

*The issues we raised in regards to Changing Your World: Investigating Empowerment, by Sharon Sterling, and published by Oxford Canada, 2005 have never been fully addressed, and the textbook was published without incorporating or addressing the majority of our suggestions.*

*Note that I was not provided with the full text of the draft in December of 2004 so the January '05 review includes comments on text only up to p. 128 and the textbook is over 300 pages. The missing sections never came to me afterward though I was constantly trying to reach the APC. I did not hear from them until sometime in May or June and then only to find out that the text had been published and that the APC would be putting off having a meeting of the committee until September. That also did not happen until March 2006.*

## **Changing Your World: Investigating Empowerment** **Suggestions for Final Draft January, 2005**

\* new points raised by the December text

### **p. 6 - The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms: Main Ideas**

*August text: Aboriginal peoples have the right to have their treaty rights recognized*

*Our revision: Aboriginal peoples have the right have their treaties and aboriginal rights recognized and respected. (Aboriginal rights are their rights to their source of life in the land.) **NOT ACCEPTED***

*December text: “The Charter also guarantees that nothing within it takes away from Aboriginal treaty or other rights or freedoms described in other parts of the constitution”*

**1.) Our January comment: This conflates aboriginal and treaty rights, which are two separate things, and it provides no explanation or definition as to what they are.**

### **p. 10 - Economic Empowerment**

*August text: Economics is the study of how people work to create wealth. It includes how we produce, distribute, and consume goods and services. Economic empowerment comes from having enough resources to take care of your needs.*

*Our revision: Economics is the study of how we produce, distribute, and consume goods and services. Economic empowerment comes from having enough resources to take care of your needs. **NOT ACCEPTED***

**2.) Our January comment and suggestion: Our concern with this definition is that it is biased towards the western pattern of those who work for money, especially surplus money known as profit, which the word wealth or wealthy implies. A.) Not everyone values being wealthy; and b.) many people in the world still live off the land for their survival and do not need money for everything they need. So your definition is not inclusive since the study of the way of life of the people who do not work for wealth (as either money or profit) is still economics. In this way your definition of economics is seriously biased against the aboriginal form**

of life which does not value wealth and which is still in many places derived directly from the land. Our point, therefore, is that economics is NOT ONLY the study of how people work to create wealth but more inclusively a study of how people provide for their basic needs. Or put another way, your second sentence should be your first.

**Our January suggestion:** *“Economics is the study of how we produce, distribute, and consume goods and services. This could include how some people work living off the land and how others work for wages to earn money to buy what they need.*

*August text:* *In Canada today, wealth is most often distributed through a system in which people work to earn money. They then use the money they earn to buy what they need. In this system, people with less money may have fewer choices when it comes to needs such as food, shelter, clothing, and education.*

**Our revision:** *In Canada today, people’s needs are met through a system in which people work to earn money. They then use the money they earn to buy what they need. In this system, people with less money have fewer choices when it comes to needs such as food, shelter, clothing, and education.* **NOT ACCEPTED**

**3.) Our January comment and suggestion:** The latest version of this sentence is unchanged in that it maintains the focus on wealth as that which is shared, when in fact most wealth in Canada is not shared or distributed. Otherwise, we would not have so much poverty alongside so much wealth. A better statement of this point, which would also improve even on our revision would be: *“In Canada today, people are expected to meet their needs through a system in which people work to earn money. They then use the money they earn to buy what they need. In this system, people with less money have fewer choices when it comes to needs such as food, shelter, clothing, and education.*

## **p. 11 - Political Empowerment**

*August text:* *Politics is a general term for all things we do to organize ourselves and make decisions in our schools, communities, and countries.*

**Our revision:** *Politics is a general term for all things we do to organize ourselves and make decisions in our schools, communities, and nations.* **NOT ACCEPTED**

**4.) Our January comment:** We strongly prefer the word “nations” over “countries” a.) so that students will come to understand the word “First Nations” and b.) because the word nation implies a political unit as opposed to country which could simply mean the terrain in a particular area.

## **p. 12 - National Empowerment**

*August text:* *If there are conflicts in the world, a nation must be free to decide for itself whether or not to go to war. [Canada is respected in the world because of its history of treating peoples and other nations fairly.] –*

**Our August suggestion:** From a First Nations perspective this is untrue. Should be omitted unless you add a sentence here regarding the treatment of First Nations.

**SUGGESTION ACCEPTED by omitting the comment altogether**

**Our August suggestion:** Add box on First Nations regarding National Empowerment, i.e., [The many First Nations in Canada had governments of their own for

thousands of years before Europeans arrived here. As Nations, they made treaties with the King of England. these treaties governed the relationship between First Nations and the Canadian Nation, and they are still law today. However, Canada has passed laws such as the Indian Act which has seriously infringed on the right of First Nations to govern themselves.] **NOT ACCEPTED**

**5.) Our January comment:** Some information to this effect is essential, if not here, at least in the section dealing with the Indian Act, but we still have not received that part of the book in order to make an assessment on this point.

## **p. 15 - Disempowerment**

December text: *People who are disempowered believe they have little control over their lives.*

**6.) Our January comment:** To suggest that people who are “disempowerment” (the euphemism for racism, oppression, etc.) only “feel” or “think” that they have no control over their lives completely dismisses the reality of such “disempowerment”. It is not that they “believe” they have no power, but simply that they do not, in fact, have much, if any, power or control over their lives. In reducing the oppression to merely how people “feel” or “think” ignores the fact that disempowerment is caused by external forces, either an invading force or an exploitive or racist political or economic system. If text avoids stating a problem directly and continues imputing problems to how people feel and think students will never understand the sources of “disempowerment” and will never have the knowledge needed to “empower” themselves. So any statements imputing any problems to how a people think or feel seems to be totally contradictory and self-defeating in a book on “empowerment”.

Our August revision: [First Nations and Disempowerment] Add- When Europeans came to Canada they helped themselves to the lands and resources upon which Aboriginal Peoples depended - without paying or asking permission. This theft [or unlawful taking] of their lands and resources was the cause of starvation, disease, and poverty for First Nations that continues today.] **NOT ACCEPTED**

**7.) Our January comment:** This topic would be most appropriate in this section because the situation our paragraph describes is ongoing and current in the news. However, we would accept this information not being here if it were included elsewhere in the book. We expect to see it in the sections we still have not received. We would also accept having the information placed in a box representing the Aboriginal point of view, if only to have all the facts available to students. To omit it altogether would be to deprive students of important understandings relevant to almost to daily news in Canada.

## **p. 21 – Become an Active Citizen**

Our August comment: We wanted a box about how Canada imposed citizenship on First Nations and why. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**8.) Our January Comment:** If not here this information must be supplied somewhere else in the book.

## p. 24 - Economies in History

August version: *When we look back in history, we can see that the way people answer these questions depends a lot on the kinds of technologies they use. Economists often categorize economies based on whether or not they use manufacturing technologies to produce goods for sale. An economy that uses this type of technology is called an industrial economy.*

Our August suggestion: *“An economy that uses this type of technology is called an industrial economy, and it was made possible through the development of capitalism.”* Pre-Industrial should be replaced with Traditional. Industrial should be replaced with Capitalist/ Industrial. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**9.) Our January comment:** We believe it is a disservice to students to be provided an overview of economic history without using the word capitalism. We would also find the chart on p. 24 to be confusing, misleading, and inaccurate:

To put food and handmade goods under needs and wants of the pre-industrial period only is to suggest that they are not needs and wants of other kinds of economies. And to suggest that natural resources were needs and wants only in Industrial times is to suggest that traditional economies did not need natural resources. All human beings' needs are the same, food, shelter, clothing. It is the means by which these needs are produced that differentiate economic eras, and the form of the products of each era.

Finally, instead of family farms or hunting groups under Production it should just be mostly farming and hunting, and leave mostly buying and selling to other eras.

## p. 25 - Meeting Needs and Wants

August version: *In the past, First Nations and Inuit peoples depended on the land and natural resources for survival.*

Our August suggestion: In the past, First Nations and Inuit peoples depended on their lands and natural resources for survival. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**10.) Our January comment:** To deliberately refuse to use the words “their lands” is to suggest that the issues here are more than just lack of knowledge. We believe that students need to understand the truth and we see the refusal to use the words “their lands” as an attempt to deny that these were our lands even in precontact times.

## p. 26 - Then and Now

August text: *Today, First Nations and Inuit peoples work a variety of jobs in cities, towns and the country. For many, their traditional economies are still an important way of earning a living. [But people who work in all kinds of jobs often still practise the traditions that show respect for the land and natural resources. These traditions are an important part of their cultures and beliefs. ]*

Our August comment: Omit. This comment is ridiculous. **ACCEPTED**

**11.) Our January comment:** This comment appears to have been omitted here, but we have not seen the latter portions of the text that may yet address this issue.

**p. 27 – Map Also map on page 36**

August text:

*Maliseet* - are also in Maine and Quebec.

*Mi'kmaq* - are also in New Brunswick, Quebec and Gaspé.

*Passamaquoddy* - are both in Maine and New Brunswick.

*Penobscot* - are NOT in New Brunswick.

Swampy Nehiyawak, Wood Nehiyawak and James Bay Nehiyawak - (Cree).

**(NOT ACCEPTED)**

**12.) Our January comment: Mi'kmaq, Passamaquoddy and Penobscot are still not in the correct positions. Penobscot are only in central Maine, not in Canada at all. Passamaquoddy are in southeast Maine and southwest NB, and Mi'kmaq are spread from Gaspé to the southern tip of NS. Also no Cree people that we know, even speakers, use the word Nehiyawak to refer to themselves when speaking English.**

**p. 28 - Production**

August text: *This 1991 painting by Roger Simon from Big Cove, New Brunswick, shows a traditional Mi'kmaw summer camp. The women are preparing dried blueberry cakes for winter. The berries are first boiled, then pressed into cakes and dried. What can you see in this painting that tells you this is a Pre-industrial economy? –*

Our August comment: Would this be the most important learning from such an image? Is this not a negative stereotype? **NOT ACCEPTED**

**13.) Our January Comment: We feel that students do not have enough information except to judge this image in a largely stereotyped and negative manner. Oh yes, the people in the picture are preparing food and wearing handmade clothing in the picture. We feel however, that there would be less chance for stereotyping if an image of “pre-industrial” European people were shown with the same question.**

**\*p. 29 The Creator Visits**

**14.) Our January comment: First of all Ervin Polchies is not Mi'kmaw. He is Maliseet from Woodstock. Secondly, with all respect to Ervin, this story is not a traditional Maliseet story, but borrowed instead from European/Christian traditions. I have spent years studying Maliseet oral traditions but have never heard this story except within non-Native traditions. Thirdly, there is another problem with the story and that is that in our traditions there are no stories of any deity, only stories of Glooskap, who was not a God-figure. To impute a God figure to Maliseet traditions is simply untruthful. This is not a criticism of Mr. Polchies, either, for since the European arrival most of our people were Christianized, and it is very common for Christian and western influences to appear in stories told today. It is just not correct to suggest that these stories are traditional or “very old” at least among our people.**

## p. 30 - Distribution

August Text: *In most First Nations and Inuit communities, everyone helped in production, and everyone shared equally in what was produced. In some regions, such as the Maritimes, resources were plentiful year-round, and there was little danger of anyone going without food or shelter. In more northern regions, communities often had to struggle to survive hard winters. People did what they could to help one another in these times.*

Our August comment: In most First Nations and Inuit communities, their economic systems were based on cooperation and sharing. Everyone cooperated in production, and everyone shared equally in what was produced. In regions such as the Maritimes, resources were plentiful year-round, and there was little danger of anyone going without food or shelter. People did what they could to help one another at all times. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**15.) Our January comment:** We do not know why the text needs to say that communities had to struggle to survive hard winters. What is the source of this anyway? How do European sources know this about pre-contact times? It is not possible to substantiate this so it should be left out. That is one reason we wanted the text to say that Aboriginal Peoples helped each other at all times. The other reason is that sharing and cooperation were practiced at all times.

August Text: *Since the land was the source of all life, being able to hunt and harvest over large areas was very important to people. In some regions, nations had very clear ideas of the boundaries of their territories and defended their lands from other nations. In other regions people from different nations freely moved back and forth over the same land. For example, the Maliseet and Mi'kmaq often shared the forests and rivers where they lived.*

Our August comment: Since the land was the source of all life, being able to hunt, fish and harvest over large areas was very important to people. The various nations had very clear ideas of their home territories and were generally free to move back and forth over the territories of others. For example, the Maliseet and Mi'kmaq shared the forests and rivers where they lived. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**16.) Our January comment:** We are shocked that the underlined text remains virtually unchanged. We would like to know who is insisting on this. First of all, there is absolutely no evidence that Aboriginal Peoples fought over boundaries or territories, and furthermore, what European source could possibly know about this in pre-contact times. Again, it is an entirely unupportable assertion. To qualify the statement that Maliseet and Mi'kmaq shared the forests by the word "often" is also unupportable. Again we insist that these undocumented assertions be left out.

August text: *First Nations and Inuit also had trade networks. For example, the Innu often traded beaver and moose hides for corn grown by the Algonquin.*

**ACCEPTED and qualified**

Our August comment: The Algonquins were not horticulturalists; maybe you mean Algonquian? Or more southerly nations?

**Our January comment:** The qualification that the Algonquins got the corn from the Wendat makes the earlier statement about the Algonquins having corn to trade plausible.

## **No One Owned the Land**

August Text: *First Nations and Inuit did not have a tradition of private ownership - the idea that one person has complete control over an area of land. To them, thinking that a person could own the land was like thinking that a person could own the air. This went against the idea that people, land, and resources are all part of the cycle of nature.*

Our August Suggestion: While Inuit and First Nations owned (and still own) all the territory that is now Canada, they did not believe in *private ownership* - the idea that one person has complete control over an area of land and the ability to exclude others. To them, this was like thinking that a person could own the air or the water. It went against the First Nations' idea that people, land, and resources are all connected and dependent on one another. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**17.) Our January comment: Since you have refused to accept our changes which immediately addressed the matter of clarifying the misleading heading (No one owned the Land), we are now insisting that you replace the heading with the following heading: “The Land was Shared”**

August Text: *In some societies, certain families had the right to traditionally harvest or hunt in particular areas, but even then they did not own that area of land. It was only theirs to care for on behalf of the whole group.*

Our August suggestion: In some societies, areas for hunting and fishing were allotted to certain families. But even then they did not own those areas of land. It was the responsibility of the families to care for those lands on behalf of the whole group and the generations to come. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**18.) Our January comment: We do not understand your objection to our August suggestion. We would further prefer the word “group” to be replaced by the word “nation”.**

## **p. 31 - Needs and Wants**

August draft: *Why did Europeans leave their homelands? One reason was that European nations wanted to own more land, so they were looking for land to take over. Some Europeans also believed that their culture, especially their religions, should be spread around the world. The main reason, however, was that individual Europeans were looking for economic opportunities.*

August Suggestion: Why did Europeans leave their homelands? One reason was that European nations wanted to gain more wealth and power. In order to do this, it was required that they own more lands and resources. However, when they came upon North America they saw that the land was already occupied by other peoples; First Nations and Inuit peoples. Consequently, some Europeans had to make up the racist myth that their culture, especially their religions, were superior compared to the peoples that were already living in North America in order to justify taking their lands. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**19.) Our January suggestion: Why did Europeans leave their homelands? One reason was that European nations wanted to gain more wealth and power, and to do so they needed more lands and resources. However, when they came upon the Americas they saw that the land was already inhabited by other peoples; now called First Nations and Inuit peoples. This did not seem to stop the Europeans who saw these peoples as not quite human. Though we now know this belief to have been**

**racist, it seemed to justify the taking of lands and resources that belonged to the Native inhabitants of the Americas.**

August Draft: *Private ownership is a very important idea in European cultures. For many centuries, most of the land in Europe had been owned by just a few families (the nobility). Most people had to rent land or work for the landowners in order to have a place to live. This created a society in which some people were very wealthy, while many others lived with poverty. So, many European families came to North America hoping to be given or to buy a piece of land to start up their own farms or ranches.*

Our August suggestion: There was a time when European cultures held land in common for local sufficiency however, by the 1500s, private ownership had become a very important idea in European cultures. Most of the land was owned by just a few families (the nobility). Most people had to rent land or work for the landowners in order to have a place to live. This created societies in which some people were very wealthy, while many others lived in poverty. So many European families came to North America hoping to either help themselves to land or be given land to start up their own farms.

**NOT ACCEPTED**

**20.) Our January comments:** We wanted to let students know that private ownership had not always been the norm in Europe. We also think it is important for students to know that many of the earliest European immigrants came and helped themselves to lands in North America either on their own or as employees of European companies or crowns.

August Text: *Europeans were also looking for natural resources, such as timber, furs, fish, and minerals, to sell back in Europe.*

Our August suggestion: At the same time European nations and companies were also looking for natural resources, such as timber, furs, fish, and minerals, to become wealthy. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**21.) Our January comment:** In ignoring our suggestions you have omitted the most important motivator for explorations and colonization efforts in the 15 and 1600s—the search for riches. It is what motivated the first explorers in their dream of finding a shortcut to the riches of the Orient. In time the myth of a city of gold in our area (Norumbega) became the reason for most of the earliest European explorations here. Then, of course, the discovery of abundant fish and furs generated a whole new set of ventures that were conceived as get-rich schemes, and which did, indeed, make a whole set of adventurers and their monarchs rich. To put all this down as simply a “desire for resources to sell back in Europe” is not only a serious understatement, but also distortion of the truth. So lucrative were these resources that Native People were shamelessly exploited and cheated, and European powers went to war over these resources for nearly two centuries.

## **p. 32- A Closer Look**

August Draft: The First resource to attract **European Nations** to North America was fish.

Our August Suggestion: In other words, the fishers came from England for the summer fishing season and returned with **shiploads full of** fish in the fall. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**22.) Our January Comment:** This was a minor suggestion to reinforce the acquisitive nature of the European drive to exploit the resources of the land and waters of North America.

### **p. 35- Distribution**

August draft: *In Europe, the economic system was based on the idea that if you owned land or a resource, you had the right to make as much profit from it as possible. Although many people helped their neighbours and shared what they could the main goal for most people was to work to benefit themselves and their families.*

Our August Suggestion: In Europe the economic system was based on capitalism, the idea that if you owned land or a resource, you had the right to make as much profit from it as possible. Although many people helped their neighbours and shared what they could the main goal for most people was to work to earn a profit from resources and the labor of others to benefit themselves and their families. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**23.) Our January comments:** Again, another perfect opportunity to introduce the word “capitalism” has been avoided. We also find the “Think it Through” activities to be problematic since the chart on economic systems (p. 24) on which the questions are based is seriously flawed. See our January comments for p. 24

### **p. 36-Early Contact in the Maritimes**

August draft: *When the First Nation of the Maritimes first met Europeans, First Nations were curious about the newcomers....*

*As they got to know one another better, both groups realized that there were some good economic opportunities.*

Our August suggestion: When the First Nations of the Maritimes first met Europeans, the situation was generally marked by violence as Europeans regularly kidnapped Inuit and First Nations people. Also, the newcomers did not know how to survive in this land that was new to them, so they badly needed the help that First Nations offered.

As they got to know one another better, both groups saw economic opportunities in peaceful relations with the other. The newcomers were very interested in getting furs, and First Nations peoples were interested in trade goods such as metal knives and pots. So, they each participated in the fur trade. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**24.) Our January suggestion:** We see no point in distorting the truth here. Early contacts were overwhelmingly not peaceful. Furthermore, the ravages of imported disease took their greatest toll, up to 90% in some communities, immediately after contact. What is to be gained by such misinformation and omission with regard to contact? (Noticed you have considered the matter of disease in the 1800s, but the greatest impact of new diseases occurred immediately after contact.

And re the map, “Mi’kmaq” needs to be written across northeast NB, as they were not just in what is now Nova Scotia, but also PEI, Gaspé (PQ) and New Brunswick.

### **p. 37 - Treaties of Peace and Friendship**

Our August suggestion: Throughout the latter 1600s and much of the 1700s First Nations in the Maritimes struggled to protect their lands from being taken/stolen by Europeans, especially the English. In spite of enormous efforts to keep the peace (in order to trade) the First Nations were driven to resist the taking of their lands in seven wars. It was at the end of each of these wars that most of the treaties here were made. From 1717 to 1779, the Passamaquoddy, Maliseet, and Mi'kmaq made at least seven treaties with Great Britain. At the time, Great Britain was the European nation with the most power in the region. These treaties were called the Treaties of Peace and Friendship.

The British wanted to make treaties in order to gain control of more lands for themselves. First Nations agreed to treaties because they also wanted peace in order to trade. In the treaties, Great Britain agreed to respect Aboriginal rights to the land and resources and First Nations agreed to keep the peace.

\*\*Note: We want the text to include at least a few pages on the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the Maritimes with the background of the treaties at least. There is nothing here on that critical period in Maritimes history, yet the text has up 20 or 30 pages on the west in the 1800s (the Metis and Cree rebellions, etc). This text is supposed to be primarily for Maritime Schools. Go figure! **NOT ACCEPTED**

**25.) Our January Comments and Suggestions:** Not one of the paragraphs in this section mentions the colonial wars that were the source of and reason for the Maritime treaties. This is a huge oversight, though it cannot have been accidental as we have insisted on this kind of background in two earlier lists of suggestions.

Instead of saying “*there had been some conflicts between First Nations Europeans from the beginning of Contact.*” which is a huge distortion, omit the first paragraph and say the following at the very least:

**“From 1675 to 1780 there were seven wars in the Maritimes between First Nations and the British. In at least four of these wars the French allied themselves with the First Nations in the Maritimes since France was also at war with England over their competing claims to North America. In spite of enormous efforts to keep the peace, the First Nations of the Maritimes were driven to war each time primarily to resist the taking of their lands by the English. In 1713 France surrendered its claim to the Maritimes to the English. In the same year the first of at least seven treaties was signed between the English and a First Nation in the Maritimes (the Maliseets). In later treaties the Passamaquoddies and Mi'kmaq were also included, and the last of these treaties was signed in 1779 near the end of the American Revolution.”** Note: Great Britain was not the European nation with the most power in the Maritimes by the early 1700s. The Treaty of Utrecht may have awarded the Maritimes to Britain, but Britain did not gain the upper hand here until 1760. Note also our original statement of 1717 as the date of the first treaty was in error. It was actually 1713.

Keep the second paragraph except for words underlined as follows:

**“Great Britain believed that treaties would help make sure that First Nations sided with Britain in any wars with France. First Nations believed that making treaties with Great Britain would ensure peace and allow them to maintain their way of life for future generations. This was important to them for they had seen what had happened to First Nations in New England when English settlers took over First Nations’ territories.”**

Omit the first three sentences of the third paragraph as the idea of a Covenant Chain was used primarily to apply to treaties between the British and the Iroquois, not originally to the treaties in the Maritimes. Keep the remainder of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph except for words underlined.

*“These treaties are... called treaties of Peace and Friendship. Each treaty was different, but the main idea... was that First Nations agreed to act peacefully toward the British, and the British agreed to respect First Nations’ access to their sources of life in the land. First Nations did not agree to give up land or natural resources to Britain. These treaties are still the law today, and they apply to the Mi’kmaq, Passamaquoddy, and Maliseet of the Maritimes.”*

As for the definition of a treaty on the side we suggest replacing the following sentence in December draft: “A Treaty sets out the nations’ rights and responsibilities and is meant to be honoured and respected.”

**26.) Our January suggestion:** “A treaty sets out the rights and responsibilities of all parties to the treaty, and once ratified it becomes the law and must be honoured and respected.”

## **The Effects of the Fur Trade**

August Draft: “You might think they could have just gone back to their traditional ways, but it wasn't so easy. European settlement was making that solution impossible.”

Our August Suggestion: “You might think they could have just gone back to their traditional ways, but it wasn't so easy. The taking of their lands and resources by European settlers made that impossible. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**27.) Our January Suggestion:** It was not European settlement by itself that made the return to traditional ways impossible. To say so is a euphemism. It was the taking of First Nations’ lands and resources that made it impossible. Please include this point.

## **p. 38 - The Effects of Settlement**

August Draft: *The really big problem for First Nations economies in the Maritimes started when large numbers of newcomers began arriving* First Nations did not see this as a problem at first. *They were used to sharing the land. However, the European idea of private ownership was something new to them. And this idea did not mix well with traditional economies.*

(Our August Suggestion) : The really big problem for First Nations economies in the Maritimes started when large numbers of newcomers began arriving and taking Aboriginal lands in violation of the Royal Proclamation of 1763. **NOT ACCEPTED**

We also suggested at least a Box on Royal Proclamation of 1763, esp. the Clause outlawing the theft of Indian lands.] **NOT ACCEPTED**

**28.) Our January Opinion:** This statement is ludicrously wrong. Newcomers began arriving in very large numbers immediately after the American Revolution and this sudden influx of settlers was alarming to First Nations in the Maritimes. We suggest the following sentence: *When large numbers of **English** settlers began arriving after the American Revolution in 1783, First Nations were alarmed. The thousands of new settlers helped themselves to some of the best lands, and immediately began fencing it off according to the European idea of private ownership. In time*

*First Nations people found themselves unable to access most of the waters and lands from which they had derived their living for thousands of years. This was a shock for a people who had been used to sharing the land.*

**We also insist on some mention of the Royal Proclamation either in the text or in a box.**

Our August suggestion: As forests were cut down and lands were fenced for farming, there were fewer areas left for hunting and fishing. *As more towns were built up, First Nations found that the newcomers were taking over the most important rivers, lakes and oceanfront areas that provided their food. The European settlers weren't sharing the land - they were taking more and more of it for themselves.* **NOT FULLY ACCEPTED**

**29.) Our January suggestion:** The second paragraph is OK except that it should say “taking” instead of “keeping” since the main issue was that First Nations lands were being swallowed up by both development and settlement. The end of this paragraph is also another opportunity to introduce the Royal Proclamation by closing it off with this statement: “And it was a violation of the Royal Proclamation which said that no lands could be taken from Indian peoples without their consent.”

Our August suggestion: *On top of these problems was the fact of racism - the belief of immigrants that their economic, political and cultural ideas were superior to First Nations ideas, and that they were racially superior as well. Most Europeans also thought First Nations peoples would die out or assimilate (become more like the Europeans).* -- Include definition of racism in box. **NOT FULLY ACCEPTED**

**30.) Our January suggestion:** This is a perfect place to introduce the word racism. As a box here it would be much more effective than the image which does nothing to enlighten the students. Note: Discovered that you have added a definition of racism on p.86

### **Activities - Think It Through**

August text and our suggestion: *In your own words, summarize how and why First Nations economies in the Maritimes were affected by Contact.* This is not possible to answer accurately without the information added here.

**31.) Our January comment:** We still stand by this recommendation,

### **p. 39 - A Closer Look---The Effects of Settlement**

August Version: The settlers made it difficult for the Beothuks to get their food sources along the coast, so the Beothuks stayed inland. ....There were conflicts between the trappers and the Beothuks, and **huge numbers of Beothuks were killed.**

**ACCEPTED IN PART (December text reads “many Beothuk were killed”**

Our August Suggestion: By the early 1800s, the Beothuks were struggling to survive, **since they were prevented from meeting even their most basic needs.** More and more Beothuk communities died out, until the last known Beothuk died in 1829.

**When one people creates conditions leading to the death of another it is called genocide.** [Box giving definitions of genocide]

**NOT FULLY ACCEPTED still missing all reference to genocide.]**

**32.) Our January comment:** By omitting any reference to genocide in relation to the Beothuks, the text is missing a hugely important opportunity for learning. What happened in Newfoundland fits at least one definition of genocide perfectly.

**\*p. 46- Businesses and Community Wealth**

December text: “When a new business starts up, it helps create wealth. Of course the business owner hopes to make a profit. In the rest of the community the first people to benefit are those who get hired to work in the business.

**33.) Our January suggestion:** “When a new business starts up, it helps create wealth. Of course the business owner benefits first when profits are made. In the rest of the community the next group of people to benefit are those who get hired to work in the business.”

**\*p. 48- Millbrook First Nation: A Co-operative Project**

**34.) Our January comments:** The use of the word “co-operative” here is entirely misleading as the word “co-operative” normally describes a worker owned business. Using it here to describe a business that appears to be based on the standard entrepreneurial, corporate enterprise not only subverts the meaning of the word “co-operative” but also completely misses the opportunity to teach about the economic model that co-operatives represent, one that is very close to and much more compatible with the traditional economic systems of Aboriginal Peoples. Furthermore there is nothing in the whole book explaining how co-operatives are not only a viable alternative to corporations, but also a successful economic model practiced in many parts of the world, including Canada.

**p. 51(Now 52) - Expenses for Basic Needs/ Income-Result: Poverty**

August draft: When expenses are higher than income, the result is poverty.... In Canada, people can get enough help from the government and people in their communities to survive.

Our August suggestion: When the cost of living is higher than income, the result is poverty.... In Canada, people can sometimes get help from the government and other agencies to survive. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**35.) Our January comment:** People cannot expend more than they have unless they have credit cards and most of those people cannot be called truly impoverished. It is the people who have nothing, or nearly nothing, not even a credit card, who are the truly poor. Furthermore, your statement that people in Canada can get help to survive, is not entirely true. Some still perish of malnourishment, or starvation-related illness.

**p. 52 - Why Do We Have Poverty ?**

Our August comment: Where is the explanation that capitalism itself creates poverty? **NOT ACCEPTED**

**36.) Our January comment:** In its promotion of the acquisition of unlimited wealth capitalism creates poverty, for there can be no wealth without poverty. Not to discuss this aspect of capitalism in a book designed to “empower” students is to deny important empowering information, which in itself is a demonstration of

enormous bias. To ascribe poverty merely to poor health, lack of work, or lack of transportation represents an enormous evasion of the truth. While these factors can contribute, they are not the cause of poverty, i.e., there is no explanation here why so many people in Canada and the world have poor health, no work, and no means of transportation. In demonstrating poverty merely as a cycle the text gives no meaningful explanation as to “Why we have Poverty”

**\*p. 67 The Global View**

**37.) Our January Comment:** Again there is nothing in the December version of the textbook on the global economy that addresses the disadvantages or criticisms of it. It is all rosy here. What about its impact on poor nations, on Indigenous Peoples, on farming peoples? Without all information, both pro and con, students will never be able to answer the questions on p. 69, and they will never be “empowered” to work for a better world.

**p. 92(now p.86) - Aboriginal Peoples**

August text: “...But for the most part, immigration had a negative impact on Aboriginal communities.”

December text: “In Unit 2, you saw how the arrival of European settlers had a big impact on First Nations and Inuit communities. By the mid-1800, this impact was being very strongly felt in the Atlantic region.

(Racism is a prejudice based on a person’s heritage or skin colour.) These attitudes resulted in discrimination in many situations.”

Loss of Land

...In Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick the colonial governments generally allowed settlers to take whatever land they wanted. When First Nations leaders complained, the governments set aside certain lands only for First Nations use... By the mid-1800s most people lived with poverty, and many communities faced starvation.

August text and our August Suggestion in bold:...However, the governments didn’t actually stop settlers from taking **even the reserved lands**. Eventually, First Nations communities were left with only small areas of poor-quality land. By the mid-1800s, **most First Nations people lived in extreme poverty and starvation.** **NOT FULLY ACCEPTED**

**38.) Our January comment and suggestion:** First of all, students were not given a very accurate characterization of contact in Unit 2 (See our comments above re pp. 36-38) Then, to refer to contact as having “had a big impact” is an enormous euphemism and understatement.

We appreciate that you have addressed the matter of racism here, however, the worst manifestations of racism were not “discrimination” as in name-calling or the refusal to hire Aboriginals. The worst manifestations can be seen in the legalized theft of First Nations lands, the laws which prohibited Aboriginals from accessing their own resources which vital to their survival, and the laws which imposed control on their political systems and which required them to be educated.

Finally we appreciate that you have addressed the matter of the theft of the land, but to call it a “loss” implies that we could not find them. The word lost or

loss is in fact a euphemism when in reality the lands and resources were stolen or taken from us without lawful authority, which is to say that they were stolen. This is very different from something that is lost, and it represents another example where the truth is neatly avoided in this text. Had you discussed the Royal Proclamation earlier in the text the matter of theft or lack of legal authority would be clear here.

To say also that the theft was carried out only by individual settlers is another misrepresentation when, in fact, the government authorized “grants” to most of the land even before most of the settlers arrived. Yes, there was an uncontrolled taking of land by some settlers, but that had fewer ramifications for First Nations than the official government grants issued to settlers, proprietors and land companies alike, all without lawful authority according to the Royal Proclamation.

**Our January suggestion: ...*In Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick the colonial governments issued grants of land to thousands of settlers, in complete violation of the Royal Proclamation which said that no lands could be taken without the consent of the First Nations. When First Nations leaders complained, the governments began to set aside small parcels of land for them. These became known as reserves. By the mid-1800s First Nations were denied access to most of their original lands and resources. Poverty was the consequence, and starvation was common.***

Displacement (Can't find this topic in the December text)

August Text and our August suggestions in bold: In Newfoundland, the Beothuks became extinct by 1829, but there were some Mi'kmaw communities on the island. Again we wanted the term “genocide” used and defined.

*In Canada West and the Maritime colonies, the arrival of the Loyalists and the English and Irish settlers created a great demand for **Indian lands**. In Canada West, the colonial government made arrangements to take over **First Nations land, but most of these treaties were signed by leaders of First Nations under extreme duress.***

Enter Definition of "Duress" NOT FOUND

### **p. 93 (Now p.86) - The Impact of European Diseases**

August Text with our suggestion in bold: *The population of First Nations and Inuit peoples in Canada dropped from approximately 500 000 before Contact to approximately 102 000 by 1871. One of the main reasons for this drop in population **was the taking of Native lands and resources by Europeans and the resulting poverty and disease.** First Nations and Inuit had no resistance to European diseases such as smallpox, influenza, and measles. **NOT ACCEPTED***

**39.) Our January Comment:** Once again the text avoids stating a primary factor. In this case disease is only the apparent cause in the drop in population. The high incidence of disease was now directly attributable to the theft of lands and resources and the resulting poverty. The matter of lack of resistance to disease was far less of an issue in the 1800s than it was in the 15 and 1600s.

### **p. 124 - The Need For More Railways**

Our August Comments: What about the truth regarding railroad barons and the huge conflict of interest on the part of legislators who were for the most part the railroad barons? All of this we pointed out in our May list of corrections, together with a list of sources. **NOT ACCEPTED**

**40.) Our January Comment:** We see no point in hiding an important side of the story of the railroads here, especially since the building of the railroads became another excuse or rationale to take more lands from First Nations, even here in NB where legislators who were also railroad incorporators each helped themselves to five square miles of forest lands in this province as personal rewards for building the railroad. (See Myers, History of Canadian Wealth 1914:150-335.) In our opinion the truth about the railroads could be “empowering”, particularly in a book on empowerment.

#### **p. 125 - The Demand For More Land**

Our August Comment: Where is our May contribution here? **NOT ACCEPTED**

**41.) Our January Comment:** We see no evidence in the December draft of our May suggestion as follows: “The true story of the Hudson Bay Company’s role in the west is another story completely swept under the rug here. (See Myers, History of Canadian Wealth, 1914:114-149.) Another huge omission that takes away from the potential for “empowerment” that this text promised.

(From here on the topics are not included in the December Text which ends on p. 139 of Unit 3. Our comments on the earlier text go to p. 201)