Peoples from these lands prioritized collaboration itself but had varied perspectives on what a relationship would entail beyond collaboration. These differences in perspectives can lead to tension when seeking ways to engage in collaboration. Therefore, it is crucial to discuss how to connect, share space and envision what collaboration could look like. Quechua immigrants could propose building relationships with Indigenous Peoples as part of their collaborative efforts, allowing Indigenous people to decide if they are open to this form of cooperation and, if so, what it might look like.

In terms of decolonizing collaboration involving Quechua settlers, I suggest going back to Quechua ways of knowing and incorporating them into the process used by Quechua settlers to engage in decolonization and consider Quijano's (2014) principles of "good living." Quechua or Andean peoples' knowing may be more effective at explaining the information shared by participants and offering recommendations since it is based on Indigenous practices. Therefore, Quechua/Andean knowing (Riqiy) may propose a different way of connecting for Quechua people. Similar to the consciousness-raising that I did with the study, I would be interested in proposing the application of Quechua/Andean concepts of knowing to discuss the themes of this dissertation. Although these forms of knowledge have been displaced through colonization, they

can be re-invigorated by forming a stronger Quechua community in Tkaronto that discusses these ways of knowing. As stated earlier, at the moment, Quechua communities are dispersed, and no unified Quechua community meets regularly.

Revisiting the concepts of musyay, yachay and ruway I introduced in Chapter 3, yachay could be used to learn the more factual aspects of Indigenous Peoples on these lands. This involves an exchange of knowledge where the person engages in learning and teaching. Engaging in these activities also helps to form a relationship between the two Indigenous populations of Quechua immigrants and Indigenous Peoples from these lands. In addition, yachay would not only involve gaining knowledge from First Nations, Métis and Inuit people but also having Quechuas teach on topics such as their Indigenous knowledge and histories.

Musyay could be used to connect with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people at an emotional and spiritual level. It would involve learning based on intuition and memories. Moving forward with the process of collaboration, utilizing musyay could help Quechua immigrants form emotional ties with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations. Sharing Indigeneity helps Quechua immigrants better understand First Nations, Métis and Inuit people at an emotional level. In this way, emotional ties could be used to establish a deeper connection with the people and the lands. Intuition and feelings could be used to foresee how Quechua immigrants could form collaborative relations with Indigenous cultures from the North.

Ruway is to learn by doing. For example, we learn to engage in collaboration through the process of collaborating. This process of 'doing collaboration' will also shape the concept's meaning. This process would involve connecting with the people and nature since fostering our relationship with nature is also central to ruway. These could be principles to guide instances of collaborative relationships between Quechua and Indigenous Peoples from these lands.

Similarly, Quijano's (2014) principles of "good living" have significant value for collaboration, as they emphasize that de/coloniality of power requires fighting for equity among different groups. As mentioned earlier, these principles assert that people's differences should not result in social inequality. If we want to achieve 'good living,' we must address the challenges that First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples and Quechua immigrants face under white supremacy. Also, we need to confront the inequities perpetuated by Quechua immigrants in their complicity in the government's actions.

Limitations

I realize that proposing to engage with Riqiy (Quechua knowledge from the Andes) to approach relationship-building may be romanticizing the potential relationships between these Indigenous populations. From the interviews, we have seen some barriers to collaborative relationships, such as Quechua people not reflecting on their settler identities. We live in a settler society that encourages settlers not to acknowledge their complicity in settler colonialism and their responsibilities as such. However, in retrospect, interviews engaged with Musyay by using knowledge to connect with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people at an emotional and spiritual level. First Nations, Métis and Inuit people have diverse knowledge, and there are also aspects in common that they share with Quechua people, demonstrating that there is potential for a way of collaborating that speaks more to Indigenous ways of knowing and thereby proving to be more effective at getting Quechuas to collaborate with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

I chose not to use the concept of Riqiy in my methods, particularly in the questions I created. My hesitance was because everyone relates to their Quechua heritage differently. I did not want to impose this way of knowing on people who may not share these beliefs, and Riqiy is a particular way that may not be shared. The study nevertheless shows Quechua's ways of

knowing, such as Musyay, even if this did not mean for that to happen per se. After conducting the discussions, I believe it would have been beneficial to intentionally incorporate these ways of knowing in my methods, and I see this as a limitation in my study.

Another limitation of the study was my level of comfort with the issues discussed with the participants. In our conversations, I felt pressure to provide them with information and believed I was unprepared for this task. I became more aware of what I did not know through our discussions. I only began to feel more comfortable sharing information in my conversations after acknowledging that we were engaged in an exchange where we were both learners and educators. As I reflect on our conversations, I realize that I need to learn more about the ongoing issues First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples experience. It is difficult to talk about First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples as a settler because of how I am implicated in colonization. It is generally unsettling to talk about other ethnic populations and the issues they are going through as outsiders to those communities. I have become more comfortable with being uncomfortable and unsettled and constantly recognizing that I need to learn more. I realize that this process requires humbleness as I will continue to make mistakes, and hopefully, I will see them and correct them. I understand the need to do so because otherwise it would leave First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples to take on the job of educating immigrants, an unfair expectation they have criticized many times. Researchers could be one catalyst in this learning process.

I also had a bias to protect the participants since we share some origins in common. As a result, it was sometimes difficult to critically analyze some of the conversations with the participants and call them out on ways of thinking that encourage the oppression of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. However, it is also a fairly colonial and imperial practice to be so thoroughly grounded in being right and having no concern for relationships or others' journeys. I

attempted to raise issues of concern that encouraged oppression when I met with the participants. However, after conducting this study, I also realized that questioning people on their ways of thinking is not effective most of the time. Instead, it might be more effective to look at the learning journey that the person is going through and together figure out what is influencing this journey, i.e., the systems that are inherently racist and colonial. Then, one can work with the participant to uncover these forms of systemic oppression together and challenge the oppressive ways of thinking we carry. Going through this learning process was reasonably easy for the participants as they were humble and open to expanding their ideas and assumptions. We shared knowledge: I learned more about Quechua and Kichwa cultures, and they learned more about First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and how settler colonialism impacts them. Some participants also taught me about First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and their cultures. Although most participants had limited information about First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples, they were able to see beyond the stereotypes that exist in dominant society. People were open to learning about how Indigenous Peoples here are discriminated against and reflected on their responsibilities in relation to this. Together, we challenged the systems in place that are established to encourage the oppression of Indigenous Peoples, and we analyzed the purposes these serve.

Lastly, a limitation in my theoretical framework, which then influenced how I conducted my conversations with participants, is my narrow discussion on treaties. Given the historical and contemporary importance of treaties in shaping relationships between Indigenous Peoples on these lands and settlers, I should have discussed this topic more. These discussions could have happened in my theoretical framework and I could have used this framework to guide my conversations with participants about treaties.

In using the Two Row Wampum Belt, I am evoking the idea that we are treaty partners. However, in my research, I did not discuss what it means for participants to be treaty partners or initiate conversations about treaties. For me, being an immigrant and a person with Indigenous and European roots, it is important to respect the legal frameworks that treaties encompass and to hold the Canadian government accountable to them. I can also relate to some of the personal struggles faced by Indigenous Peoples from these lands, which informs my views on collaboration.

It would have been important for the participants to engage in a discussion about treaties and how they apply to their lives. For Indigenous immigrants, there is a dual responsibility regarding treaties that they hold as settlers and Indigenous people. There is a responsibility to collaborate with Indigenous Peoples in Canada, as these are not their lands of origin. There is also respect and responsibility as Indigenous Peoples living on other Indigenous Peoples' lands to follow their protocols. This dual responsibility brings us to the discussion of what happens to Indigenous people travelling to other Indigenous People's lands. There is a different engagement that happens because of the shared Indigenous identity. Indigenous immigrants may continue their cultural practices, but they still need to engage with the protocols of the lands on which they are living. This would involve a discussion with Indigenous Peoples from these lands to determine how this would be implemented.

This study intends to contribute to how Quechua and Kichwa immigrants can engage in collaborative relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people and be allies. However, there needs to be a shift in the use of Western-based models to encourage collaboration and relationships between Indigenous populations. This decolonizing process must be based on Indigenous ways to achieve better results.

References

Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in postcoloniality*. Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2010). *Promise of happiness.* Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2013). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Routledge,

Aigner-Varoz, E. (2000). Metaphors of a Mestiza consciousness: Anzaldúa's *Borderlands/La Frontera. MELUS, (25)*2, 1, 47–62, https://doi.org/10.2307/468218

Alfred, T. & Corntassel, J. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against contemporary colonization. *Government and Opposition, (40)*4, 597–614. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2005.00166.x

Allan, B., & Smylie, J. (2015). *First Peoples, second class treatment: The role of racism in the health and well-being of Indigenous peoples in Canada*. The Wellesley Institute.

Altamirano-Jiménez, I. (2013). *Indigenous encounters with neoliberalism: Place, women, and the environment in Canada and Mexico*. UBC Press.

Álvarez Gamboa, G. (2012). Oru Lundu responde (...) una perspectiva situada del imaginario afrodescendiente [Oru Lundu responds (...) a situated perspective of the Afro-descendant imaginary]. *Universum, (27)*2, 13–30. http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-23762012000200002

Amadahy, Z., & Lawrence, B. (2009). Indigenous peoples and Black people in Canada: Settlers or allies? In A. Kempf (Ed.), *Breaching the colonial contract: Anti-colonialism in the US and Canada* (pp. X–X). Springer.

Amar Bhatia, A. (2013). We are all here to stay? Indigeneity, migration, and 'decolonizing' the treaty right to be here. *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice (31).* https://wyaj.uwindsor.ca/index.php/wyaj/article/view/4411/3614

Andean Project of Farming Technologies. (November 2008). *Memorias del II taller sobre educación intercultural y epistemologías emergentes* [*Memories of Workshop II on intercultural education and emergent epistemologies*]. www.pratec.org.pe

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: The new Mestiza/La Frontera*. Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

APTN National News (2019, June 3). *MMIWG Inquiry anniversary*. https://www.aptnnews.ca/topic/mmiwg/

Aquino, M. (2021, November 24). *Peru softens stance on mining permits that rattled sector. Reuters.* https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/perus-government-softens-stance-mining-permits-2021-11-24/

Arguedas, J. M., & Izquierdo Rios, F. (1947). *Mitos, leyendas y cuentos Peruanos* [*Peruvian myths and folk stories*]. Siruela. www.siruela.com/archivos/fragmentos/Cuentos_peruanos.pdf

Armony, V. (2014). Latin American communities in Canada: Trends in diversity and integration. *Canadian Ethnic Studies (46)*3, 7–34. 10.1353/ces.2014.0043

Arriagada, P., Hahmann, T. & O'Donnell, V. (2020, May 26). *StatCan COVID-19: Data to insights for a better Canada*. Statistics Canada. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/45-28-0001/2020001/article/00023-eng.pdf?st=xRI3bNwF

Arraiz Matute, A. (2018). *Cariño in the Borderlands: Pedagogical relationships in a community-based education support program* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Toronto. https://hdl.handle.net/1807/89855

Arraiz Matute, A., & Elgueta, N. (2019). Cuentos del Sur: Building relationships of solidarity with Indigenous women on Turtle Island. *NACCS Annual Conference Proceedings, 11,* 52–71. https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccs/2019/Proceedings/11

Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonization and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations, 25*(1), 8–34.

Assembly of First Nations. (2018). *Dismantling the Doctrine of Discovery*. https://www.afn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/18-01-22-Dismantling-the-Doctrine-of-Discovery-EN.pdf

Aylwin, J. (2008). Globalization and Indigenous Peoples' rights: An analysis from a Latin American perspective. *Cahiers DIALOG*. https://reseaudialog.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/CahierDIALOG2008-01.pdf

Ball, J., & McIvor, O. (2013). Canada's big chill. In C. Benson & K. Kosonen (Eds.), *Language issues in comparative education: Inclusive teaching and learning in non-dominant languages and cultures* (pp. 19–38). https://books.scholarsportal.info/en/read?id=/ebooks/ebooks3/springer/2013-08-13/4/9789462092181

Barboza, A. (1994). *Sexo y Conquista* [*Sex and Conquest*]. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. https://www.legisver.gob.mx/equidadNotas/publicacionLXIII/Aracely%20Barboza%20-%20La%20violaci%C3%B3n%20como%20m%C3%A9todo%20de%20la%20conquista%20espa%C3%B1ola.pdf

Barker, A. (2010). From adversaries to allies: Forging respectful alliances between Indigenous and settler people. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships.* (pp. 316–333). University of Toronto Press.

Baskin, C. (2006). Aboriginal worldviews as challenges and possibilities in social work education. *Critical Social Work (7)*2, 1–10.

Baskin, C., Green, R., Hendry, J., Lavallée, L., & Murrin, J. (2008). We pass the talking stick to you: Forming alliances and identities in the academy. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *(31),* 89–106.

Bauder, H. (2011). Closing the immigration-Aboriginal parallax gap. *Geoforum, (42*)5, 517–519.

Bauder, H., & Breen, R. (2023). Indigenous perspectives of immigration policy in a settler Country. *Journal of International Migration & Integration, 24,* 369–384. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1007/s12134-022-00951-4

Bautista Mamani, R. (2008). *YACHACHIQ: El Quechua en la cosmovisión andina* [*YACHACHIQ: The Quechua within Andean worldviews*]. http://reneeducaebi.blogspot.ca/2008/12/el-quechua-en-la-cosmovisin-andina.html

Bear Nicholas, A. (2001). The great white bird – Canada’s colonial mission. In K. P. Binda & S. Calliou (Eds.), *Aboriginal education in Canada: A study in decolonization*. Canadian Educator’s Press.

Beedie, N., Macdonald, D., & Wilson, D. (2019, July). *Towards justice: Tackling Indigenous child poverty in Canada*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Benítez Bastidas, N. M. (2017). *Formas y modos de vida de los Pueblos Kichwas de Imbaburru (Ecuador): Territorio, organizacion, patrimonio interculturalidad* [*Modes and ways of life of the Kichwa Peoples of Imbaburru (Ecuador): Territory, organization,*

heritage, interculturality]. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universidad de Extremadura.

Benítez Bastidas, N. M., Hernández Carretero, A. M., Gurría Gascón, J. L., & Cisneros Vásquez, F. L. (2016). Hechos y realidades de las principales culturas del Ecuador, con énfasis en los Pueblos Kichwas de Imbabura, a partir de la historia, el territorio, la Constitución e indicadores de desarrollo [Facts and realities of the main cultures of Ecuador, with emphasis on the Kishwa Peoples of Imbabura, based on history, the territory, the Constitution and development indicators]. *Turydes Journal of Tourism and Development*, *21*. http://www.eumed.net/rev/turydes/21/kichwas.html

Benjamin, C., Preston, J., & Leger, M. (2010). The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Partnerships to advance human rights. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships* (pp. 57–66). University of Toronto Press.

Berger, M. (2019, December 15). A guide to how gender-neutral language is developing around the world. *Washington Post.* https://link-gale-com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/apps/doc/A608751919/AONE?u=uniwater&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=e43139e7

Bernal Heredia, S. V. (2020). "Cholo Soy," 1973 y 2016: Voces de choledad en el Perú ["Cholo Soy," 1973 and 2016: Voices of *choledad* in Peru]. *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, *5,* https://doi.org/10.1080/08263663.2020.1735103

Birks, M., Chapman, Y., & Francis, K. (2008). Memoing in qualitative research: Probing data and processes. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 13*(1), 68–75. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1177/1744987107081254

Bishop, A. (1994). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression in people* (2nd ed.). Fernwood Publishing.

Blackwell, M., Lopez, F., & Urrieta Jr., L. (2017). Special issue: Critical Latinx indigeneities. *Latino Studies, 15*, 126–137. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41276-017-0064-0

Blanco, H. (2008). *The fight for Indigenous rights in the Andes today*. South Branch Publications.

Bohacker, H., & Iacovetta, F. (2009). Making Aboriginal people 'immigrants too': A comparison of citizenship programs for newcomers and Indigenous Peoples in postwar Canada 1940s–1960s. *The Canadian Historical Review, 90*(3), 427–461.

Bonnici, L. M., & Bayley, R. (2010). Recent research on Latinos in the USA and Canada, Part 2: Spanish varieties. *Language and Linguistics Compass (4)*2, 121–134.

Bourke, B. (2020). Leaving behind the rhetoric of allyship. *Whiteness and Education, 5*(2), 179–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/23793406.2020.1839786

Brake, J. (2019, January 11). *Trudeau, Horgan under fire for downplaying Aboriginal title following RCMP raid of Wet'suwet'en*. APTNnews. https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/trudeau-horgan-under-fire-for-downplaying-aboriginal-title-following-rcmp-raid-of-wetsuweten/

Bruker, M. (2011). [Review of the book *Red, white & black: Cinema and the structure of U.S. antagonisms* by F. B. Wilderson III]. *Journal of Film and Video*, *63*(4), 66–69. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/457556/summary

Bulowski, N. (2022, May 18). *Canadian mining companies keep targeting developing countries in dispute settlements*. Canada's National Observer. https://www.nationalobserver.com/2022/05/19/news/canadian-mining-companies-target-developing-countries-dispute-settlements

Burnette, C. E., & Billiot, S. (2015). Reaching harmony across Indigenous and mainstream research contexts: An emergent narrative. *Journal of Indigenous Social Development, (4)*1, 1–15.

Bury, J. (2007). Neoliberalismo, mineria y cambios rurales en Cajamarca [Neoliberalism, mining and rural change in Cajamarca]. In A. Bebbington (Ed.), *Minería, movimientos sociales y respuestas campesinas: Una ecología política de transformaciones territoriales* [*Mining, social movements, and peasant responses: A political ecology of territorial transformations*] pp. 49–80. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos

Byrd, J. (2011). *The transit of empire: Indigenous critiques of colonization*. University of Minnesota Press.

Cahuas, M. C. (2020). The struggle and (im)possibilities of decolonizing Latin American citizenship practices and politics in Toronto. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 38*(2), 209–228. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775820915998

Cahuas, M. C., & Arraiz Matute, A. (2020). Enacting a Latinx decolonial politic of belonging: Latinx community workers' experiences negotiating identity and citizenship in Toronto, Canada. *Studies in Social Justice, 14*(2), 268–286.

Calderon, D. (2017, April 22). *Mestizo longing as a settler futurity along the U.S./Mexico borderlands* [Conference presentation]. The Work of Settler Colonization II: Emergent Solidarities Conference, OISE, University of Toronto, ON.

Callirgos, J. C. (1993). *El Racismo: La cuestión del otro (y de uno).* [*Racism: The question of the other (and of oneself)*]. DESCO.

Cameron, L., Courchene, D., Ijaz, S., & Mauro, I. (2021). ‘A change of heart’: Indigenous perspectives from the Onjisay Aki Summit on climate change. *Climatic change, 164*, 43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03000-8

Campbell, C. W. (2015). *A transnational perspective of Latin American immigrant families in Canada* [Unpublished master’s thesis]. The University of Guelph.

Canada’s Centre for Digital Media Literacy. Common Portrayals of Indigenous People. https://mediasmarts.ca/digital-media-literacy/media-issues/diversity-media/indigenous-people/common-portrayals-indigenous-people

Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. (2016, November 29). *Federal Kinder Morgan decision short-sighted: Fossil fuel interests put before those of public, First Nations.* https://www.policyalternatives.ca/news-research/federal-kinder-morgan-decision-short-sighted/

Canadian Council on Learning. (2009). *The state of Aboriginal learning in Canada: A holistic approach to measuring success*. http://www.ccl-cca.ca/pdfs/StateAboriginalLearning/SAL-FINALReport_EN.PDF

Canadian Council for Refugees. (2016). *Migrant workers: Precarious and unsupported. A Canada-wide study on access to services for migrant workers*. http://ccrweb.ca/sites/ccrweb.ca/files/migrant-workers-2016.pdf

Canadian Council of Social Development (2013, June 11). *Defining and re-defining poverty: A CCSD perspective*. https://ccsd.ca/research/policy-initiatives/policy-statements-briefs-submissions/112-defining-and-re-defining-poverty-a-ccsd-perspective

Cañamar Maldonado, T. (2019, June 14). *El tercer género en Los Andes: Un modo muy otro* [*The third gender in the Andes: A very different way*]. NeuvaPacha. https://nuevapacha.home.blog/2019/06/14/el-tercer-genero-en-los-andes-un-modo-muy-otro/

Cárdenas González. (2012). *Articulations of Blackness: Journeys of an emplaced politics in Colombia* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of California, Santa Cruz.

Cardoso-Ruiz, R. P., Gives-Fernández, L. C., Lecuona-Miranda, M. E., & Nicolás-Gómez, R. (2016). Elementos para el debate e interpretación del Buen vivir/*Sumak kawsay* [Elements for the debate and interpretation of Buen Vivir/*Sumak kawsay*]. *Contribuciones desde Coatepec* [*Contributions from Coatepec*] *31*. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=28150017005

Casuncad, N. (2020). *Exploring Indigenous-newcomer relations in the city of Toronto: Changing demographics, reconciliation, and potential of city planning* [Working paper]. Ryerson Centre for Immigration and Settlement and the CERC in Migration and Integration.

CBC News. (2019, June 2). *231 'imperative' changes: The MMIWG inquiry's calls for justice*. https://www.cbc.ca/news/Indigenous/mmiwg-inquiry-report-1.5158385

Chatterjee, S. (2018). Teaching immigration for reconciliation: A pedagogical commitment with a difference. *Intersectionalities*, *6*(1), 1–15.

Chazan, M. (2020). Making home on Anishinaabe lands: Storying settler activisms in Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Canada). *Settler Colonial Studies, 10*(1), 34–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2019.1605963

Chiefs of Ontario. Protecting Our Lands: A First Nations Response to Bill 5 & Bill C-5. Overview of Bill 5 (Ontario): Implications for First Nations.

https://chiefs-of-ontario.org/resources/protecting-our-lands/

Chirapaq, Centro de Cultura Indígenas del Perú [Chirapaq Centre of Indigenous Cultures in Peru]. (2013). *Educación, racismo y pueblos Indígenas*. [*Education, racism and Indigenous villages*]. Sinco Editores SAC.

Choate, P., & Tortorelli, C. (2022). Attachment theory: A barrier for Indigenous children involved with child protection. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(14), 8754. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19148754

Chrisjohn, R.D, McKay, S.M. & Smith, A.O. (2017). *Dying to Please You: Indigenous Suicide in Contemporary Canada*. Theytus Books Ltd. Chuecas Cabrera, A (n.d.). The Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Communities in the Historical Context of Peru. El Derecho de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades en el Contexto Histórico del Perú. https://www2.congreso.gob.pe/sicr/cendocbib/con4_uibd.nsf/CD62A7B22B15803A05257BCD00771534/$FILE/Derecho_de_los_pueblos_ind%C3%ADgenas_y_comunidades.pdf

Chung, M. (2010). *The relationships between racialized immigrants and Indigenous Peoples in Canada: A literature review* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Winnipeg.

City of Vancouver. (2011). *Vancouver dialogues: First Nations, Urban Aboriginal, and immigrant communities*. https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/dialogues-project-book.pdf

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(3), 297–298. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613

Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador. [Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador]. (n.d.) *Kichwa*. https://conaie.org/2014/07/19/kichwa/

Coleman, A. (2017, January 30). *How does change happen: Angela Davis on movements, erasure, and the dangers of heroic individualism.* Medium. https://medium.com/@angelicacoleman/how-does-change-happen-906eaf9bd9b5

Comisión De La Verdad y Reconciliación (2003). Informe Final. [Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Final Report]. Capítulo 1. Los Actores Armados. El Partido Comunista Del Perú Sendero Luminoso. [Chapter one: Armed Actors. 1.1. The Communist Party of Peru, Shining Path].
file:///C:/Users/Brenda%20Polar/AppData/Local/Temp/291b8020-7740-49b3-b5a1-184ad0239457_CAP%20I%20SL%20ORIGEN.zip.CAP%20I%20SL%20ORIGEN.zip/CAP%20I%20SL%20ORIGEN.pdf

Correa, C. (2013, June). *Reparaciones en Perú: El largo camino entre las recomendaciones y la implementación* [*Reparations in Peru: The long road from recommendations to implementation*]. International Center for Transitional Justice.

Coulthard, G. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. University of Minnesota Press.

Cull, I., Hancock, R., McKeown, S., Pidgeon, M., & Vedan, A. (2018). *Pulling together: A guide for front-line staff, student services, and advisors.* BC Campus. https://opentextbc.ca/indigenizationfrontlineworkers/

Culturas Pre-Incas [Pre-Incan cultures]. (2022). *Cultura Wari*. https://culturas-preincas.com/cultura-wari/

Daes, E. (1996, June 10). *Standard-setting activities: Evolution of standards concerning the rights of Indigenous people.* Working Group on Indigenous Populations. UN Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/AC.4/1996/2.

Davis, L. (2010). Introduction. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships* (pp.1–10). University of Toronto Press.

Davis, L., Hiller, C., James, C., Lloyd, K., Nasca, T., & Taylor, S. (2017). Complicated pathways: Settler Canadians learning to re/frame themselves and their relationships with Indigenous Peoples. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *7*(4), 398–414, https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2016.1243086.

Davis, L., O'Donnell, V., & Shpuniarsky, H. (2007). Aboriginal social justice alliances: Understanding the landscape of relationships through the coalition for a public inquiry into Ipperwash. *International Journal of Canadian Studies, 36*, 95–119. https://doi.org/10.7202/040778ar

De Costa, R., & Clark, T. (2011). Exploring non-Aboriginal attitudes towards reconciliation in Canada: The beginnings of targeted focus group research. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (pp. 327–340). Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Deerchild, R. (2015, September 25). *Lasting effects of trauma reaches across generations through DNA* [Radio Broadcast transcript]. CBC. https://www.cbc.ca/radio/unreserved/buffy-sainte-marie-wab-kinew-and-how-dna-remembers-trauma-1.3242375/lasting-effects-of-trauma-reaches-across-generations-through-dna-1.3243897

Degregori, C. I. (1991). ¿Por qué apareció Sendero Luminoso en Ayacucho [Why did the Shining Path appear in Ayacucho?] In A. Pérotin-Dumon (Ed.), *Historizar el pasado vivo en América Latina* [*Historicizing a live past in Latin America*] (pp.1–29). IEP.

De la Cadena, M. (2005). Are Mestixs hybrids? The conceptual politics of Andean identities. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, *37*(2), 259–284.

De la Cadena, M. (2004). *Indígenas Mestizos: Raza y cultura en el Cusco* [*Indigenous Mestizos: The politics of race and culture in Cuzco*]. IEP Ediciones. https://repositorio.iep.org.pe/server/api/core/bitstreams/3dc47bcd-f27e-474b-bc6e-aa41353de5e6/content.

Delugan, R. M. (2010). Indigeneity across borders: Hemispheric migrations and cosmopolitan encounters. *American Ethnologist, 37*(1), 83–97. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40389880

Dhamoon, R. (2015). A feminist approach to decolonizing anti-racism: Rethinking transnationalism, intersectionality, and settler colonization. *Feral Feminisms, 4,* 20–36. http://feralfeminisms.com/rita-dhamoon/

Diken, B. (1998) *Strangers, ambivalence and social theory.* Ashgate.

Dion, D., Johnston, K., & Rice, C. M. (2010). *Decolonizing our schools: Aboriginal education in the Toronto District School Board*. http://www.tdsb.on.ca/Portals/0/Community/docs/Decolonizing%20Our%20Schools%203.pdf.

Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2021). Not a nation of immigrants. *Monthly Review*, *73*(4), p. 17–30. https://doi.org/10.14452/MR-073-04-2021-08_2

Eckhardt, K., Gironda, A., Lugo, J., Oyola, W., & Uzcátegui, R. (2009). *Empresas mineras y población: Estrategias de comunicación y relacionamiento.* Universidad ESAN.

Enciclopedia del Ecuador [Ecuadorian Encyclopedia]. (n.d). *Huayna-Capac*. https://www.enciclopediadelecuador.com/geografia-del-ecuador/huayna-capac/

https://revolucioncantonaldotnet.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/encuentro-condor-aguila.pdf

Ermine, W. (1995). Aboriginal epistemology. In M. Battiste & J. Barman (Eds.), *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 101–112). UBC Press.

Espinoza Sauceda, G. (2020, March 21). *La doctrina del descubrimiento y la legislación indígena en México.* ContraLínea. https://contralinea.com.mx/analisis/social/la-doctrina-del-descubrimiento-y-la-legislacion-indigena-en-mexico/

Etcheverry, G. (2015). *Cultures of coloniality: Latina/o writing in Canada*. [unpublished doctoral dissertation]. https://curve.carleton.ca/4aa90be7-4487-4584-8b39-1384d5e6ca02.

Fachinger, P. (2014). Intersections of diaspora and indigeneity: The standoff at Kahnesatake in Lee Maracle's *Sundogs* and Tessa McWatt's *Out of My Skin*. *Canadian Literature, 220*, 74–91.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks* (Charles Lam Markmann, Trans.). Grove Press Inc. (Original work published 1952).

Fermín, T., & Eudis, F. (2010). La crisis del ciclo neoliberal en los países de la región andina. [The crisis of the neoliberal cycle in the countries of the Andean region]. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales [Journal of Social Sciences]*, *16*(4), p. 687–698. http://ve.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1315-95182010000400011&lng=en&tlng=.

Fforde, C., Bamblett, L., Lovett, R., Gorringe, S., & Fogarty, B. (2013). Discourse, deficit and identity: Aboriginality, the race paradigm and the language of representation in

contemporary Australia. *Media International Australia, 149*(1), 162–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X1314900117

First Nations Child & Family Caring Society of Canada. (2016, July). *The legacy of Duncan Campbell Scott: More than just a Canadian poet.* https://fncaringsociety-com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/sites/default/files/duncan_campbell_scott_information_sheet_final_updated.pdf

Fortier, C., & Hon-Sing Wong, E. (2019) The settler colonialism of social work and the social work of settler colonialism. *Settler Colonial Studies, 9*(4), 437–456, https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2018.1519962

Freire, P. (1970a). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Bergman Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1968).

Frideres, J. (2008). Aboriginal identity in the Canadian context. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 28*(2), 313–342.

Gaspari, M. (2020). Reflexión histórico-antropológica sobre las prácticas de consumo de alcohol en el Perú andino. [A historical-anthropological reflection on alcohol consumption practices in Andean Peru]. *Cultura y Representaciones Sociales.* [Culture and Social Representations]. *14(28).* http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2007-81102020000100001&lng=es&tlng=es.Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2012). Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1,* 41–67.

Ghorayshi, P. (2010). Diversity and interculturalism: Learning from Winnipeg's inner city. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research, 19*(1), 89–104.

Giddens, A. (1991). *The consequences of modernity*. Polity Press.

Gilmore, R. W. (2002). Fatal couplings of power and difference: Notes on racism and geography. *The Professional Geographer, 54*(1), 15–24.

Gkisedtanamoogk. (2010). Finding our way despite modernity. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships* (pp. 42–56). University of Toronto Press.

Global Alliance of Territorial Communities. (n.d). *Who we are*. https://globalalliance.me/about/

Goeman, M. (2008). From place to territories and back again: Centering storied land in the discussion of Indigenous nation-building. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies, 1*(1), 23–34.

Gombay, N. & Palomino-Schalscha, M. (2019). Indigenous Places and Colonial Spaces. The Politics of Intertwined Relations (pp. 1-30). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Gomez Ixmatá, J. (2015). Me Llaman "Latina," Aunque No Soy //Kab'iix "Latina" Chweh, Paneh Na In Latina Taj [They call me "Latina" Although I am not]. *Label Me Latina/o*, *5*, 1–11.

http://www.oci-bec.gc.ca/cnt/rpt/oth-aut/oth-aut20121022info-eng.aspx

Government of Canada. (2013). *Suicide prevention in Indigenous communities.* https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/first-nations-inuit-health/health-promotion/suicide-prevention.html

Government of Canada. (2017). *Help refugees: Volunteer and donate*. https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/refugees/about-refugee-system/welcome-syrian-refugees/volunteer-donate.html

Government of Canada (2021). *First Nations.* https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100013791/1535470872302

Government of Canada. (2022, July 18). *IRCC anti-racism strategy 2.0 (2021*-2024) – *Glossary*. https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/mandate/anti-racism-strategy/glossary.html

Government of Canada (2018). Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans – TCPS 2 (2018). https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html

Green, R. (2016). *Understanding your education: Onkwehonwe and guests responsibilities to peace friendship and mutual respect* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. OISE University of Toronto.

Green, R. (2018). What is a guest? What is a settler? *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry 10(2),* 166–177.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2014). Narrative practice and the transformation of interview Subjectivity. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti, & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 27–44). SAGE Publications. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452218403.

Gyepi-Garbrah, J., Walker, R., & Garcea, J. (2013). Indigeneity, immigrant newcomers and Interculturalism in Winnipeg, Canada. *Urban Studies, 51*(9), 1795–1811. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013502826

Hale, C. R. (2005). Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review, 28*(1), 10–28. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24497680

Harell, A., Soroka, S., & Ladner, K. (2014). Public opinion, prejudice and the racialization of welfare in Canada. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 37*(14), 2580–2597. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1080/01419870.2013.851396

Hart, M. (2010). Indigenous worldviews, knowledge, and research: The development of an Indigenous research paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work, 1*(1), 1–16.

Herzfeld, A. (2008). ¿El castellano, el quechua o el inglés?el porqué de la actitud de los estudiantes peruanos hacia estos idiomas.[Spanish, Quechua, or English? Why Peruvian students' attitudes toward these languages differ]. *Tinkuy 9,* 83–107. https://www.studocu.com/pe/document/universidad-cesar-vallejo/filosofia/dialnet-el-castellano-el-quechua-oel-ingles-3303640/36145447

Hill, R. W. Sr., & Coleman, D. (2019). The Two Row Wampum-Covenant Chain tradition as a guide for Indigenous university research partnerships. *Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies*, 19(5) 339–359. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708618809138

Horswell, M. J. (2003). Toward an Andean theory of ritual same-sex sexuality and third-gender subjectivity. In P. Sigal (Ed.), *Infamous desire: Male homosexuality in colonial Latin America* (pp. 25–69). The University of Chicago Press,

Huang, H. (2006). Blood/memory in N. Scott Momaday's *The Names*: *A Memoir* and Linda Hogan's *The Woman Who Watches over the World: A Native Memoir*. *Concentric: Literacy and Cultural Studies 32*(1), 171–195.

Institute of Human Rights and Businesses (2022, December 13). What is Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)? https://www.ihrb.org/resources/what-is-free-prior-and-informed-consent-fpic

Jafri, B. (2020). Refusal/film: Diasporic-Indigenous relationalities. *Settler Colonial Studies, 10*(1), 110–125. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2019.1677133

Kane, C. (2023, October 13). Treaty 3: Honouring its Truths. https://humanrights.ca/story/treaty-3-honouring-its-truths

Karlenzig, M. (2021, October 5). '*She's not coming back': Family members remember Mavis Ducharme and others.* APTNNews. https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/shes-not-coming-back-family-members-remember-mavis-ducharme-and-others/

Kawagley, A. O. (2010). Foreword. In R. Barnhardt & A. O. Kawagley, (Eds.). *Alaska Native education: Views from within.* Alaska Native Knowledge Network, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Kearney, M. (2000). Transnational Oaxacan Indigenous identity: The Case of Mixtecs and Zapotecs. *Identities Global Studies in Culture and Power*, *7*(2), 173–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2000.9962664

Keefer, T. (2010). Contradictions of Canadian colonization: Non-Native responses to the Six Nations reclamation at Caledonia. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships* (pp.77–90). University of Toronto Press.

King, T. (2003). *The truth about stories: A Native narrative.* House of Anansi.

Kirkness, V. J. & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four R's – respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education, 30*(3), 1–15. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24397980

Knott, E., Rao, A. H., Summers, K., & Teeger, C. (2022). Interviews in the social sciences. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers, 2*, 73. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-022-00150-6

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts.* University of Toronto Press.

Kovach, M. (2021). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts* (2nd ed.). University of Toronto Press.

Kuokkanen, R. (2008). Globalization as racialized, sexualized violence – The case of Indigenous women. *International Feminist Journal of Politics, 10*(2), 216–233.

Kuokkanen, R. (2012). Self-determination and Indigenous women's rights at the intersection of international human rights. *Human Rights Quarterly, 34*, 225–250.

Kwan, H. (2021, June 3). *Two Years On: Demanding action on the calls for justice from the National Inquiry into MMIW*. YWCA Metro Vancouver. https://ywcavan.org/blog/2021/06/two-years-demanding-action-calls-justice-national-inquiry-mmiw

Kwong, M. L. (2006). El genocidio de los Quechua en el Perú entre 1980 y 1992.[The Genocide of the Quechuas in Peru between 1980 and 1992]. *University of Wisconsin Journal of Undergraduate Research 9,* 1–5.

La Cruz Bonilla, J. (2010). Más allá de la Cholificación: Movilidad social ascendente entre los Aimaras de Unicachi en Lima. [Beyond Cholificación: Upward social mobility among the Aymaras of Unicachi in Lima]. *Debates en Sociología [Debates in Sociology], 35*, 107–132.

LaDuke, W. (1999). *All our relations: Native struggles for land and life*. Haymarket Books.

Lange, M., Mahoney, J., & vom Hau, M. (2006). Colonialism and development: A comparative analysis of Spanish and British Colonies. *American Journal of Sociology, 111*(5), 1412–1462. https://doi.org/10.1086/499510

Larraín, J. (1994). La identidad Latinoamericana teoría e historia [The Latin American identity: Theory and history]. *Estudios Públicos, 55,* 31–64.

Lavallée, L. (2009). Practical application of an Indigenous research framework and two qualitative Indigenous research methods: Sharing circles and Anishnaabe symbol-based reflection. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 21–40.

Lavallée, L., & Menzies, P. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Journey to healing: Aboriginal people with addiction and mental health issues.* CAMH.

Lawrence, B. (2017, April 20). *Canada at 150: Where is the 'truth' in the reconciliation process?* [Keynote Speech]. Transgressing the Nation-State: Constructs of Canadian Identity Conference, Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies, York University. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QuFtiFjnHis

Lawrence, B. & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing antiracism. *Social Justice, 32*(4), 120–143. https://racismandnationalconsciousnessresources.files.wordpress.com/2008/11/bonita-lawrence-decolonizing-anti-racism.pdf

Lee, J. (2016). Non-white settler and Indigenous relations: Decolonizing possibilities for social justice, *Lectora, 22*, 13–26. doi: 10.1344/Lectora2016.22.2

Leenaars, A. A., EchoHawk, M., Lester, D., & Leenaars, L. (2007). Suicide among Indigenous peoples: What does this international knowledge tell us? *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 27*(*2*), 479–501.

Légaré, E. I. (1995). Canadian multiculturalism and Aboriginal people: Negotiating a place in the nation. *Identities, 1*(4), 347–366.

Lloyd, A. S. (1972). Freire, conscientization, and adult education. *Adult Education, 23*(1), 3–20.

Lowan-Trudeau, G. (2016). A Rose by any Other Name: Repressive Tolerance, Burnout, and Hope in the New West. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education (21),* 57-71.

Ludlow, F., Baker, L., Brock, S., Hebdon, C., & Dove, M. R. (2016). The Double Binds of Indigeneity and Indigenous Resistance. *Humanities*, 5(3), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.3390/h5030053

MacDonald, C. & Steenbeek, A. (2015). The impact of colonization and western assimilation on health and wellbeing of Canadian Aboriginal people. *International Journal of Regional and Local History, 10*(1), 32–46.

Machado-Casas, M. (2012). Pedagogıas del camaleón/Pedagogies of the chameleon: Identity and strategies of survival for transnational Indigenous Latino immigrants in the US South. *Urban Review, 44,* 534–550. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-012-0206-5

Madden, B. (2019). A de/colonizing theory of truth and reconciliation education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *49*(3), 284–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2019.1624478

Manríquez S., V., & Sánchez, S. (2003). Memorias de aa sangre, memorias de la tierra. Pertenencia, identidad y memoria entre los Indígenas del Noroeste Argentino, Atacama y Chile Central Durante el período Colonial [Memories of blood, memories of the land. Belonging, identity, and memory among the Indigenous peoples of Northwest Argentina, the Atacama Desert, and Central Chile during the colonial period]. *Atacameños Studies 26*, 45–59.

Mantilla Falcón, J. (2006). La Comisión de la Verdad y Reconciliación en el Perú y la perspectiva de género: Principales logros y hallazgos [The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Peru and the gender perspective: Main achievements and findings]. *Inter-American Institute of Human Rights Magazine, 43.*

Martínez Cobo, J. (1982). *Study of the problem of discrimination against Indigenous populations.* Final Report (Supplementary Part). E/CN.4/Sub.2/1982/2/Add.6.

Martínez Cobo, J. (1986/7). *Study of the problem of discrimination against Indigenous populations.* UN Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/1986/7 and Add. 1–4

Martínez Rojas, M. F. (2015). *Comunicación intercultural y rescate de saberes y prácticas ancestrales: Estudio de caso del acompañamiento de la Asociación Bartolomé Aripaylla (ABA) en la comunidad campesina de Quispillaccta (Ayacucho)* [*Intercultural communication and rescue of the Ancestral knowledge and practices: Follow-up study of the Bartolome Association Aripaylla (ABA) in the agricultural community Quispillaccta (Ayacucho)*] [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. Pontifical Catholic University of Peru.

Martens, K. (2019, December 17). *Canada has made 'dreadful progress' in fulfilling TRC's Calls to Action*. APTN News. https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/canada-has-made-dreadful-progress-in-fulfilling-trcs-calls-to-action/

Marx, K. (1959). *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844* (Trans.). Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1844).

Massey, D. (1991). A global sense of place. *Marxism Today,* June*,* 24–29. https://eclass.hua.gr/modules/document/file.php/GEO272/MASSEY%20-%20a%20global%20sense%20of%20place.pdf

Mata, F. (2021, June 15). *Exploring the ethnic immigrant inflows from Latin America to Canada: 1981-2016.* Primer Congreso de Estudios Norteamericanos [First Congress of North American Studies]. Mexico City.

Mattié, M.(n.d.). Pachakuti: Cambios en el Mundo Andino. [Changes in the Andean World].

Centro de Estudios Políticos de Relaciones Internacionales y Desarrollo. [Centre for the Political Studies for of International Relations and Development]. http://www.nodo50.org/ceprid/img/cabeza.jpg

McLaurin, V.A. (2012). *Stereotypes of Contemporary Native American Indian Characters in Recent Popular Media*. [Unpublished Master Thesis]. University of Massachusetts Amherst, Massachusetts. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/47757

Cárdenas González. (2012). *Articulations of Blackness: Journeys of an emplaced politics in Colombia* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of California, Santa Cruz.

Mejía Huamán, M. (1997). *La cosmovisión Andina y las categorias Quechuas como fundamentos para una filosofía Peruana y de America Andina* [*Andean worldviews and the Quechua categories as fundamentals for the Peruvian and an Andean American philosophy*]. 49th International Congress of the Americas, 7 July 1997. Quito, Ecuador. https://naya.com.ar/congresos/contenido/49CAI/Huaman.htm

Mignolo, W. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and de-colonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society, 26*(7–8), 1–23.

Mignolo, W. (2016, November 3-5). *Politics of memory and reconciliation* [Keynote]. 8th Annual Decolonizing Conference. OISE, University of Toronto.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Ministry of Culture of Peru. (n.d.). *Base de datos de pueblos Indigenas u orriginarios*. [Database of Quechua communities and original peoples]. http://bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/pueblos/quechuas

Mining Watch Canada. (2022, June 13). Indigenous people protest opening of world's largest mining fair. https://miningwatch.ca/news/2022/6/13/Indigenous-people-protest-opening-world-s-largest-mining-fair

Molinari Morales, T.A. (2008). Sobre la nvisibilización y las representaciones de lo Indígena en el Perú [On the invisibility and the representations of the Indigenous in Peru]. *Investigaciones Sociales, 12*(20), 217–227.

Monachesi, M. (2008). *Profecias Incas. Asombro y sabiduria en tiempos de cambio* [*Inca prophecies: Astonishment and wisdom in times of change*]. Editorial Kier.

Montoya, R. (1975). Colonización y antropologia en Peru [Colonization and anthropology in Peru]. *Nueva Antropologia, 1*(2), 23–42. https://antropologiaunfv.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/colonialismo-y-antropologia-en-el-perc3b9-rodrigo-montoya.pdf

Moreno Figueroa, M. G. (2010). Distributed intensities: Whiteness, mestizaje and the logics of Mexican racism. *Ethnicities, 10*(3), 387–401. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1177/1468796810372305

Morgensen, S. L. (2014, May 26). White settlers and Indigenous solidarity: Confronting white supremacy, answering decolonial alliances. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*. https://decolonization.wordpress.com/2014/05/26/white-settlers-and-Indigenous-solidarity-confronting-white-supremacy-answering-decolonial-alliances/

Narine, S. (2022, January 7). Justice delayed, justice denied, say families of murdered Indigenous women as Alberta announces completion of final MMIWG report. *The Toronto Star*. https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2022/01/07/justice-delayed-justice-

denied-say-families-of-murdered-Indigenous-women-as-alberta-announces-completion-of-final-mmiwg-report.html

Nelson, R. (2019). Beyond Dependency: Economic Development, Capacity Building, and Generational Sustainability for Indigenous People in Canada. *SAGE Open*, *9*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019879137

Niezen, R. (2003). *The origins of indigenism: Human rights and the politics of identity*. University of California Press.

Noejovich, H. O. (2020). La transición del sistema prehispánico al sistema económico colonial. Economía del período colonial temprano.[The transition from the pre-Hispanic to the colonial economic system. Economy of the early colonial period]. In C. Contreras (Ed.), *Compendio de Historia Económica del Perú. [Compendium of Economic History of Peru]. Vol 2.* (pp. 40–57). Banco Central de Reserva del Perú.

Noriega Rivera, P. (2010). *El vuelo del aguila y el Condor: Historia de un Yachak.* [*The flight of the eagle and the condor: A story of a Yachak*]. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Politechnic Salle University.

Nunavut Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services Division. (2008). *Inuglugijaittuq: Foundation for inclusive education in Nunavut Schools.* https://www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/publications/2022-03/inuglugijaittuq_eng.pdf

Oboler, S. (1996). *El mundo es racista y ajeno. orgullo y prejuicio en la sociedad Limeña contemporánea* [*The world is racist and alien. pride and prejudice in contemporary Lima society*]. IEP Ediciones

Oelschlegel, A. (2006). El informe final de la Comisión de la Verdad y Reconciliación en el Perú. Un resumen crítico respecto a los avances de sus recomendaciones [The final report

of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Peru: A critical summary of the progress of its recommendations]. *Anuario de Derecho Constitucional Latinoamericano [Yearbook of Latin American Constitutional Law]. (12)*2, 1335–1368. https://vlex.com.co/vid/informe-final-comision-verdad-1076209201.

Office of the Correctional Investigator (2013). *Backgrounder. Aboriginal offenders: A critical situation*.
https://oci-bec.gc.ca/en/content/backgrounder-aboriginal-offenders-critical-situation

Onondaga Nation, People of the Hills. (n.d.). *Two Row Wampum – Gaswéñdah.* https://www.onondaganation.org/culture/wampum/two-row-wampum-belt-guswenta/

Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants. (2017). *Growing gap: Immigrants, racialized residents in the 2016 Census*. https://ocasi.org/growing-gap-immigrants-racialized-residents-2016-census

Ontario Newsroom. (2021, September 29). *Ontario to strengthen mandatory Indigenous learning in school curriculum.* https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/1000904/ontario-to-strengthen-mandatory-Indigenous-learning-in-school-curriculum

Ortiz, P. (2022*). El Mundo Indígena 2022: Ecuador*. [*Indigenous Peoples in Ecuador: 2022*]. International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. https://iwgia.org/es/ecuador/4786-mi-2022-ecuador.html#_ednref1

Parveen N. (2013, November 7). *Discrimination experienced by landed immigrants in Canada.* RCIS Working Paper 2013/7. Ryerson Centre for Immigration & Settlement, Ryerson University. https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/centre-for-immigration-and-settlement/tmcis/publications/workingpapers/2013_7_Nangia_Parveen_Discrimination_Experienced_by_Landed_Immigrants_in_Canada.pdf

Paz Campuzano, O. (2022). Perspectiva léxico-semántica de lo cholo en *Lima, hora cero* y *Kikuyo* de Enrique Congrains. [A lexical-semantic perspective of the cholo in *Lima, hora cero* and *Kikuyo* by Enrique Congrains]. *Lengua y Sociedad. Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* [*Journal of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*], *21*(2), 567–582. https://doi.org/10.15381/lengsoc.v21i2.23283

Pazos, P. J. (2016). Discriminación socio-racial y racista en la educación peruana: Una mirada desde los maestros en Lima [Socio-racial and racist discrimination in Peruvian education: A view from the teachers in Lima]. *Investigaciones Sociales [Social Research],* 20(36), 15–25.

Peredo Beltrán, E. (2004). *Una aproximación a la problemática de género y etnicidad en América Latina*. [*An approximation to the problematic of gender and ethnicity in Latin America*]. Naciones Unida. Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL). *Unidad Mujer y Desarrollo*

Perez-Frausto, C. (2012). *The experiences of immigrants from Mexico who speak Indigenous languages: A sociocultural and postcolonial perspective on language, culture, and identity* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Chapman University.

Petrović, G. (1963). Marx's theory of alienation. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 23*(3), 419-426.https://www.jstor.org/stable/2105083?origin=crossref

Pineda, E. (2017). Esclavitud, colonizationo y racism discursive en America Latina [Slavery, colonization and discursive racism in Latin America]. *Religacion: Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, (2)*5, 237–254.

Premji, S., Shakya, Y., Spasevski, M., Merolii, J., & Athar, S. (2014). Precarious work experiences of racialized immigrant women in Toronto: A community-based study. *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society, 22*, 122–143.

Quijano, A. (1980). *Dominacion y cultura: Lo Cholo y el conflict cultural en Perú* [*Domination and culture: The Cholo and the cultural conflict in Peru*]. Mosca Azul Editors.

Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2-3), 168–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353

Quijano, A. (2014). "Bien vivir": Entre el "desarrollo" y la des/colonialidad del poder [Good living: Between the development and the de/coloniality of power]. In *Cuestiones y horizontes:De la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder* [*Issues and horizons: from historical-structural dependence to coloniality/decoloniality of power*]. CLACSO.
http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/se/20140507045047/eje3-10.pdf Quispe, A. (January, 12, 2012). Caminos de Wayra.
https://caminoswayra.wordpress.com/author/karisan2011/

Ramsay, N. J. (2014). Intersectionality: A model for addressing the complexity of oppression and privilege. *Pastoral Psychology, 63*, 453–469 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-013-0570-4

Real People's Media. (2016, Dec. 5). *The Inca prophecy of the Eagle and the Condor*. http://realpeoples.media/the-inca-prophecy-of-the-eagle-and-the-condor/

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

Reierson, S. (2007). *A case study of two Indigenous Honduran immigrants in the US: Utilizing English and service-oriented cultural capital to transform borders and re-envision their roles in society* (Publication No. 3298158). [Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico] ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Reierson, S., & Celedón-Pattichis, S. (2014). Transforming experience through English use and service-oriented cultural capital: Indigenous Honduran immigrants to the U.S. Southwest. *Latin American Perspectives*, *41*(3), 208–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X14524361

Rensink, B. (2010). *Native but foreign: Indigenous transnational refugees and immigrants in the U.S.-Canadian and U.S.-Mexican borderlands, 1880-present* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Nebraska.

Restoule, J. P. (n.d.). *Indigenous worldviews: Understanding Indigenous perspectives*. [PowerPoint slides]. Indigenous Education Research Centre, University of Toronto. https://www.oise.utoronto.ca/abed101/Indigenous-worldviews/

Restrepo Botero, D. I. (2015). Neoliberales y empresarios en la emergencia de la descentralización en la Bolivia de los 90 [Neoliberals and entrepreneur in the emergence of decentralization in the Bolivia of 90s]. *Revista de Historia Regional y Local 7*(14), 320–351.

Ribadeneira, C. (2001). *El racismo en el Ecuador contemporáneo: Entre la modernidad y el fundamentalismo étnico: El discurso del otro*. [*Racism in contemporary Ecuador: Between modernity and ethnic fundamentalism: The other's speech*]. Abya Yala.

Rice, J. (2011, April 9). *Indian Residential School Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Cultural Survival.

https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/indian-residential-school-truth-and-reconciliation

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. (2012). Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization. *The South Atlantic Quarterly, 111*(1), 95–109. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-1472612

Rivera-Salgado, G. (2014). Transnational Indigenous communities: The intellectual legacy of Michael Kearney. *Latin American Perspectives*, *41*(3), 26–46. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24573913

Robyn, L. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and technology: Creating environmental justice in the twenty-first century. *American Indian Quarterly, 26*(2), 198–220. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4128459

Rocke, C. (2017, June). *What does reconciliation mean to new Canadians post-TRC?* [Paper presentation]. CASWE Congress, Toronto, ON.

Rodríguez García, H. (2011). Mestizaje y conflictos sociales: El caso de la construcción nacional boliviana. [Mestizaje and social conflicts: The case of Bolivian national construction] *Cuadernos Inter.c.a.Mbio Sobre Centroamérica Y El Caribe*, [*Exchange notebooks on Central America and the Caribbean*] *8*(9), 145–182. https://revistas.ucr.ac.cr/index.php/intercambio/article/view/2204

Rodríguez Mir, J. (2008). Indigenous movements in Latin America. Resistances and alterities in a global world. *Gazeta de Antropología, 24*(2), 37. http://hdl.handle.net/10481/6928

Romero, A., & Vera Colina, M. A. (2014). Las empresas transnacionales y los países en desarrollo. *Tendencias 15*(2), 58–89.

Rossiter, A. (2001). Innocence lost and suspicion found: Do we educate for or against social work? *Critical Social Work, 2*(1), 1–6.

Ruiz Leotaud, V. (2021, January 24). *Peru rescinds Canadian company's exploration rights*. Mining.com. https://www.mining.com/peru-rescinds-canadian-companys-exploration-rights/

Russell-Mundine, G. (2012). Reflexivity in Indigenous research: Reframing and decolonising research? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 19*(1), 85–90, https://doi.org/10.1017/jht.2012.8 .

Salazar-Soler, C. (2020). Minería y moneda en la época colonial temprana. [Mining and Currency in the Early Colonial Era] In C. Contreras. (Ed.), *Economía del Período Colonial Temprano: Compendio de historia económica del Perú* [Economy of the Early Colonial Period: Compendium of the economic history of Peru] (Vol 2). (p. 170). Banco Central de Reserva del Perú.

Schachter, H. (2012, June 18). What does it take to be a good team player? *The Globe and Mail*, B7.

Scholz, S. J. (2009). Feminist political solidarity. In L. Tessman (Ed.), *Feminist ethics and social and political philosophy: Theorizing the non-ideal*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6841-6_12

Schugurensky, D. & Ginieniewicz, J. (2007). *The Latin American community in Canada: Some challenges ahead*. Diálogos. http://dialogos.ca/2007/07/the-latin-american-community-in-canada-some-challenges-ahead/

Schultz, C. (2017). Between discomfort and comfort: Towards language that creates space for social change. *Philosophical Inquiry in Education*, *24*(3), 266–272.

Servindi. (2018, September 10). *El 60,2% de los Peruanos se identifican como Mestizos. 25 % originarios* [*60.2% of Peruvians identify as Mestizos. 25% as Indigenous*]. https://www.servindi.org/actualidad-noticias/10/09/2018/6-de-cada-10-peruanos-se-consideran-mestizos

Sharma, N., & Wright, C. (2008). Decolonizing resistance: Challenging colonial states. *Social Justice, 35*(3), 120–138.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states.* Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1198w8z

Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back.* Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Sinclair, E. (2021). Indigenous reintegrative shaming: A comparison of Indigenous legal traditions of Canada and Braithwaite's theory of reintegrative shaming. *Bridges: An Undergraduate Journal of Contemporary Connections 5*, (1). https://scholars.wlu.ca/bridges_contemporary_connections/vol5/iss1/5

Singh, K. (2021, July 1). *Citizenship study guide remains outdated in its 'simplistic' account of Indigenous history, critics say.* CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/canadians-waiting-citizenship-guide-1.6084736

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Research and Indigenous peoples: Decolonizing methodologies.* Zed Books Press.

Snelgrove, C., Dhamoon, R. K., & Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 3*(2), 1–32.

Soria, K. (2020). *History of the first Kichwas in the Amazonia.* https://prezi.com/wzidyl5ogq9a/parque-nacional-yasuni/?fallback=1

Soria Choque, V. (2009). Colonización mental: Mecanismos de adaptación y fragmentación psicológica del andino-mestizo. [Mental colonization: Adaptation mechanisms and psychological fragmentation of the Andean-Mestizo]. *Revista de Investigacion Psychologica, 5*, 85–94.

Statistics Canada. (2009). *Immigration in Canada: A portrait of foreign-born population, 2006 census: Immigration: Driver of Population Growth.* https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-557/index-eng.cfm

Statistics Canada. (2016, April). *Study: Living arrangements of Aboriginal children aged 14 and under, 2011.* https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/160413/dq160413a-eng.htm

Stollery, B. (2018, May 18). Canada's Digital Divide: Preserving Indigenous Communities means Bringing them Online. *The Toronto Star.* https://www.thestar.com/opinion/contributors/canada-s-digital-divide-preserving-indigenous-communities-means-bringing-them-online/article_a06bab5a-3140-54e6-b59f-f3e3405ba8e8.html

Suarez, E. B., & Suarez, C. (2015). The memorialisation of narratives and sites among Indigenous women in Ayacucho: Resilience in the aftermath of mass violence and atrocities. *Resilience, 4*(2), 98–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2015.1094173

Suzack, C. (2021). Reckoning with Indigenous solidarity. *American Literary History, 33*(1), 133–148.

Swamp, J. (2010). Kanikonriio: Power of a good mind. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships* (pp.15–24). University of Toronto Press.

Sylvestre, P., Castleden, H., Denis, J., Martin, D., & Bombay, A. (2019). The tools at their fingertips: How settler colonial geographies shape medical educators' strategies for grappling with Anti-Indigenous racism. *Social Science & Medicine*, *237*(Sept), 112363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112363

Tait, C. L. (2013). Resituating the ethical gaze: Government morality and the local worlds of impoverished Indigenous women. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health, 72,* 1–6. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23986898/

Tenenbaum, S. & Singer, K. (2018). Borders of belonging: Challenges in access to anti-oppressive mental health care for Indigenous Latinx gender-fluid border-youth. *AlterNative. 14*(3), 245–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180118785

Ticona Alejo, E. (2003). Pueblos Indigenas y estado boliviano. [Indigenous towns and Bolivian state]. *Gazeta de Antropologia 19*(10), 1–7.

Tiessen, R., & Heron, B. (2012). Volunteering in the developing world: The perceived impacts of Canadian youth. *Development in Practice, 22*(1), 44–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2012.630982

Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.

Thorp, R., & Paredes, M. (2010). *La etnicidad y la persistencia de la desigualdad: El caso Peruano*. [Ethnicity and the Persistence of Inequality: The Peruvian Case. Institute of Peruvian Studies]. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos. [Institute of Peruvian Studies].

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

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation*

Commission of Canada: Calls to action. https://exhibits.library.utoronto.ca/items/show/2420.

Tuck, E. (2016, November 5). *Politics of memory and reconciliation* [Keynote speaker]. 8th Annual Decolonizing Conference. OISE, University of Toronto. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1kqbywXKEyA

Tuck, E., & McKenzie, M. (2014). Relational validity and the 'where' of inquiry: Place and land in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*(7), 633–638. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414563809

Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1–40.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2009). *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples: Introduction*.

Universidad Pontificia Católica de Chile [Pontifical Catholic University of Chile]. (n.d). *Organización política y social* [*Political and social organization*]. https://www7.uc.cl/sw_educ/historia/conquista/parte1/html/h72.html

University of British Columbia. (n.d). *Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls, & Two-Spirit (MMIWG2S)*. https://guides.library.ubc.ca/mmiwg

Urrieta Jr., L. (2016). Diasporic community smartness: Saberes (knowings) beyond schooling and borders. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 19*(6), 1186–1199.

U. S. Department of Homeland Security. (2008). *Yearbook of immigration statistics: 2007.* Washington D.C. https://ohss.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/2023-12/ois_2007_yearbook.pdf.

Vela Belarde, C. (2014). Mestizaje y etnicidad en la construcción de la identidad cultural en

el Perú [Mestizaje and ethnicity in the construction of cultural identity in Peru]. *La Vida & la Historia [Life & history]*, 3, 70–85. https://doi.org/10.33326/26176041.2014.3.375

Vergara Estévez, J., & Vergara del Solar, J. (2002). Cuatro tesis sobre la identidad cultural Latinoamericana: Una reflexión sociológica [Four theses about Latin American's cultural identity: A sociological reflection]. *Revista Ciencias Sociales*, *12*, 77–92

Waddington, R. (2016). *Los Quechua*. The Peoples of the World Foundation. http://www.Peoplesoftheworld.org/quichua/quechuaes.jsp

Wade, P. (2001). Racial identity and nationalism: A theoretical view from Latin America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 24*(5), 845–865.

Waters, R. (2010) Understanding allyhood as a developmental process. *About Campus, 15*(5), 2–8. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.20035

Watson, I. (2014). Re-centering First Nations knowledge and places in a Terra Nullius space. *AlterNative, 10*(5), 508–520. https://doi.org/10.1177/117718011401000506

Watson, K. (2020). *Understanding Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives of reconciliation: A case study* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The University of Western Ontario.

Weaver, J. (1997). Native American studies, Native American literature, and communitism. *Ayaangwaamizin, 1*(2), 23–33.

Whitinui, P., McIvor, O., Robertson, B., Morcom, L., & Cashman, K. (2015). The World Indigenous Research Alliance (WIRA): Mediating and mobilizing Indigenous Peoples' educational knowledge and aspirations. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*, 120. http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.2052.

Wilderson III, F. B. (2010). *Red, white & black: Cinema and the structure of U.S. Antagonisms*.

Duke University Press

Williams, M. T., Khanna, R. A., MacIntyre, M. P., & Faber, S. (2022). The traumatizing impact of racism in Canadians of colour. *Current Trauma Reports, 8*(2), 17–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40719-022-00225-5

Willows, N. D., Veugelers, P., Raine, K., & Kuhle, S. (2009). Prevalence and sociodemographic risk factors related to household food security in Aboriginal peoples in Canada. *Public Health Nutrition*, *12*(8), 1150–1156. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980008004345

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

Wilson, C. L, Flicker, S. & Restoule, J. P. (2015). Beyond the colonial divide: African diasporic and Indigenous youth alliance building for HIV prevention. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 4*(2), 76–102.

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

Wylie, L. & McConkey, S. (2019). Insiders' Insight: Discrimination against Indigenous Peoples through the Eyes of Health Care Professionals. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities (6).* 37-45. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40615-018-0495-9

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.

Zaffaroni, R. E. (2015). Latin American law in the higher phase of the colonialism. *Passagens – International Journal of Political History and Legal Culture (7)*2, 182–243. doi: 10.15175/1984-2503-20157201

Zea, L. (1985). Busqueda de la indentidad Latinoamericana [Search for the Latin American identity]. In *El problema de la identidad Latinoamericana* [*The identity problem in Latin America*] (pp. 11–31). Ciudad de Mexico: Nuestra America.

Zuber-Skerritt, O., Wood, L., & Kearney, J. (2020). The transformative potential of action learning in community-based research for social action. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, *17*(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767333.2020.1712840

Appendix A: Recruitment Poster

Invitación A la Comunidad Quechua, Qheshwa, Kechwa, Runa Simi, Quichua y Mestiza

Si se identifica como:

-Quechua, Qheshwa, Kechwa, Runa Simi,Quichua o Mestizx (de raíces Quechuas)

-Viene de un país con raíces Quechuas; vive en Toronto por 5 cinco años o más

-Habla Español; mayor de 18 años

Les invito a participar a tres sesiones pequeñas de charlas para compartir sus pensamientos sobre: la identidad Indígena Quechua después de venir a Canadá; establecer relaciones de colaboración con la gente Indígena de Canadá

Se ofrece un incentivo de 10$ por asistir a cada charla. Son tres charlas. Si asiste a las tres charlas, se ofrece 10 dólares adicionales; tokens incluidos

Soy Brenda Polar, Mestiza nacida en Lima, Perú. Estoy completando mi doctorado en trabajo social en la Universidad de York. Estas charlas son parte de mi tesis.

Preguntas: escríbame por favor brendapolar@hotmail.com

Recruitment Poster Translation

INVITATION TO THE QUECHUA, QHESHWA, KECHSWA, RUNA SIMI, QUICHWA, KICHWA AND MESTIZA COMMUNITIES

If you identify as:

- Quechua, Qheshwa, Kechswa, Runa Simi, Quichwa, Kichwa and Mestiza communities
- Come from a country where Quechua people are from
- Have lived in Toronto for at least 5 years
- Speak Spanish

You are invited to 3 discussion groups to talk about:

- Your Indigenous identity after moving to the Canadian State
- Forming collaborations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations

An incentive of $10 for each discussion group. If you attend all 3 groups, there will be an additional $10 for all your time. There will be a dinner after the last group. Tokens will be offered.

I am Brenda Polar, Mestiza, borne in Lima, Peru. I am completing my Doctorate degree in Social Work at York University. These discussions are part of the thesis.

Questions? Please email me at brendapolar@hotmail.com

Appendix B: Cholo Soy y No Me Compadezcas

Cholo Soy y No Me Compadezcas (translation below)

Cholo soy y no me compadezcas
Que esas son monedas que no valen nada
Y que dan los blancos como quien da plata
Nosotros los cholos no pedimos nada
Pues faltando todo, todo nos alcanza
Déjame en la puna, vivir a mis anchas
Trepar por los cerros detrás de mis cabras
Arando la tierra, tejiendo los ponchos, pastando mis llamas
Y echar a los vientos la voz de mi quena
Dices que soy triste
¿Qué quieres que haga?
No dicen ustedes que el cholo es sin alma
Y que es como piedra, sin voz, sin palabra
Y llora por dentro, sin mostrar las lágrimas
Acaso no fueron los blancos venidos de España
Que nos dieron muerte por oro y por plata
No hubo un tal Pizarro que mató a Atahualpa
Tras muchas promesas, bonitas y falsas
¿Entonces qué quieres, qué quieres que haga?
Que me ponga alegre como día de fiesta
Mientras mis hermanos doblan las espaldas
Por cuatro centavos que el patrón les paga
Quieres que me ría
Mientras mis hermanos son bestias de carga
Llevando riquezas que otros se guardan
Quieres que la risa me ensanche la cara
Mientras mis hermanos viven en las montañas como topos
Escarba y escarba
Mientras se enriquecen los que no trabajan
Quieres que me alegre
Mientras mis hermanas van a casas de ricos
Lo mismo que esclavas
Cholo soy y no me compadezcas
Déjame en la puna, vivir a mis anchas
Trepar por los cerros detrás de mis cabras
Arando la tierra, tejiendo los ponchos, pastando mis llamas
Y echar a los vientos la voz de mi quena

Déjame tranquilo, que aquí la montaña
Me ofrece sus piedras, acaso más blandas
Que esas condolencias que tú me regalas

Translation to English

I'm Cholo, and Don't Pity Me
I'm cholo[1], and don't you pity me.
Those coins you carry, they have no value.
they hand them to me, as if they were money
Us cholos, we ask for nothing
Since we need of anything
Everything's all we have
Leave me be at the puna, to live as I know how
to hike up the hills, trail behind my goats
till up the farmland, knit plenty of ponchos and feed my llamas
bestow the wind with the sound of my quena
You pity my life, but what am I to do?
Wasn't it you who said cholos are soulless,
made of stone, lacking words and a voice
and cry inside, hide their tears by choice
Wasn't it the white ones, hailing from Spain
they rained death upon us to rake in our gold,
Wasn't there a Pizarro that killed Atahualpa
all those promises made, so grand yet hollow
So, what do you want? What is it you want me to do?
That I shout for joy as if I were partying,
while my brothers break their backs
to get paid only four cents for their work
You want me to laugh,
while my brothers act as bag mules
bringing riches for others to hoard
You want bliss splattered on my face
while my brothers at the mountains live like moles
digging night and day,
while the rich get richer without breaking a sweat
You want me to smile
while my sisters go to their patrons' homes
as if they were enslaved.
I'm cholo, and don't you pity me
Leave me be at the puna, to live as I know how

to hike up the hills, trail behind my goats
till up the farmland, knit plenty of ponchos and feed my llamas
bestow the wind with the sound of my quena
Let me live here, up with the mountain
it offers me stones, some might even be softer
than those condolences you dish out at me
        I'm cholo, and don't you pity me!

Appendix C: Sample of Electronic Mail for Recruitment

Good afternoon, my name is Brenda Polar. I am originally from Lima, Peru. I am very interested in exploring our Indigenous roots and ways to build bridges between Indigenous cultures from the South and the North. I am interested in this topic at the personal level as I explore my Mestiza roots (Quechua and European) while holding a settler identity. At an academic level, I am pursuing my doctoral degree in Social Work at York University and my research area examines these topics in particular.

My dissertation research explores the complexities and barriers to collaboration amongst Indigenous immigrants from the South and Indigenous Peoples from the North. I focus on one particular settler population living in the Canadian State: Quechua people. Quechua people originally come from the Andes of South America in territories that are presently known as Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia and to a lesser degree, Colombia, Chile and Argentina.

My dissertation research has received approval from my supervisor, Chris Chapman, Social Work professor at York University.

The reason for this email is to ask for your help in recruiting participants. I am looking for 14 -18 participants to attend discussion groups. They would be split into two groups of 7-9 participants. The first group will consist of people ages 18-25. The second group consists of people ages 25 and older. Each group will attend 3 discussion groups that will take place during the summer/fall and will last 1.5 hours each.

The Inclusion criteria for this group are the following:

The participants need to be 18 years old and over who identify as Quechua or Mestizx (having Quechua roots and European or other roots). They may identify as cis-man, cis-woman, non-binary, transgendered, or none of these categories. They must speak fluent Spanish and will have been living in the Canadian state for a minimum of 5 years. Before moving to Canada, the participants will have lived in countries where Quechua people are originally from.

The exclusion criteria will be participants who do not have Quechua roots, and before moving to the Canadian state, have lived in countries other than those where Quechua people are originally from.

There will be an inducement of 10 dollars for attending each discussion group. An additional inducement of 10 dollars will be offered to participants who completed three discussion groups for the time they have given to the study. Tokens will be provided. A dinner will be offered in the last group.

In the case that you know of any potential participants could you ask them if they will be interested in participating in the study. If they are, could you ask them permission for me to contact them.

Thank you so much for your help. Should you have any questions, please contact me through e-mail or phone at 647 468 3450. Feel free to share this information with any potential participants.

Sincerely,

Brenda Polar

Appendix D: Discussion Prompting Questions

Question 1: What are the Quechua people's views and understanding of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, and their relations to these populations?

Discussion Prompting Questions:

- What is your understanding of First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations, the original people who have been living here and caring for these lands?
- What are some of your relations to First Nations, Métis and Inuit populations?
- What does the Two-Row Wampum Belt mean to you? How do you see it applying to you?
- As an Indigenous person, how do you view your place here in these lands that have been cared for by First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations?
- What are your relations to these lands? People who are coming to Indigenous lands are often referred to as settlers. Under this concept, we come to be settlers and in some way, consciously or not, we end up supporting settler colonization.
- What are some of your thoughts about this settler identity we take on when coming here, considering that we are also Indigenous and have fought colonization at various levels back home?

Question 2 How can these understandings facilitate our partaking in decolonizing collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations?

Question 3: How can Indigeneity be used as a bridge to facilitate the potential collaboration of Quechua people with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nationss in Canada?

Discussion Prompting Questions

- What does this prophecy mean to you? How do you see it applying to you?
- One of the main roots of the conflicts Indigenous Peoples in the Canadian State experience stems from settler colonialism. If we follow this prophecy and realize that we, as people from the South, need to unite with people from the North, what do you think needs to change for this union to happen?
- Do you know of any folk stories/ teachings that can be used to guide these changes?
- What do we need to consider as settlers living in the lands of other Indigenous populations?
- What do you see as some of the responsibilities we have as Quechua Peoples towards First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations?
- First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations talk about needing non-Indigenous people to contribute to decolonizing projects. Decolonization refers to the repatriation and sovereignty of Indigenous Peoples and their lands. What do you think about this?

- Participating in decolonizing collaboration would be a way of bringing the Eagle and Condor together. Do you see Quechua people as collaborating with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations in Canada? Why? Or Why not?
- Do you think that sharing an Indigenous identity strengthens the possibility of Quechua immigrants participating in decolonizing collaboration with First Nations, Métis and Inuit Nations? How so?