Canadian Settler Philanthropy and Reconciliation: A Critical Textual Analysis

By Sabina Trimble

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Social Policy
in the School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research, in the
Division for the Study of Law, Society and Social Justice

University of Kent
October 2024

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ***.......... iv***

Prefatory note on language: settler philanthropies ***.......... vii***

Introduction – "Ongoing harm under a prettier, brighter umbrella": reconciliation in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector ***.......... 1***

Reconciliation in the settler philanthropy sector 3

Overview of the thesis project 10

Theoretical framework and analytical focus: reconciliation and colonial durabilities 13

On the settler philanthropy ecosystems in present-day Canada and U.S.: situating the study 18

Breakdown of chapters 28

Concluding thoughts 32

Chapter 1 – Durable and dissonant: context on coloniality, philanthropy, and reconciliation 38

1.1 – Settler colonial durabilities, elimination and philanthropy in Canada 39
1.1.1 – Colonial eliminationism in Canada 39
1.1.2 – Settler philanthropies and eliminationism 47
1.1.3 – Neoliberalization and the durability of colonial violence 55
1.1.4 – Neoliberal restructuring and philanthropy in North America 61

1.2 – Reconciliation and colonial durabilities 74
1.2.1 – Colonial recognition and colonial unknowing 78
1.2.2 – Reconciliation and the grand gesture 86

1.2 – The minor and the dissonant: reciprocity, reparations and refusals 88
1.3.1 – Indigenous systems of giving, sharing, and reciprocity 89
1.3.2 – Refusing the colonial status quo in and through settler philanthropies 94

Conclusion 102

Chapter 2 – Journeying through the methodology ***.......... 106***

Introduction 106

2.1 – Overview of the project and research questions 107

2.2 – Building an archive 109
2.2.1 – Overview of organizations 116
2.2.2 – Gathering texts 124

2.3 – Analyzing the reconciliation change narrative: A critical textual analysis 131
2.3.1 – Thematic coding and analysis 134

2.4 – Journeying through the methodology: shifts, ethical tensions, and limitations 143
2.4.1 – Shifts and tensions 143
2.4.2 – Limitations 148

Conclusion – on research as love 153

Chapter 3 – Reconciliation as a "Canadian Imperative:" The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action *157*

Introduction **157**

3.1 – The development of the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* **161**

3.2 – Accountability and performative allyship **173**

3.3 – Unprecedented moments and national urgency: grand gesture reconciliation **181**

3.4 – Reparations and reciprocity: refusing the grand gesture **188**

Conclusions **198**

Chapter 4 – The colonial spectre *202*

Introduction **202**

4.1 – Temporal and spatial distancing **207**

4.2 – Conceptual distancing **217**

4.3 – Omission and renaming **226**

4.3.1 – Renaming as omission 231

Conclusions **241**

Chapter 5 – Settlers on a journey *245*

Introduction **245**

5.1 – Articulations and critiques of the settler learning journey **249**

5.2 – Settler consumption of Indigenous suffering **254**

5.3 – Truth-telling **263**

5.4 – Settler discomfort: closures and possibilities **268**

5.4.1 – Embracing discomfort: settler de-centring, reparations and reciprocity 274

Conclusions and summary of findings across chapters **281**

Conclusion – on philanthropy toward decolonial love *286*

Contributions and possibilities for future research **297**

Limitations of this study and possibilities for further research **298**

Concluding thoughts: on philanthropy toward decolonial love **301**

Appendix I: The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action *306*

Appendix II: Chart of Archive Sources *309*

References *317*

Abstract

This thesis presents a critical textual analysis of what I call the reconciliation change narrative in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector, as expressed across an archive of 156 texts produced from 2008-2022 by four philanthropic organizations and their members: one Indigenous-led intermediary (the Circle); three settler-led philanthropic intermediaries (Imagine Canada, Community Foundations Canada [CFC], and Philanthropic Foundations Canada [PFC]); and one widely read sector publication called *The Philanthropist*. Engagement with the concept of reconciliation became common in the Canadian settler philanthropy world after 2015. Change narratives like reconciliation are stories whereby philanthropic actors situate themselves in the social order and justify their activities; they are simultaneously discursive and affective formations with important material functions, directing organizational and sectoral policies, and shaping giving and granting decisions, institutional practices, and giving relationships. Across my chapters, I explore how diverse and dissonant expressions of the reconciliation change narrative can maintain colonial durabilities, working to mask or obscure the ongoing workings of colonial violence in the settler philanthropy sector and the wider world, especially through what Coulthard (2014) calls colonial recognition and Vimalessary *et al.* (2016) describe as colonial unknowing. At other times the texts I analyze present alternative possibilities for and beyond dominant expressions of reconciliation and settler philanthropy. These shift the focus away from the colonial politics of reconciliation toward the advancement of relations of reparations, reciprocity and refusal. Drawing on diverse approaches and theoretical frameworks from critical discourse analysis, affect theory, decolonial studies and philanthropic studies, I demonstrate through this analysis that Canadian settler philanthropy's relations to coloniality are, and always have been, characterized by dissonance.

Acknowledgements

Although I began my PhD in Canterbury, England in September 2019, most of the research and writing for this project took place from 2020-2024 in the hereditary homelands of the Îyârhe Nakoda, of the Tsuut'ina, of the Niitsitaapi members of the Blackfoot Confederacy: Siksika, Kainai, and Piikani, and of the Métis peoples of this region. The place where I live, work and write is known colonially as Calgary, but for much longer has been known as Wîchîspa in Nakoda, Guts'ists'i in Dene, and Mohkinsstsis in Blackfoot. It is, was and always will be an important, storied meeting place – the place where two rivers meet. It has been stewarded by the peoples who have lived and loved in this region since time immemorial, and is a place that diverse Indigenous Peoples continue to call home.

This land became home to settlers like me through the ongoing and durable violences of coloniality and white supremacy, and through the negotiation of agreements like Treaty 7, a peace treaty negotiated in 1877 between Indigenous and non-Indigenous government representatives. In this treaty, Indigenous leaders in what is now called Southern Alberta agreed to peacefully share their homelands with settler newcomers, in exchange for many promises made both orally and in writing by representatives of the British Crown. Settlers and settler governments have since not honoured these promises – consistently breaking them or ignoring them altogether. As a settler living here nearly 150 years since its signing, I too am obligated to honour and uphold the promises of Treaty 7. My ability to reside and complete a PhD in this place is a direct and ongoing benefit of broken promises, and of the subsequent institution of racist and colonial systems, policies, and relations in present-day Alberta. While I benefit from these ongoing processes, Indigenous peoples of this region have suffered the intergenerational traumas of colonial violence, expulsion, and forced assimilation. They have also resisted and refused, hoped and thrived. I am thankful and honoured to exist in this place. I would like to offer my work as an expression of my commitment to expose and refuse colonial violence and white supremacy in all their subtle and overt forms, and to amplify the wisdom and work of Indigenous leaders, Elders, activists, land defenders and knowledge holders, both in academia and in the philanthropy sector in what is now called Canada.

It will be difficult to meaningfully express my gratitude to my PhD advisors Beth Breeze and Carolyn Pedwell. Beth and Carolyn consistently offered thoughtful and empathetic supervision and support while I have been at Kent (to me, and I'm sure to their many other students) even as they continued to advance thought in important ways in their respective fields. In the five years I have been a PhD student, they have each released a full-length monograph and an edited collection (or two!), along with multiple journal articles and presentations, and have made important contributions in non-academic spaces, engaging in service, activism and advocacy at the institution and beyond, all while also being parents and carers. I don't know how they do it. Thank you both so much for your incisive and thoughtful feedback. Thank you for also providing a safe and encouraging space as I navigated challenging and painful circumstances over the past five years. I truly could not imagine a better advisory team.

I am also thankful to scholars and friends who have helped me grow, graciously and patiently encouraging me along my academic journey since 2010, especially Liam Haggarty and John Lutz. I am and will always be grateful for you, who continuously exemplify the generative capacities of humility, of "unthinking mastery" as Julietta Singh beautifully says it, and of living and working toward radical love. Thank you also to many others who have inspired and encouraged me over the years, and to those who believed in me and told me to keep on going when I didn't think I could: Gracie Kelly, Joe Anderson, Renae Watchman, Scott Murray, Kirk Niergarth, Wendy Wickwire, and Keith Carlson. Thank you also to everyone at Willow Springs for providing me with space to work and grow, and being supportive as I continued my PhD journey. Thank you to other former colleagues and (especially) to Emma, whose recommendation in 2016 was what brought me into this world of settler philanthropies, and to the experiences that inspired the direction and focus of this project.

To my dear friends who have shared inspiration, hope and (when needed) distraction, especially Michael, Victoria, Ashley, Cathryn, Sam and Liam. I'm so deeply grateful for the decade and more of your friendships and can only hope to reciprocate the joy and love I have received there, for many more years to come. Special, sincere thanks to my dear friend Ashley Banbury who graciously read and proofed the full thesis, and who left loving and encouraging comments in the margins! Thank you so very much to Mike and Gesche McGibbon and their children Kate and

Finn, who generously opened their home to me while I lived in Kent in 2019 and 2022. You have always kept the door open when I needed a place to stay, or felt lonely, or wanted some company for a lively and happy meal. Thank you for being my family overseas!

I wish to express my immense love and gratitude to all my parents, my family and my many siblings (Jasmine, Elliot, Domini, Laura, Tiffany, Taggert, Paola, Sarah, Leezy, Bekett), my niece and god-daughter Alani, and my "crumb warriors" Mum and Laura for your unwavering love, prayers and support all throughout. I love you all so, so much.

And finally, to Colton (and Thor and Bella!). You are a lighthouse while I wander, and a gift to me.

Prefatory note on language: settler philanthropies

Throughout this thesis I employ some terms that I feel require explanation, in part because I have sometimes experienced resistance to my use of them when explaining my project to settlers. Specifically, I will describe here my intentional political and analytical choice to use the terms settler, coloniality, and settler philanthropy/ies. I will also briefly discuss how I understand the concept of philanthropy more broadly, situating my own very narrow focus in this thesis on a specific subset of settler philanthropies within the wider literature conceptualizing philanthropies from settler/western/global north perspectives, as well as philanthropies, reciprocity, and giving and sharing from Indigenous perspectives.

First, the terms settler and coloniality. My use of the term settler aligns with Métis scholar Chelsea Vowell's description, referring to "non-Indigenous peoples living in Canada who form the European-descended sociopolitical majority,' aka white people" (in Thomas 2019). Like Vowell, I use the language of settlerness when speaking of the white sociopolitical majority in Canada – including myself – and those of us who benefit most (albeit in varying ways) from the durable structures of coloniality and white settler supremacy on which Canada is founded. I also use it when discussing institutions, systems and structures created primarily by and for settlers. As I argue throughout this thesis, and as Indigenous scholars and activists have been telling us for a long time, colonialism is not something that ended in the past but persists in the present, taking transfigured forms over time that are often insidious and hard to see (Munshi and Willse 2007; Simpson 2016a; Stoler 2016; Coulthard 2014; LaDuke and Cowen 2020). This is why I typically prefer to use the term coloniality rather than colonialism: referring to a complex state of being rather than a clearly defined historical period that has ended. Coloniality is an assemblage

of imposed power relations, policies, structures, systems, discourses, affective relations, and epistemologies, that filter into identities and daily life in the present (Mignolo and Walsh 2018). In settler colonial states like Canada, colonial relations are predicated on the violent or coercive removal (elimination) of the presence of Indigenous Peoples and ways of life, in order to make Indigenous homelands and waters available to settlers (Carey and Silverstein 2020; Wolfe 2006).

I use the term settler to actively expose the durable nature of these colonial relations in Canada, from which I, as a member of the group Vowell describes, continue to benefit and on which the Canadian settler state is founded. Settlerness, like coloniality, persists in the present. It does not simply refer to the waves of British and European settlers that invaded Indigenous homelands in previous centuries as part of a larger historical imperial project. Rather, the term also signifies a certain social, economic and political positionality rife with power and privilege, and characterized by a sense of entitlement based on the assumption that having 'been here' for some generations, settlers can claim Indigenous land as 'our land.' Use of the term settler, then, can be an acknowledgement of oneself as a member of a group of "occupiers of Indigenous homelands, perpetrators [and beneficiaries] of cultural genocide and sustainers of settler colonial practices in the present" (Davis et al. 2017, p. 399). Using it may be a step toward living out the responsibility, as Mi'kmaq critical education scholar Marie Battiste puts it, "to both unlearn and learn —to unlearn racism and superiority in all its manifestations, while examining our own social constructions in our judgments" (Battiste 2013, p. 166). Deliberate use of the term settler, then, is important to decolonial practice.

There are some complexities to the use of the term settler, though. Vowell argues that members of some populations who "settle" in Indigenous lands as migrants or refugees may become "folded into the settler-colonial project that is Canada" but – because they are not imposing legal orders and worldviews on everyone – they do not fall within her definition of settler colonials. Decolonial scholars also argue that people living in what is now called Canada who descend from those who were forcibly taken from the African continent and enslaved, are not settlers. "Settlement" in the way that Vowell describes it requires active choice, and power to impose governance, structures of control and epistemologies on others in whose lands one is arriving. As Ashley Marshall states, as a Black woman in Canada, she sees herself as "a member of a diaspora that is here against their will" who therefore is "unwillingly complicit…in Indigenous people being displaced, and their land being stolen" (Thomas 2019). Chickasaw historian Jodi Byrd (2011) uses the term "arrivant" to refer to those people "forced into the Americas through the violence of European and Anglo-American colonialism and imperialism around the globe" (p. xix) whose presence, as Vimalessary et al. (2016) write, "destablize the settler/native binary."

With these complexities in mind, some theorists argue that interrogations of settlerness and coloniality in Canada, and in other settler colonial states, must be understood alongside and in relation to theorizations of Blackness and anti-Black racism, and that the decolonial struggles of Indigenous peoples in settler states are also deeply entangled with the struggles of Black liberation, and the resistance work of feminist and queer folks of colour (Vimalessary et al. 2016). Decolonial studies must pay heed to the fundamental interconnectedness of migration, forced diaspora, the enslavement of peoples from the continent of Africa, colonial eliminationism, and the theft of Indigenous lands (e.g. Smith, Tuck and Yang 2019; Koshy *et al.*

2022). In some chapters therefore, alongside my discussions of anti-colonial refusals and alternatives to reconciliation and settler philanthropy, I highlight the works of activists and leaders of colour who explicitly address these intersections and their implications for philanthropic and charitable practice in present-day North America (e.g. Allen, Pereira and Salmon 2021; Imagine Canada Staff 2022; Buchholz, Bolduc, et al. 2020; Buchholz, Dean-Coffey, et al. 2020).

Settler resistance to the use of the term settler (or to explicit references to whiteness) stems from and reproduces the de-racialization of white settler selves, practices, institutions and social phenomena. It rests on the assumption that they exist outside of race and coloniality, framing them thus as universal standards. Settlerness also comes with assumptions that dominant systems of governance, epistemologies, and ways of being are the 'norm' or the 'standard' to which everything and everyone else must answer. Anything that appears to deviate from this imposed standard is usually named or flagged, while settlerness and whiteness often go unnamed and unremarked; by extension, the presence of settlers on Indigenous lands remains "the stable and unremarkable norm" (Liboiron 2021, p. 3, fn 10). This in turn feeds the "representational oppression" that Indigenous and racialized peoples face daily, as Cherokee literary theorist Daniel Heath Justice (2018) explains (p. 14). While settlers decide what counts as something (literature, philanthropy, justice, governance, history, etc.) based on settlers' worldviews, histories, and experiences, Indigenous Peoples' diverse and longstanding practices and understandings of those very things are often ignored and dismissed. By explicitly referencing settlerness, then, I intentionally aim to shift "the frame of reference away from ideas of a naturalized…identity and onto an understanding of settler relations with the land [that settlers]

have occupied, the peoples they have dispossessed and the power that they continue to deploy in unequal colonial relations" (Maddison and Nakata 2020, p. 7; see also Lowman and Barker 2015). Explicit and intentional use of the term settler can be a way to call into question and disrupt colonial assumptions and norms that have very real material implications.

For these reasons, I also am intentional about my use of the term "settler philanthropy/ies" throughout this thesis, a term developed by Indigenous leaders to refer to a diverse and sprawling field of philanthropic activities, organizations, relations and institutions in Canada. According to The Circle's current CEO Kris Archie, settler philanthropic practices have too often enjoyed the universal name of just "philanthropy," but in colonial states, they should be understood much more specifically—as generated, led, benefitting, and practiced primarily by and/or for non-Indigenous settler peoples, on Indigenous lands (see Archie 2021b). Elsewhere Archie notes: "here's the thing about philanthropy: Indigenous practices, laws and teachings have been around since the beginning of time, and we know a few things as Indigenous peoples about how to redistribute wealth" (in Dirksen et al. 2020). Philanthropic practices, she implies, are deeply ingrained in Indigenous societies, and have been since time immemorial. In other words, philanthropy is something much bigger and more widespread and diverse than it is often assumed to be. Being specific about referencing the "settlerness" of some forms of philanthropy is critical to understanding the implications of their expression and practice in colonial states.

Most of my thesis is really about a small pocket of the Canadian settler philanthropic landscape: I am focused mostly on institutional, organizational and "sectoral" forms of philanthropy that in general engage in funding, especially through private, public and community granting vehicles

such foundations, United Ways, and other state-recognized charitable organizations. This is because most of the critiques and commentary on settler-generated or settler-led philanthropies in texts I analyze in this thesis focus on these forms of philanthropic activity. However, I tend to take a much broader view on defining philanthropy generally, which is a complex and contested concept. I will zoom out a little to situate these perspectives in the broad and ongoing scholarly debate about what exactly philanthropy is. Philanthropy is a term that can represent vastly diverse relations, ideas and activities across times and place, and scholars frequently point to the contestedness of its meanings. Ilchman et. al. (1998) argue in a global collection on the diverse and transnational character of philanthropy that "something called 'philanthropy' – rooted in the ethical notions of giving and serving to those beyond one's family – probably existed in most cultures and in most historical periods" (p. ix). But, as Breeze and Moody (2016) point out, it is "exceedingly diverse in…expression and complicated in…practice" (p.3). There is "by no means widespread agreement" about philanthropy's definition, "why it exists, what makes it distinctive, or how we should think about and study it" (ibid., p. 3). For these reasons, Siobhan Daly (2012) shows how the concept has been taken by scholarly researchers "'in profoundly different directions' not only with respect to its meaning, but also the value and purposes attributed to" it (p. 537). This is largely because, as Tade Aina (2013) writes, "[h]istory, politics, culture and the economy all to a greater or lesser extent define and are defined by the varieties of philanthropic experiences found in any society" (p. 1). Philanthropy in all its diverse expressions and outcomes is always a product of its sociohistorical surroundings: it is both geographically and temporally specific, and cannot be disentangled from the social, economic, cultural and interpersonal infrastructures from which it emerges. Philanthropic practices and systems are enduring cultural

phenomena with highly local particularities; but cultural phenomena change over time. This is what makes philanthropy so hard to define.

In much of the western/settler-focused literature, researchers commonly position philanthropy as an action or a behaviour. Specifically, they frame it as voluntary action of a private nature, with public intentions or outcomes: i.e. the "application of private means to public ends" (Sulek 2010b, p. 201). It is often seen to involve a voluntary distribution of wealth or material goods. Sulek (2010b) notes that the synonymity of philanthropy "with charitable donations is generally taken as a given by most scholars" (p. 201). Others take a more generous stance, arguing philanthropy does not always have to do with giving away money or material goods. Payton and Moody (2008) define philanthropy much more broadly as "voluntary action for the public good," which includes giving, service or association (p. 44). Other scholars conceptualize philanthropy as a disposition, characteristic or motivation. Historian Marty Sulek (2010a) describes it as an affective and affecting state of being: "love motivating the greater realization of human potential" (p. 399). He takes the position that philanthropy as love (i.e. as a state of being) precedes and determines philanthropic actions. It is a highly affective/affected motivation to act.

Another common approach to defining philanthropy in the Western/settler-focused literature is to conceive of it in sectoral terms (e.g. in terms of nonprofit, voluntary, third or philanthropic sectors) or in terms of the mechanisms and institutions through which it is practiced (e.g. foundations). As John Van Til (1990) notes, the institutional or sectoral approach focuses on "the formal embodiment of like-minded actors" (p. 20) and centres the "realm of institutional activity that is societally and governmentally entrusted as a nongovernmental organization to advance the

public good" (p. 34). The "formal embodiments" are categorized by the *actions* they undertake, and the relationships they hold with other sectors (i.e. public and private). There is a common trend in the Canadian philanthropic studies literature to conceptualize philanthropy as a sector (one that encompasses the *actions* of both institutions and individuals), which exists "between" other sectors (i.e. public and private sectors). A number of studies and anthologies therefore focus on the relations between the philanthropy sector and the Canadian state (e.g. Phillips et. al. 2001; Elson 2011; Elson 2016; Lasby and Barr 2015).

Perhaps the broadest and most useful framework for conceptualizing philanthropies around the world positions philanthropy as a social relationship, or a field of social relations. Paul Schervish and Susan Ostrander's (1990) social relations model conceives of philanthropy as a social institution involving many parties, through which relations of power are constantly negotiated, and imbalances of power either upheld or challenged. By this definition, although philanthropy may *involve* action, those actions are always contained and mediated within a complex web of social relations. The relationship framework, Dwight Burlingame (1993) notes, is useful because it neither restricts philanthropy to certain types of action nor presumes a voluntary element. It also "allows for transferability…across cultures and over time" (p. 76). My perspective is that all of the above typologies can be usefully applied to understand the many different things – actions, dispositions and motivations, institutions and sectors, and social relations – that comprise settler philanthropies, and many other philanthropies across time and space.

As Archie (2020) emphasizes (in Dirksen et. al. 2020), Indigenous peoples across what is presently called Canada have also maintained diverse and sophisticated philanthropic structures,

relations, practices, and systems since time immemorial. When European and British explorers and missionaries were encountering Indigenous lands for the first time throughout the 16th-19th centuries, bringing with them deep-rooted philanthropic traditions and sensibilities, they were encountering places with firmly established and sophisticated traditions and sensibilities of their own. Giving, sharing and reciprocity–concepts commonly associated with Indigenous philanthropic practices–are, and have always been, fundamental to the economic, political, social and cultural infrastructures of Indigenous societies (e.g. Grimm 1998; Kuokkanen 2011; Haggarty 2015; Couchman et. al. 2020; Bédard and Price 2021). These things have always been critical to maintaining social relationships and stewarding community and relations to homelands (Couchman et. al. 2020, p. 134). As historian Anne O'Brien (2015) points out in the Australian Indigenous context, Indigenous peoples did not have need of imported philanthropy and charity as the British and European arrivals understood them; even though hubris led colonial agents to believe Indigenous peoples needed "saving" through colonial philanthropy (p. 10). Indeed, in the early days of colonial contact in what is now called Canada it was Indigenous communities' systems of sharing, often enacted by Indigenous women, that helped some groups of imperial explorers and missionaries to survive in the brutal winter conditions they experienced (Couchman et. al. 2020, pp. 131-133).

Furthermore, as in other contexts, Indigenous philanthropic expressions embody tensions and change over time. Scholars emphasize the importance of historicizing philanthropies rather than placing them in a "time capsule" and relegating them to a "traditional" or "anti-modern" past. Indigenous practices and structures of giving and sharing are neither homogenous nor timeless, and should be understood locally. They are highly diverse and manifest in culturally and

geographically specific ways. Innu scholar Shelley Price's research focuses on restorying philanthropy through Indigenous narratives of giving and sharing. In this research, she draws together oral stories from five different Indigenous communities (Innu, Algonquin, Mohawk, Cree and Mi'kmaq) that illuminate diverse Indigenous philosophies of giving, sharing, and reciprocity (Bédard and Price 2021). Some writers also emphasize that Indigenous ways of giving and sharing, and of reciprocity, function as resilience mechanisms in the face of colonial violence (e.g. Kuokkanen 2011). Others show that they are expressions of durable Indigenous sovereignties that exist beyond and outside of coloniality (Kelly and Kelly 2015; Kelly 2017; Kelly and Woods 2021). They have been thriving and maintaining communities since time immemorial, and shifting in response to other environmental and social changes around them. In Chapter 1, I will discuss some of the ways that these practices have been conceptualized in Indigenous-authored literatures focused on specific, local examples from diverse geographies and traditions.

Despite a large body of work on Indigenous philanthropic practices around the globe, much of the research in the growing scholarly field of philanthropy studies tends to uncritically centre Western, white and settler definitions. As Srivastava and Oh (2010) point out: "It would be salient to consider…does the definition and practice of philanthropy in a Northern context hold in a developing one?" (p. 470). The dominance of non-Indigenous assumptions in practice and research, write Mahomed and Moyo (2013), writing in the context of the southern African continent, "developed a narrative of philanthropy" that is often "far from what philanthropy" is like in Indigenous communities and in other non-settler, non-white, non-"Global North" contexts.

Even the use of terms such as philanthropy can be problematic when discussing diverse Indigenous systems and expressions. The word "philanthropy" is of settler origin, and according to Indigenous scholars and knowledge-holders, few Indigenous languages have words that translate directly to "philanthropy" (Bédard and Price 2021). Thus, for some, using the term philanthropy in reference to Indigenous expressions of giving, sharing, and reciprocity, can risk reproducing colonial erasures, by imposing language on Indigenous practices that have existed since time immemorial. Others argue that *not* using the term philanthropy to refer to Indigenous practices and structures can reproduce assumptions that "philanthropy" is a strictly settler thing, and that it is more established or "formal" than what happens in Indigenous communities. In the context of the African continent, for example, Moyo and Ramsamy (2014) argue, "due to analytical influence and frameworks primarily from the West, philanthropy in Africa or, to be more specific, African philanthropy, has sometimes been wrongly and maliciously defined as indigenous or informal" (p. 658). The trouble with using such language as "informal," "traditional," "anti-modern" is that it risks subordinating longstanding, complex and sophisticated practices of philanthropy in an arbitrary hierarchy of progress where institutional settler forms of philanthropy that have developed in settler states over the last century or so are at the top. It also ignores the historicity, resilience and adaptations of local philanthropies by relegating them to a "pre-modern" or "pre-colonial" past.

Keeping these complexities in mind, in this thesis I tend to use the term "Indigenous philanthropies" when referencing Indigenous authors who prefer to use that term. Otherwise, I use "Indigenous practices/structures of giving, sharing, and reciprocity" – or other context and community-specific descriptions. I also tend to pluralize these terms to emphasize their

exceptional diversity both within and across communities throughout the geography of what is presently called Canada, and the fact that they have changed over time.

By using the terms "settler philanthropies" or "Indigenous philanthropies," my aim is to emphasize that philanthropy is, and has always been, many different things, which change over time and are expressed in highly diverse ways across places and cultures. I acknowledge that in some ways use of the term is a form of shorthand and may function as an over-generalization for what Fugiel-Gartner (2024) describes as the "intricate interplay" of many different philanthropic identities and traditions, activities, actors, organizations, and relations that make up the "rich tapestry of Canadian philanthropy" (p. 8 & 66). But by using the term settler philanthropies, my intention is not to ignore or deny complexity within or amongst them. Many forms and expressions of philanthropy (whether represented in the texts I analyze here or not) are practiced by diverse peoples who by my definition are settlers living on Indigenous lands. Settler philanthropy practices and ideas also change over time. And, there are layers and complex dynamics of power and oppression *within* the ecosystem of settler philanthropy in Canada or elsewhere; for example, white settler feminist philanthropic organizations may not control as much wealth or public clout as private family foundations established and controlled by white men (Ostrander 2004). Because I see these things as sprawling, contextually specific, and constantly changing, I typically refer to settler philanthrop*ies* in the plural, or as an ecosystem with many moving parts, throughout my thesis. Furthermore, I am not suggesting that Indigenous peoples do not engage in forms of philanthropy that I would call "settler." On the contrary, most of the Indigenous authors and speakers who are critical of institutional settler philanthropic practices in Canada have worked within settler philanthropy organizations, and in

some cases are presently working within them to reform them. Many Indigenous leaders and communities are also doing things that are commonly positioned as forms of settler philanthropy, such as for example, establishing Indigenous-led community foundations.

There is no question about complexity here. My point in using the term settler philanthropies (and I think the aim of Indigenous leaders working in or adjacent to the sector in having developed it) is that philanthropy is not just one thing. It is a problem that the highly specific and localized philanthropic expressions of some settlers (e.g. foundations or elite donor activities) are often neutrally, universally described just as "philanthropy." This tendency risks implicitly assuming universality for very particular understandings, an assumption that is fundamental to the "ubiquitous socializing power of white supremacy" as demonstrated by Robin DiAngelo (2018, p. 129). It also dehistoricizes settler philanthropies in settler states, removing them from their underpinnings in colonial violence and white supremacy. Such universalizing language, which appears in some philanthropic studies discourse, can nurture coloniality and white supremacy in scholarship, practice and the wider social world. For these reasons, I think it is important to centre the specific dynamics of power (which themselves are complex and intersectional) inherent to relations between Indigenous and settler peoples in the wider landscape of philanthropies in Canada. I am doing so in part by naming the settlerness of things that I think are often de-racialized, distanced from coloniality, and deemed universal. Doing so poses a challenge to the "refusal to know" that forms a pillar of white supremacy and coloniality, both in the settler philanthropy world specifically and across what is now called Canada generally (DiAngelo 2018).

One final note: I use the term Indigenous to refer generally to the diverse Peoples (First Nations, Métis, Inuit) whose homelands the Canadian colonial state invades. However, wherever possible I indicate the specific names, nations, homelands, or languages of Indigenous individuals, according to how they identify themselves in the texts I have read.

Introduction – "Ongoing harm under a prettier, brighter umbrella": reconciliation in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector

In 2015, leadership of The Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal peoples–an Indigenous-led member organization working to strengthen relations between Canadian philanthropy and Indigenous communities–described reconciliation optimistically as "one of the ways we return to humanness in our relationships" (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2015). Canadian philanthropy, they wrote, had an important role in the social movement "to make good again, to create repair" through the "building and then healing of right relationship" between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada. Skarù rę' and Kitigan Zibi Anishinaabeg leader Wanda Brascoupé, the Circle's CEO at the time, encouraged philanthropic actors to see themselves as leaders in the nationwide movement toward reconciliation. She wrote in 2017 that the Circle was committed to facilitating reconciliation in the sector, and that organizational leadership believed "reconciliation involves a willingness to engage in the uncomfortable, to enable us to acknowledge the hidden truth of our shared history to activate an encompassing movement of fairness, equality and respect" (Avery and Brascoupé Peters 2017). The Circle, she indicated, was committed to facilitating the Canadian philanthropy sector's movement in this direction, toward building relationships between the sector and Indigenous communities.

Four years later, under different leadership, the Circle tweeted that its position on reconciliation had drastically changed. It had made the decision to intentionally avoid the use of the term reconciliation altogether, because Indigenous members of the organization felt reconciliation "didn't mean anything" anymore, and in fact had been "co-opted by industry, philanthropy, academia" to become a "dirty word to justify ongoing harm under a prettier, brighter umbrella" (Archie 2021a). As the then-new CEO Kris Archie wrote, in the early days of reconciliation, many

Indigenous peoples in the sector had hope that it was "a word that mattered," and that settlers in philanthropy would "do [their] part in learning and making right." Yet, according to Archie, Indigenous peoples soon found themselves burdened with the labour of doing reconciliation *for* settlers, saddled with the expectation that they were the ones who had to reconcile with colonial institutions and behaviours that would not actually change. They also frequently experienced resistance when they attempted to expose settlers in the sector to institutional philanthropy's complicity in the historical and ongoing violence of colonialism (Dupré 2018 & 2019; Manning 2021). Where once reconciliation had been hopefully advanced as a process of deep, sector-wide transformation, in practice it was being experienced a means to sustain colonial business as usual. For these reasons, Archie emphasized, the Circle would no longer focus on reconciling relations between settlers in philanthropy and Indigenous peoples. Rather it shifted its focus to amplifying the leadership and self-determination of Indigenous leaders, movements, and communities, and to inviting settlers in philanthropy to support that work humbly and amply, in the background.

This strong tonal shift from hope to disappointment, from optimism to cynicism–even to the point of total refusal of reconciliation as a meaningful concept–encapsulates the key focus of this thesis: the dissonant expressions and outcomes of what I call the reconciliation change narrative in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector. As Brascoupé and her colleagues had hopefully indicated, reconciliation could be part of a transformative movement toward equity and justice in and beyond the philanthropy sector, reshaping settler-Indigenous relations. Archie, who became the Circle's CEO in 2017, noted, however, that reconciliation narratives could also obscure and perpetuate the very problems that reconciliation's champions purported to address. The Circle's reasons for its rhetorical shift points to the complex and at times contradictory roles that settler philanthropies can

play in the wider landscape of colonial relations from which they emerge, and in which they function.

In this study, I analyze the significance of such dissonant expressions. I am interested in the ways that reconciliation has been described and defined, and how diverse actors across the settler philanthropy ecosystem have articulated reconciliation as a concept, ideal, or course of action, as well as how others have critiqued and resisted dominant articulations of reconciliation. These articulations have specific and material implications for settler philanthropic practice.

Reconciliation in the settler philanthropy sector

Engagement with reconciliation in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector must be contextualized within the broader history of public engagement with reconciliation in Canada. In the wider literature, reconciliation is usually framed as the process, means or goal of transforming relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. While expressions of "truth and reconciliation" have a long and international genealogy (Gaertner 2020), reconciliation's application in Canada was clearly articulated and widely publicized through the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) in 2008, and the 2015 release of its *Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*.

The TRC was established following the 2007 conclusion of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement (IRSSA), the largest class action settlement in Canadian history (de Bruin and Gallant 2020). This was a key outcome of decades of advocacy and legal campaigns led by survivors of the Indian Residential School (IRS) system in Canada, pressing governments and churches to acknowledge the abuses and intergenerational harms of the IRS and to provide

compensation to survivors. Under the IRSSA, survivors, legal counsel, and government representatives agreed to several components, including compensation payments, the provision of healing and health services, and the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (ibid.). The TRC was a $60 million dollar, 5-year federal commission intended to raise public awareness and create space for survivors and witnesses across the country to share their testimony about the 120 years of residential school history. During this time, government and church officials had forcibly removed over 150,000 Indigenous children from their homes and communities and forced them into residential "schools" where their cultures and ways of living and knowing were actively devalued, and they were often subject to physical, emotional, and sexual abuse, and punished for speaking their languages (de Bruin and Gallant 2020). Residential school survivors and historians have written extensively on the history and intergenerational impacts of residential schools, demonstrating that these were instrumental in Canada's colonial genocide. The residential school system tore apart Indigenous families, severed the intergenerational transmission of Indigenous knowledge and ways of being to youth for generations, while also interrupting the connections of Indigenous children and families from the lands and waters that made up their homelands. As such, residential schools were essential weapons of what Audra Simpson (2014) and Matthew Wildcat (2015) call social, political, and cultural death: the destruction of Indigenous collectivities. This, they argue, is key to the work of colonial elimination in settler states like Canada: the removal of Indigenous peoples, societies, ways of living and claims to sovereignty from the land, with the intention of transforming that land into a place settlers claim as home.

In June 2008, former Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper formally and publicly apologized to all victims and survivors of the IRS for Canada's role (Government of Canada 2008). The Government of Canada, he said, "sincerely apologizes and asks the forgiveness of the Aboriginal

peoples of this country for failing them so profoundly" (ibid.). Seven years later, in June 2015, the final report of the TRC was released. It concluded that residential schools were instruments of cultural genocide in Canada: the systematic destruction of Indigenous cultures, languages, values, ways of knowing and communities (TRC 2015). The final report identified pressing socioeconomic issues Indigenous peoples face as a direct result of the policies of assimilation and cultural genocide. It called on all Canadians to engage with truth and reconciliation, "establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples" through "awareness of the past, acknowledgment of the harm that has been inflicted, atonement for the causes, and action to change behaviour" (ibid., p. 7). Concluding with 94 specific calls to action for enacting reconciliation across sectors, levels of government, and institutions, it stated that all Canadians "have a critical role to play in advancing reconciliation" (p. 183).

Since then, what critical theorist David Gaertner (2020) calls the "genre" of reconciliation was taken up very publicly by settler governments at all levels (i.e. federal, provincial, municipal) and within other institutions such as universities and hospitals, and corporations. In 2016, Canadian Liberal Prime Minister Justin Trudeau's federal administration promised to act on the TRC's conclusions and recommendations and increase public spending for Indigenous services and programs, and to engage in "nation to nation" relations with Indigenous governments. In other industries and sectors, engagement with reconciliation took the form of public statements of commitment, formal apologies, land acknowledgements, increased hires of Indigenous employees, cultural sensitivity training and professional development, and the development of organizational strategic plans that centred reconciliation, decolonization, and Indigenization goals.

In this context, the concept of reconciliation also gained traction in the settler philanthropy sector, as some philanthropists and organizations began to engage in conversations about their roles in the reconciliation movement. Philanthropy-specific responses to the TRC's 94 Calls to Action (none of which were explicitly directed to philanthropy or the voluntary sector) were reflected most clearly in the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration for Action* (the *Declaration*), co-written by several Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders in the sector in 2015, to serve as a call to action directed toward Canadian philanthropy.[1] The *Declaration* framed reconciliation as a responsibility of all Canadians, and by extension, of the sector (The Circle 2015). It described the TRC's 2015 conclusion as "an opportune moment for Canada's philanthropic community" not only to do reconciliation themselves, but also to "demonstrate leadership" on reconciliation in Canadian society, bringing "our networks, our voices, and our resources" to the table to do the work (ibid.). The document's 86 current signatories (as of Summer 2024) include private and community foundations of all kinds and sizes, philanthropic convening groups like PFC and CFC, hybrids like United Ways, schools and university organizations, and other types of charitable organizations.[2] Some of the key events leading up to and following the *Declaration*'s release are outlined in the chart below.

Timeline of key events related to the Canadian philanthropic sector's engagement with reconciliation	
2006-2007	A small group of Canadian private foundation leaders meet over several conference calls to discuss how their foundations (and the wider foundation community) could "better support Indigenous communities." They establish the Aboriginal Grantmakers Network (the predecessor to The Circle) (Couchman et al. 2020, p. 135; Simon et al. 2021).
2008	The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada is established to fulfill one of the mandates of the *Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement*, with a $60 million budget over five years (CBC News 2008).

[1] I have included a transcription of the *Declaration* as an appendix to this thesis. See Appendix I.
[2] The list is posted and maintained on the Circle's website. The Circle updates the list every year.

	Former Conservative Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper publicly apologizes to survivors of Indian Residential Schools in a televised speech (Government of Canada 2008).
	The first All My Relations (AMR) Gathering, hosted by the Aboriginal Grantmakers Network, takes place north of Winnipeg. Forty staff members and leaders from Canadian private, public and community foundations, Indigenous communities, and charitable organizations attend. The event is described as "the first time philanthropic foundations [had] assembled together with the aim to better understand Aboriginal peoples, communities and issues in Canada." It coincided with the televised apology of Stephen Harper on 11 June (The Circle 2008, p. 1).
2011-2013	Assembly of First Nations[3] Grand Chief Shawn A-in-Chut Atleo gives the keynote speech at the Philanthropic Foundations Canada conference (2011), Imagine Canada Summit (2011) and Community Foundations Canada conference (2013), speaking about the roles of Canadian philanthropy and charitable sector in addressing socioeconomic disparities faced by Indigenous peoples. He encourages philanthropic leaders to develop stronger and long-term relationships between the sector and First Nations communities (Atleo 2011a; Atleo 2011b; Atleo 2013).
2014	Hon. Justice Murray Sinclair, the Chairman of the TRC, gives the keynote speech at PFC's 2014 Conference in Halifax, Nova Scotia. This event inspired philanthropic sector leaders to draft the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017).
2014-2015	Staff and leadership from CFC, PFC, the Circle and several private and community foundations collaborate to draft the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* to publicly express sector interest in engaging in reconciliation (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2016).
June 2015	The TRC holds its closing events in Ottawa, Ontario, presenting a summary of findings of the Commission as well as the 94 Calls to Action that the TRC recommended.
	Co-authors and original signatories of the *Declaration* present the document as a statement of their commitment and the commitment of those in the Canadian philanthropy sector to reconciliation at TRC Closing events in Ottawa (Pearson *et al.* 2015).
2020	In February 2020, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) arrest more than 200 peaceful Wet'suwet'en protestors, mostly Elders, hereditary leaders, and other land defenders who dissented to the expansion of the Coastal GasLink (CGL) Pipeline through their unceded ancestral homelands. RCMP tactical teams armed with assault weapons raided protestors' camps and road blockade (which had stopped the CGL Pipeline work) at the Unist'ot'en Healing Centre. In turn, a series of solidarity protests and blockades emerge across Canada, represented under hashtags #alleyesonWetsuweten, #SHUTDOWNCANADA and #reconciliationisdead. The state's violent responses to the protests lead some Indigenous critics to emphasize the view that reconciliation in Canada is dead, or

[3]An organizing body of the 634 First Nations in Canada. Established in 1982, it is a national umbrella organization that focuses on advocacy/lobbying on issues of interest to First Nations governments such as environmental protection, economic development, rights and justice. The organization primarily represents Status First Nations peoples (i.e. it is not representative of non-Status First Nations, Métis or Inuit peoples). National Chiefs are elected for three-year terms. See https://afn.ca.

	that it had never lived in the first place (Rotz, Rück and Carleton 2020; Wente 2020).
	In summer of 2020, reporting on the inequitable distribution of the effects of COVID-19 on Indigenous and racialized communities, as well as the murder of George Floyd and uptake of the Black Lives Matter movement, spurs an increased number of online discussions of philanthropy's role in decolonization, racial justice and anti-racism in North America (PFC 2020; Saifer 2020a; Tune and Contreras Correal 2020; Contreras Correal 2020d).
2021-2022	Ground-penetrating radar studies at Tk'emlups Indian Residential School near present-day Kamloops, British Columbia find over 200 underground "anomalies," the unmarked graves of Indigenous children forced to attend the school. A number of other studies at the grounds of former residential schools across the country produce similar findings. The media coverage surrounding the findings results in a resurgence of reconciliation discourse in the philanthropy sector and across Canadian media (Blackstock and Palmater 2021).

As was the case across other institutions and sectors, the "age of reconciliation" was one of the first times people in the institutional philanthropy sector were collectively and explicitly called to awareness of and engagement with coloniality and Indigenous/settler relations. Advocates argued that given its unique position in relation to governments and communities, the philanthropic sector in Canada could play an important role in supporting Indigenous communities and initiatives, more than it had previously. Brascoupé and her colleagues argued in 2016 that engagement with reconciliation had the potential to shift relationships by encouraging deep relationship building, humility and learning amongst settler philanthropy actors, and a shift in power and resources from philanthropic organizations to Indigenous leaders and communities (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2016). Reconciliation was framed as an opportunity for settler philanthropy actors to commit to learning about Indigenous communities, Indigenous-settler relations and the history of colonialism in Canada (Karim 2017); to increase the diversity of their organizations and the wider sector by building relationships with Indigenous communities and recruiting more Indigenous peoples, especially in positions of leadership (Pearson 2018); to commit to abundantly and intentionally funding Indigenous organizations and causes (Manwaring *et al.* 2016; Circle 2018); and to use their

political and social leverage to advocate for greater inclusion both in the sector and across Canadian society (Lacerte 2016).

Settler philanthropic organizations responded to the public discourse on reconciliation in various ways. Some organizations established mandates to direct philanthropic funds to Indigenous-led initiatives and communities, such as for example the MasterCard Foundation (Brennan and Kwofie 2021), the Inspirit Foundation (Zaman 2021), and the Catherine Donnelly Foundation (Catherine Donnelly Foundation 2020). The umbrella organizations for all community foundations, Community Foundations Canada (CFC), published its commitment to develop "sustainable funding and grant-making opportunities to support Indigenous initiatives in collaboration with community foundations," and highlighted new funding programs related to reconciliation that were being developed by various community foundations across Canada (Grant 2016; CFC 2017). Other organizations hired Indigenous peoples into leadership roles; for example in 2017 the Calgary Foundation (the community foundation for the city of Calgary, Alberta) created a new leadership position: Vice President of Indigenous Relations, and hired Tim Fox, a Niitsitaapi (Blackfoot) nonprofit leader and member of Kainai First Nation for the role (Fox 2018). In 2021, Janine Manning, Anishinaabe member of the Chippewas of Nawash First Nation (Neyaashiinigmiing) became the first Indigenous woman to be named president of a private foundation's board of directors, at the Laidlaw Foundation (Morrisseau and Manning 2021). As Kris Archie reflected during a webinar in 2021, early on, there were "[all] kinds of ways" in which some members of the sector were "showing up alongside Indigenous partners and doing amazing work."

However, echoing parallel critiques being voiced across other sectors and industries, some Indigenous leaders in philanthropy also articulated strong critiques of reconciliation discourse and

activity. Follow-up research suggested that by 2022, a small number of philanthropic institutions had mandated more funding toward Indigenous communities, but the overall funding landscape had not much changed within seven years of the TRC, with just over 1% of the total number of grants, and .7% of the total granted amount, of all foundations going to Indigenous-led organizations ((Redsky *et al.* 2021; Redsky *et al.* 2022). Other critiques suggested that sometimes reconciliation discourse masked and reproduced colonial power dynamics in the settler philanthropy context even as it talked about addressing colonialism (Archie *et al.* 2017; Bahubeshi *et al.* 2018; Goodchild 2019). In many cases, critics suggested alternative ways of engaging with reconciliation, or sometimes refused it as a meaningful concept altogether (Jamieson 2020; Couchman et al. 2020; Munshi and Levi 2021). The archive of texts I have assembled and analyze in the chapters that follow are a window into these complex discussions. I will draw conclusions about dissonant expressions and outcomes of the reconciliation narrative and their implications for settler philanthropic actions and decision-making. In turn, I explore what a critical analysis of reconciliation can say about the complicated and dynamic relationship of settler philanthropies to durable colonial relations in present-day Canada.

Overview of the thesis project

This thesis presents a critical textual analysis of what I call the reconciliation change narrative in Canadian philanthropy, as expressed from 2008-2022 in texts produced by a group of philanthropic intermediary organizations and their members: one Indigenous-led philanthropic intermediary (the Circle on Philanthropy [“the Circle”]); three settler-led philanthropic intermediaries (Imagine Canada, Community Foundations Canada [CFC], and Philanthropic Foundations Canada [PFC]); and one widely read Canadian sector publication called *The Philanthropist*. The intermediaries on which I focus provide a view onto a specific side of Canadian settler philanthropy, as an ecosystem of actors, institutions, communities, ideologies and actions. Each has been involved in important

ways in the expression, and sometimes the refutation, of reconciliation within this ecosystem. I theorize change narratives as stories whereby philanthropic actors situate themselves in the social order and justify their activities. The production of such narratives is part of the process of imagining and framing practical, social, political, and ethical problems of interest to philanthropic actors and organizations, and determining which ones get attention or resources at a given time. Change narratives like reconciliation are simultaneously discursive and affective formations: they are made up of words and representations (discourse) and of sensed, felt, embodied and performed experience (affect), and they have important functions in the settler philanthropy world. They direct and inform organizational and sectoral policies, and shape philanthropic relationships, giving and funding decisions, and institutional practices. They also change over time to reflect shifting priorities and ideas with uptake within the sector and in wider public discourse.

Drawing on theoretical and methodological approaches from a broad range of literatures in critical discourse studies, affect studies, decolonial studies, Indigenous studies, and philanthropic studies, this thesis aims to explore several topics of interest. My key focuses are how various settler philanthropy actors have engaged with, imagined, and expressed reconciliation in and for the Canadian philanthropic sector over time, and what some of the common affective and discursive patterns of this change narrative are. I am also interested in resistance, refusals and reimaginings of reconciliation – especially those articulated by Indigenous critics of settler philanthropy practices and institutions, and of reconciliation. Following these threads, my goal is to shed light on what settler philanthropy actors' engagement with this change narrative (and its critiques and alternatives) can tell us about the complex place of settler philanthropies in the wider environment of durable colonial relations in Canada. I look to the complex and often subtle ways that colonial

power has been exercised and reproduced, obscured, discussed, refused and resisted, in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector over time.

I have conducted a critical analysis of an expansive archive of digital texts I assembled through a comprehensive search of PFC's, CFC's, Imagine Canada's and The Circle's communications and publications, as well as of the full online database of *The Philanthropist*. The core archive of texts I assembled consists of 156 texts published from 2008-2022, including a mix of blog posts, journal articles, social media releases, transcribed recordings of conference sessions and webinars, research reports, practice guides and professional development resources produced by these organizations. I also occasionally refer to texts that were produced by other organizations or that were published outside of this timeframe, to situate my analysis within a broader spatial-temporal context. These various types of texts are authored by a diverse group of people including Indigenous and non-Indigenous sector leaders, volunteers, activists, staff of philanthropic and charitable organizations, politicians, academics and community leaders. Each of the texts I review in some way sheds light on the diverse and dissonant ways that reconciliation has been expressed and operationalized across the Canadian philanthropy ecosystem.

I chose to focus on PFC, CFC, Imagine Canada and the Circle because their 'in-between' position in the philanthropy sector, and their diverse membership/audiences, bring critical perspective to my study. These organizations and *The Philanthropist* all work, to some degree, to inform and influence philanthropic practice, policy and decision-making, and each has contributed to engagement with reconciliation in the Canadian settler philanthropy ecosystem in varying ways. Their resources reach a broad membership base that includes private and public foundations, community foundations, charitable organizations, policy-makers, individual givers, charity leaders,

grassroots organizations, giving circles and advocacy groups. I will situate the focus of this study within the broader context of settler institutional/sectoral philanthropies taking shape on Indigenous homelands across the continent what is presently called North America below. As I will discuss further in Chapter 2, the texts produced by these intermediary entities provide lenses onto the power of change narratives to influence both thought and practice in the philanthropy ecosystem, and onto the ways that change narratives in the broader social world filter into the world of philanthropy. These organizations play complex roles in this respect; they both reflect and reproduce the narratives already at work within the philanthropy ecosystem (that is, feeding back to philanthropic actors the discourse and affect that are already circulating amongst them), and at other times introduce new or unfamiliar narratives onto the scene. As such, intermediary organizations' messaging can function to both stabilize and disrupt norms and unremarked assumptions in the settler philanthropy world. Philanthropic intermediaries' change narratives about reconciliation, settlerness and Indigeneity filter into and shape actions, perspectives and relations in the settler philanthropy ecosystem – with impacts on material relations in the wider social world in which that ecosystem emerges. This in turn feeds back into the production and reframing of existing and new change narratives.

Theoretical framework and analytical focus: reconciliation and colonial durabilities

My analysis rests on several key premises about philanthropy and coloniality. I will briefly summarize these now, but unpack them further in the next chapter, where I provide conceptual and historical framing for my study. The first premise is that settler colonialism is not a historical phenomenon that has ended in Canada, but rather is durable and shifting (and durable because it shifts), as Indigenous scholars and activists have extensively discussed (e.g. Coulthard and Epstein 2015; Simpson 2016d; Simpson 2016b; LaDuke and Cowen 2020). I deliberately use the word

'coloniality' rather than 'colonialism' throughout this thesis, to suggest more of an ongoing state of being rather than a historical time period or set of activities that has ended. Where, as in Canada, it appears that imperial powers have receded, leaving behind only traces, place-names and imperial nostalgia, durable colonial relations continue to rearticulate themselves, in new and sometimes obscure ways. I agree with post-colonial historian Ann Laura Stoler who argues that colonial relations continue to "bear on the present" in complex ways and are "ineffably threaded through the fabric of contemporary life" (Stoler, 2016 p. 5). My focus on reconciliation necessitates attention to colonial durabilities taking shape in the late 20th and early 21st century – in the form of neoliberal social and economic policy and dominant neoliberal discourses. Because reconciliation in the settler philanthropy sector and in other institutions and sectors in Canada emerges within and (to some extent) in response to neoliberal policies and discourses, I pay critical attention to theorists of colonial neoliberalization in this thesis. Indeed, the second key premise for this study is that settler philanthropies in Canada, past and present, cannot be understood apart from this complex and shifting field of colonial relations from which they emerge. This project therefore aims to explicitly centre critical perspectives on coloniality within the growing field of Canadian and global philanthropic studies, in order to unpack some of these connections through my analysis of reconciliation.

Another core premise is that colonial durabilities are neither inevitable nor total. Indigenous resistance and alternative futures have been expressed across a wide range of Indigenous literatures, research, activism, art, song and story, and myriad other forms. These remind us that, though stubbornly durable, coloniality is not all-consuming; rather, Indigenous sovereignties, ways of knowing, and alternative futures both refuse and exceed coloniality (i.e. not needing it to exist).[4]

[4] Carey and Silverstein (2020) present a helpful review and discussion of much of the Indigenous-authored literature centring these perspectives.

Just so, as Indigenous scholars and activists tell us, durable systems of Indigenous giving, sharing, and reciprocity have often been a means of challenging colonial relations of domination, and a tool of resisting and refusing colonial power (e.g. Kuokkanen 2004 & 2011; Kelly 2017). They also, according to Indigenous theorists, have existed without reference to coloniality for a long time – shaping and sustaining diverse Indigenous communities. Just as I am interested in the connections between settler philanthropies and colonial durabilities, I am also focused on the durable possibilities against and beyond coloniality that Indigenous critics have articulated across the archive of texts I analyze, and in the wider literature. A final premise is that change narratives such as reconciliation can be important windows onto this complex field of durable (but precarious) colonial relations. As bundles of discourse and affect change narratives can have potentially powerful material functions in the settler philanthropy world. My specific interest is in the ways change narratives reflect, respond to and shape durable colonial relations (and refusals) in the sector and more widely in Canada, and in turn what this has meant for both the practices and outcomes of settler philanthropy.

Building on these premises, I have developed a layered conceptual and theoretical framework to analyze the reconciliation change narrative as a discursive-affective production characterized by dissonance: tensions, contradictions, ambivalence and change over time. I bring the archive of texts I have assembled into dialogue with wider critical commentary on reconciliation, philanthropy, and coloniality, especially articulated by Indigenous activists, scholars and practitioners from within and outside the sector. As Gaertner (2020) argues, "Understanding reconciliation means listening to the peoples on whose lands that concept is being enacted and whose histories it claims to redress," many of whom have "produced rigorous and critical Indigenous frameworks through which to consider and critique the possibility of reconciliation in Canada" (p. 56).

I draw especially on theorists of reconciliation who see it as an expression of both colonial recognition and of colonial unknowing – co-constitutive discursive-affective processes that, as I explore in Chapter 1, can keep colonial relations of domination and violence firmly in place and out of sight (Coulthard 2014; Vimalessary et al. 2016). Colonial recognition, a theoretical concept elaborated by Dene scholar Glen Coulthard, is a key structuring technology of the Canadian colonial nationstate. The aim of state recognition, Coulthard writes, is to coercively reconcile Indigenous People's assertions of self-determination and sovereignty over the land with "settler state sovereignty" through formal state recognition of Indigenous rights within the dominant settler legal order. Other Indigenous scholars expand this theorization to argue that it is a discursive and affective feature of reconciliation work in Canada, in which settlers and institutions engaged in reconciliation perform recognition of problems caused by coloniality, but treat those problems with spatial and temporal demarcations: recognizing the existence of colonial violence, but relegating it to the past (specifically, to the history of residential schools). Relatedly, colonial unknowing, according to Vimalassery et al. (2016), refers to the willful forgetfulness at the heart of much reconciliation discourse – through which settlers distance themselves from the presentness of coloniality. As mutually constitutive processes, recognition and unknowing reinscribe and obscure colonial durabilities.

In addition to theories on recognition and unknowing, I draw on theorists of change, who argue that grand-scale performances of change, like those associated with the reconciliation change narrative, are usually tied up with keeping the status quo in place – in maintaining colonial durabilities (Stoler 2016; Manning 2016). This is a key point of dissonance I foreground in this thesis: despite being a narrative that is all about largescale societal transformation, often the reconciliation change

narrative functions to reproduce the status quo both in the field of settler philanthropy and in the broader areas in which settler philanthropists operate. Canadian philosopher Erin Manning (2016) describes this as the "grand gesture" version of change. The large-scale and revolutionary shifts in history that she associates with the grand gesture are often imagined or presumed to be where most social transformation lies, but in reality, often only serve to maintain existing structures of power. Manning concludes that as a "grand gesture," reconciliation does not make way for the genuinely decolonial, the minor and otherwise alternative futures – "despite its splash." Even with, or perhaps because of, well-meaning efforts to "do" reconciliation, colonial relations of domination can persist. Critics of dominant strains of reconciliation also advance alternative ideas and possibilities for, or instead of, reconciliation; thus they introduce another strain of dissonance to the conversation altogether. Their alternative visions reflect what Manning (2016) describes as the "minor tendencies, gestures and interactions" or what historian Penelope Edmonds (2016) in her study of reconciliation describes as "unruly ruptures" in the public consensus around reconciliation, revealing the limitations of the dominant reconciliation paradigm "with its linear push to forget and move forward" (p. 11). Such unruly ruptures are imagined as ways by which colonial violence can resisted and refused, and reconciliation reimagined or perhaps abandoned altogether.

Theory on reconciliation and colonial durabilities, on unknowing and recognition, on change, the minor, and the grand gesture together help me to unpack the dissonant expressions and functions of the reconciliation change narrative as expressed across the texts I analyze in this thesis. I am interested in what the change narrative says about Canadian settler philanthropy, how it is expressed, and what it *does* – i.e. its many complicated and dissonant outcomes. My aim is to mobilize these layered theoretical perspectives to shed light on some of the complex ways that

colonial power is exercised, obscured, challenged and refused in and by Canadian settler philanthropy.

In the chapters that follow, I trace out a number of interrelated features across the texts in the archive I have assembled. I discuss what is and is not said, focusing on common themes and motifs, word choice, use of pronouns and verb tense, omissions, obfuscations and rhetorical devices of distancing. I also attend to context: taking into account the identities and positionality of those who create and consume texts (and those who are intended to consume them), and the (stated and perceived) reasons for their production. I am also interested to some extent in the physical and social spaces in which texts were produced, and the political, professional and social parameters in which the people and organizations producing and receiving the texts are operating. I try to think through the significance of genre and mode of expression of different texts, and also attend to literary and rhetorical devices, use of metaphor and imagery, expressions of emotion, tone and stress, use of tense, and syntactic structure. I also trace some of the affective inflections that cannot be captured strictly by analysis of language or discourse, following threads of urgency, anxiety, compassion, shame and guilt articulated in some texts. I attend to the emotional and affective tenor and tone of some of the texts. Every text cannot be weighed or analyzed in the same way. Each has a different style, potential audience, purpose, outcome and function. Taken in aggregate, these diverse documents demonstrate possibilities and tensions, contradictions, and alternate visions for reconciliation and for the settler philanthropy ecosystem as a whole.

On the settler philanthropy ecosystems in present-day Canada and U.S.: situating the study

The world of settler philanthropies that has developed in the Indigenous lands across what is presently known as North America is diverse and sprawling, and changing all the time. As I explained in the Prefatory Note, my thesis focuses on a small subsection of this much wider field in the settler Canadian context. However, I tend to conceptualize settler philanthropies, and philanthropy in general, in much broader terms – as a shifting and complex field of relations and activities through which power is always negotiated, shored up, and redistributed amongst many parties. Philanthropies are also always the products of their geographic, cultural, and sociohistorical contexts. The discussion that follows is focused to provide context on the development and shape of the specific types of settler philanthropic entities represented by the intermediary organizations I study – those that are primarily institutional in structure and practice, hold legal and corporate designations as "charitable organizations" under the Canadian state's regulatory framework, and are mainly focused on funding. I also provide some comparative context with parallel settler philanthropies in the present-day United States. There are many similarities in both contexts. The policy frameworks that underpinned much of the development of various types of philanthropic institutions in the U.S. were mirrored in the Canadian context throughout the 20th century, shaping the field to the present. Furthermore, in both contexts, institutional settler philanthropies have always been deeply entangled in the histories of colonial violence and genocide across the continent.

Institutional settler philanthropies have strong roots in a historical spectrum of cultural, linguistic, and religious traditions and sensibilities imported from Britain and continental Europe (Fugiel-Gartner 2024, p. 8). In both present-day Canada and U.S., scholars have identified strong geneaological connections to Judeo-Christian traditions of charity toward the poor as well as Greco-Roman traditions of making private contributions for public works and infrastructures

(Lefèvre and Elson 2020, p. 17; Fontan and Pearson 2021, p. 2). These philanthropic traditions were imported to the colonies being established in Indigenous lands with the violent waves of European and British imperialism throughout the 16th-19th centuries.

By the late 19th century, with both the international boundary line and the colonial states of Canada and America, and their growing industrial capitalist economies, more firmly established, the institutional and state-supported structures of philanthropy that are the focus of this thesis began to proliferate. Vast accumulations of industrial and capital wealth on both sides of the imposed border, alongside shifts in formal state definitions and regulation of philanthropy in both countries throughout the 20th century, shaped the landscapes of institutional settler philanthropic funding into what they are now (Lefèvre and Elson 2020, p. 20): a blend of private family and corporate foundations, community foundations, and United Ways among other diverse registered giving/granting vehicles. The establishment of large philanthropic institutions by wealthy settler industrialists at the turn of the 19th century came with a shift in perspectives on the purpose of philanthropy – from charitable notions of relief to the poor, to focusing on capitalist investments in the "public good," and the belief in the power of the "rigour and method of a capitalist enterprise" to address social issues and contribute to the progress of "all mankind" (Lefèvre and Elson 2020, p. 17; also Rigillo et al. 2018, p. 9). Strong political traditions of cooperatives and mutual aid, especially in the Western provinces and in Quebec, also influenced the widespread development of more hybrid models of institutional philanthropy like United Ways and community foundations (Rigillo et. al. 2018, p. 9; Lefèvre and Elson 2020, pp. 23-26). Of course, as I will discuss at length in the next chapter, settler concepts of "progress," mutual aid and community development in the age of industrial colonial capitalism were not applicable equitably to all. They took root and shaped settler philanthropic enterprises at the expense of Indigenous, Black and racialized lives, and

through the theft of Indigenous lands. Eliminationist policies in both Canada and the U.S. enabled the vast accumulations of capital, land and power that were the basis of many of the oldest and largest philanthropic organizations in the U.S. and Canada.

The landscape of philanthropic institutions in both present-day Canada and the United States has developed in large part in response to shifts in state policy around philanthropy. As Lefèvre and Elson (2020) write, there are strong parallels in the histories of institutional philanthropy in both settler states. Federal tax deductions for charitable donations during the First World War established the states' stances on subsidizing philanthropic giving, in 1917 in the U.S. and in 1921 in Canada. The federal government in the U.S. began registering foundations in 1943, and in Canada in 1967 (Fontan and Elson 2021, p. 4; Lefèvre and Elson 2020, p. 20). These incentives and frameworks, and their subsequent revisions throughout the century, catalyzed the establishment of many different types of philanthropic entities, including private and community foundations, as well as federated giving vehicles like United Ways (Elson et. al. 2018, p. 1778; Khovrenkov 2021, p. 1). While the growth of philanthropic institutions in present-day Canada trailed that in the U.S. for most of the 20th century, it accelerated significantly from the 1980s to the early 2000s, in large part as a response to major contractions of the welfare states taking place during these decades – a phenomenon I discuss at greater length in the next chapter (Rigillo 2018, pp. 19-20; Fugiel-Garner 2024, p. 9).

In Canada, the state-recognized philanthropic landscape is divided into three categories: private foundations, public foundations, and charitable organizations. To obtain federal recognition as a registered charity under the Canadian *Income Tax Act* (which determines whether an organization pays taxes on income and whether it can issue tax-deductible receipts for donations), institutions

must fall under one of those three designations, and their purposes must fall under at least one of four categories based on the *Pemsel* case, an 1891 decision on what constitutes "charitable activity" made in the English House of Lords, with roots in Elizabethan charity law. The four acceptable purposes include: the relief of poverty, the advancement of education, the advancement of religion, and other purposes beneficial to the community not falling under the preceding heads (Barnes 2022). The principle activity of private and public foundations is distributing funds (i.e. grant-making), but they can also carry out charitable activities (i.e. implementation), while other charitable organizations must expend a majority of their resources on carrying out charitable activities. Public foundations usually receive their funding from arms-length donors, and 50% or more their boards and trustees must deal with each other at arms-length (Rigillo et. al. 2018, pp. 5-6). These arms-length requirements do not apply to private foundations, which can (and typically are) funded through a single, endowed gift made by a donor, family or corporation, and managed often by family members or others who are not at arms-length from the original donor (ibid.; Glover and Stevens 2020, p. 112). Grant-making foundations must disburse a minimum of 4.5% of assets every year to maintain their tax-free status under the *Canadian Income Tax Act.* In the present-day U.S., the regulatory field is slightly more complicated, with twenty-nine different types of charitable organizations exempt from some or all federal taxes. There are three types of foundations there: public charities, private foundations, and private operating charities. Public charities must benefit the public good through their carrying out of charitable activities, must be governed at least at 50% arms-length, and must raise revenues through fundraising. Private foundations typically exist through endowments made by an individual, family or corporation and can be controlled by multiple parties. They must disburse a minimum of 5% of assets annually. Private operating foundations can have similar origins as other private foundations (i.e. coming from single endowments made by individuals, families or corporations) but primarily exist for

implementation rather than for grant-making. They must spend at least 85% of their income on conducting charitable activities and are not subject to the minimum 5% payout rule (Rigillo et. al. 2018, pp. 6-7).

In practice, private foundations in the settler Canadian context typically are family foundations (such as the McConnell Foundation and the Max Bell Foundation) and corporate foundations (such as the RBC Foundation, the Suncor Energy Foundation, and the MasterCard Foundation). Organizations that fall under the public foundation designation generally include community foundations and United Ways, as well as federally funded endowments that operate at arms-length from government. Community foundations operate across the continent as place-based and (in theory) citizen-governed funding entities "rooted in the issues and concerns of their geographic communities" (Pearson 2020, p. 49). These organizations pool and distribute philanthropic resources to address those issues and concerns, formally manage individual donations and endowments, and implement their own charitable activities (McCort and Phillips 2021, p. 2). They also provide advice to donors, convene in their communities, and engage in public policy (ibid., p. 3). United Ways are a unique form of philanthropy with roots in the federated funding and mutual aid movements (under the form of Community Chests and Red Feathers) from late 19th-century Buffalo in the present-day New York and present-day Montreal. These organizations centralize fundraising and distribute donations to charitable organizations serving local communities (Khovrenkov 2021). Another unique form of public foundations, which are also unique feature of the Canadian philanthropic landscape, are government-endowed grant-making foundations usually created through one-time federal grants, which function to address a specific area or issue of interest. For example, the Aboriginal Healing Foundation was established in 1998 as an Indigenous-managed foundation that administered funding and programs to foster healing

strategies for survivors of residential schools. It was endowed initially with $350 million dollars from the Canadian government.[5] The Foundation for Black Communities was established in 2023 with an initial endowment from the federal government of $200 million. It is the first Foundation dedicated to investing in Black Communities.[6] Other federally endowed foundations include those that distribute student scholarships and that fund research (Rigillo et. al. 2018, pp. 14-15).

Presently, the ecosystem of institutional settler philanthropies across the continent is diverse and sprawling. The wealth and power that fuels it comes still from extractive activities with clear connections to colonial eliminationism (such as oilsands extraction), as well as from other industries that have developed on Indigenous lands since the early 20th century, including finance capitalism and big tech, real estate wealth, the fashion and textile industry, the food industries, and the entertainment industry. A diverse mix of philanthropic institutions engaged in grant-making, implementation and asset management characterize the field (Elson et. al. 2018, p. 1794). Organizations are highly diverse in mission, strategy, style and purpose (Fontan and Pearson 2021, p. 4).

As of 2021, the Canadian ecosystem encompasses 86,000 registered charities and an additional 85,000 non-registered not-for-profit organizations.[7] These 86,000 registered charities include 11,061 private and public foundations (6,225 private and 4,836 public) collectively holding $135 billion in assets and disbursing about $10 billion in grants annually (Fugiel 2024, p. 6). This includes the 207 community foundations which hold over $6.4 billion in assets and disburse $378

[5] See: Aboriginal Healing Foundation Fonds. http://archives.algomau.ca/main/node/20177.
[6] See: Foundation for Black Communities. https://forblackcommunities.org/about/.
[7] Registered charities versus non-registered nonprofits are important legal distinctions in Canada that are codified in the *Canadian Income Tax Act,* which defines "charitable activity" to distinguish between organizations that are eligible for tax credits and deductions associated with charitable giving and thus to receive tax-receipted charitable donations, and those that are not.

million annually, and 69 United Ways, as well as a number of federally funded "special interest" foundations. Grants and gifts are disbursed to registered charities across subsectors, including in education research, health, social services, and international development, arts and culture, environment, sports and recreation, religion, and others (Fugiel 2024, p. 12). A very small number of private foundations control most of the philanthropic wealth in the field (The Charity Report 2020). About 30 foundations would be considered "mega-foundations," holding more than $100 million dollars in assets, including the MasterCard Foundation, a corporate foundation with $20 billion in assets (Lefèvre and Elson 2020, pp. 26-27). The sector employs 2.5 million people in Canada and 13 million volunteers. At the individual giving level, Canadians give almost as much cumulatively as all foundations disburse in grants each year. In 2018, Canadians gifted $14 billion to registered charities – mostly to religious charities, but also to public health institutions, social services agencies, and international development organizations, among many others (Lasby and Barr 2018; Imagine Canada 2021; Canada Helps and Environics Institute 2024).

In the present-day American settler philanthropy context, the ecosystem is also vast. In 2023, there were 1.5 million registered charitable organizations (in the U.S. the legal designation is 501(c)(3)) (National Philanthropic Trust 2024). As of 2021, there were 127,595 foundations, most of which were private (mostly family) grant-making vehicles, with a small number of operating and corporate foundations. There were 1,184 community foundations across the United States in 2021 (Candid 2021). In 2023, foundations collectively controlled a total of $1.2 trillion in assets, of which community foundations controlled $99 billion. Total grants and gifts disbursed by all foundations was about $103.5 billion in 2023, of which community foundations granted $10 billion (National Philanthropic Trust 2024; Candid 2021). Nearly half of all grant money went to 1% of all recipient organizations in the U.S. Most grants went to education and health charities, with a

smaller percentage going to community and economic development, human services, and arts and culture (ibid.). The sector employs 12 million people, and about 61 million Americans contributed 4.1 billion volunteer hours from 2020-2021 (National Philanthropic Trust 2024). At the individual giving level, people gave $374.4 billion to charities in 2023: more than three times as much as foundations disbursed that year (Double the Donation 2022).

While the raw numbers from the American context are significantly higher than those in the Canadian, per capita they are more comparable. Canada has slightly more foundations per capita than the U.S. does, and in the American context the per capita grant disbursement rate is just 12% higher than in the Canadian context (Rigillo 2018, p. 20). In addition to the differences in numbers and regulatory frameworks, scholars have identified other differences in the nature and trends shaping these two national fields. For example, the community foundation field in the Canadian context functions more as “movement” or “collective” than that in the U.S., where community foundations operate more independently of each other (Carlton and Lyons 2020, p. 220). Additionally, in the American context, state funded grant-making institutions (e.g. the Foundation for Black Communities) do not exist at the same scale as in the Canadian context (Rigillo et. al. 2018, p. 32).

Each intermediary organization I study here represents different parts of the overall ecosystem in Canada. CFC represents all 207 community foundations in Canada, and PFC has 133 member foundations from amongst the 11,000 private and public foundations in Canada. While PFC’s membership represents just a sliver of the overall private foundation landscape, its members include most of the largest foundations in Canada (by asset size and grantmaking levels), with one-third of its members controlling nearly half of all private foundation assets in the country: $54

billion of $120 billion held in private and public foundations (PFC 2022; CFC 2022). Imagine Canada's membership includes over 280 members from many subsectors of the Canadian philanthropy ecosystem, including private funding organizations (e.g. foundations), conveners, YMCAs, United Ways, Humane Societies, educational institutions, hospitals, and many various other types of charitable organizations (Imagine Canada 2022). The Circle's membership is similarly diverse, and it is the only organization among the four that distinguishes between settler-led and Indigenous-led organizations. Its current membership includes 39 of what it labels "philanthropic organizations" – mostly private and community foundations, but also United Ways, corporations, and other types of charitable organizations, as well as 58 "Indigenous-led organizations" – including Indigenous philanthropic funds and funding collaboratives; advocacy organizations; food sovereignty initiatives; Indigenous-led research and education organizations; Friendship Centres; and many other types of organizations (The Circle 2020). In Chapter 2, I provide more detail about these intermediaries' histories, missions and makeup, as well as their membership, and some of the broad details of their engagement with reconciliation.

The present-day landscape on both sides of the imposed international border is highly diverse in terms of sources of wealth and power; the shapes, structures, sizes, purposes and priorities of the giving vehicles; the nature of relations with other organizations in the ecosystem; and the politics, policies and regulatory frameworks governing them. A philanthropy ecosystem this size, encompassing great diversity and sprawl, and with such a complex history, cannot be easily represented in a small textual analysis like mine. My study is not intended to provide a comprehensive view of this diverse assemblage of philanthropies in the settler Canadian context. Rather, my goal in this thesis is to focus specifically on those parties within the ecosystem most involved in the reconciliation movement over the past 15 years. While the archive I have

assembled is not an exhaustive compilation of all texts related to reconciliation in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector, analyzed together these texts provide a helpful lens onto the dominant expressions of the change narrative across the ecoystem. They are reflective of the diverse and shifting ways reconciliation has been imagined, articulated and deployed in and for settler philanthropy organizations over time.

Breakdown of chapters

Each chapter of this thesis develops my analysis of the reconciliation change narrative. Chapter 1 establishes theoretical and historical context for the analysis by drawing connections across several bodies of scholarly literature, including philanthropic studies (especially in North America), decolonial studies, Indigenous studies, and affect studies. This chapter is divided into three main Parts. In Part 1, I discuss key literatures from decolonial studies and Indigenous studies that theorize settler colonial relations in Canada as durable, and as taking specific shape and form in the context of the neoliberal present in settler colonial Canada. I also focus on some of the philanthropic studies literature, mostly from the contemporary North American context, that addresses how various types of philanthropy have been tied up with imperialism and coloniality, past and present, both in Canada and elsewhere. Then in Part 2, I discuss scholarly critiques of reconciliation in Canada, drawing these into conversation with affect studies to unpack some of the discursive-affective functions of the reconciliation genre. Critics in Indigenous studies and decolonial studies have argued that reconciliation in Canada can often function to stabilize and obscure the durable relations of colonial violence – especially through processes of colonial recognition and colonial unknowing. In Part 3, I expand this discussion with reference to literatures demonstrating how philanthropies can sometimes be mobilized to refuse colonial structures of violence. I focus first on Indigenous-authored discussions about specific and local systems of

giving, sharing and reciprocity. I conclude Part 3 by drawing on some sector and academic literatures advancing decolonial possibilities for philanthropy in North America, through reparative practices, as well as radical, participatory and trust-based philosophies and practices. By weaving together this extensive range of literature and theory from across disciplines, my aim is to construct a contextual framework that informs my analysis of the reconciliation change narrative, and its often dissonant material outcomes in the settler philanthropy ecosystem.

Chapter 2, my methods chapter, discusses the approach I took to assembling the diverse archive of texts forming the core of my analysis. It also discusses the mixed methodological approach of my analysis, which applies tools and ideas from post-colonial critical discourse analysis and from affect studies. I discuss some of the ethical and political tensions I experienced in the progression of this thesis project, and the ways that the project has changed over time in response to those. I also discuss the limitations of my research approach – especially those resulting from focusing entirely on written texts produced mostly by and for settlers in the institutional settler philanthropy sector. I conclude by more explicitly situating myself in the methodology and the project as a whole, discussing the possibilities of research as an act of love and service.

In Chapter 3, I introduce the change narrative though an analysis of a key document in the history of settler philanthropic engagement with reconciliation: *The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action.* I also discuss articulations of some of the key roles commonly imagined for settlers and settler philanthropy organizations in reconciliation, including as funders, partners, and advocates. The release of the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* is often referenced in the texts I analyze as a galvanizing moment for settler philanthropy. In the emotionally charged and highly visible moment of its presentation in 2015, the *Declaration* may have played an

important part in alerting settler philanthropy actors to their potential roles in addressing Canadian coloniality. Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders alike were hopeful that the *Declaration* would draw attention to reconciliation, leading to material outcomes through subsequent actions taken by signatory philanthropic organizations across the sector. I also argue that some of the discursive and affective features of the *Declaration* and its uptake may have underpinned a "grand gesture" version of change for the sector, embodying performances of reconciliation that were already at play at the state level. As some Indigenous critics later pointed out, signing the *Declaration* could be performative rather than activating, not necessarily leading to the kinds of action they felt would be most meaningful. In the final sections of this chapter I also foreground alternative articulations of (or against) "grand gesture" versions of reconciliation that Indigenous critics have advanced since the release of the *Declaration*.

In Chapter 4, I explore how in some expressions, the reconciliation change narrative engages in colonial unknowing. Specifically, I analyze the discursive-affective patterns across the archive by which settlers (whether consciously or not) spatially, temporally and conceptually distance themselves, their organizations, and settler philanthropy as a whole from durable, present realities of coloniality and white supremacy. I engage with theories of haunting by scholars who argue that, where colonial spectres emerge before settlers–reminding them of the present-ness of coloniality, of their complicity in it, and of the living and substantive challenges that Indigenous expressions of sovereignty present–settlers often defensively attempt to ignore or avoid hauntings through distancing, omission and renaming (e.g. Gordon 2008; Bergland 2015; Ghaddar 2016). Colonial spectres are reframed as a "vestige" of the past or as an unwelcome, localized aberrance: an anomaly not reflective of presumed Canadian progressive social norms of inclusivity, multiculturalism and tolerance advanced in the change narrative. The concurrent work of colonial

unknowing and recognition in turn keep everyday processes of dispossession and violence in the present, both in the sector and in wider Canadian society, unacknowledged and unchecked. Indigenous critics of unknowing thus urge settlers to face hauntings courageously and embrace the discomfort they generate – actively and intentionally naming the workings of coloniality in organizational practices, philanthropic decisions and relations, and in the wider society. In so doing, they argue, settler philanthropists and settlers in philanthropy can engage in more critical work towards reparations and reciprocity.

In Chapter 5, I analyze a motif that appears frequently across the texts under analysis: that of the settler on a learning journey. In order to *do* reconciliation through philanthropy, some texts suggest, settlers need first to engage in a journey of learning about the history and current landscape of settler-Indigenous relations, listening to Indigenous people's voices and experiences, and including Indigenous peoples more actively in philanthropic spaces. I focus on how this motif is characterized by performances and experiences of settler remorse and compassion, as well as settler discomfort, triggered by settlers' sudden recognition of the pain of Indigenous peoples. The learning journey triggers affective experiences for settlers in philanthropy which in turn are often assumed to generate action toward reconciliation. Yet, I suggest throughout the chapter, while explicitly focused on generating transformation, settler learning journeys can have the outcome of obscuring the reproduction of colonial durabilities in complex ways. Some authors across the archive suggest that reconciliation action should be fueled not by settler consumptions of Indigenous suffering that in turn may lead to settler feelings of remorse and compassion, but rather by truth-telling and an embrace of settler discomfort toward the radical decentring of whiteness and settler supremacy. They suggest that affective triggers of anxiety and discomfort can then be more usefully harnessed toward decolonial possibilities.

The concluding chapter provides a summary overview of the analyses and ideas I have presented throughout the thesis, and how these have responded to my research questions, as well as some contributions I see the study making to theory and scholarship on philanthropy and coloniality in Canada. I also discuss some of the issues I inevitably could not get to as the shape of my project came together, and in turn possibilities for future research. I conclude with what I hope to see take place in the settler philanthropy world: the possibilities of mobilizing settler philanthropies in the service of what Junot Díaz (2012) and Leanne Simpson (2016) have called decolonial love, even toward a potential future where structures and institutions that dominate the settler philanthropy world no longer exist.

Concluding thoughts

It will be clear to the reader by now that I am not shy about using the first-person voice and about transparently situating myself in the research. I think that the binary between "objectivity" and "perspectives/experience" in research is artificial, and objectivity itself is a mythological construction: one with deep colonial, sexist, racist roots, which has produced and reinforced epistemological violence in academia (while also justifying and informing other forms of colonial violence outside of it).[8] Who I am, how I think, and my positionality, privilege and power – as a white, cisgender, heterosexual, able-bodied settler living on Indigenous lands, with access to stable work in an English-speaking colonizer country where I was born to white parents who both have academic degrees – all put me in a position to be able to (and to want to) do this work in a specific

[8] For many Indigenous peoples, according to Taiake Alfred, universities and research "are not safe ground…they are sites of colonialism" (Alfred 2004, p. 88) where Indigenous knowledges, ways of knowing, and voices "have been overwhelmingly silenced" (Smith 2012, p. 72). Métis scholar Adam Gaudry (2018) points to the "ongoing presumption that Indigenous knowledge is less sophisticated than European-derived knowledges universalized as 'science' and 'knowledge.'" (p. 257), a presumption with devastating material effects. Marginalizing Indigenous knowledges has helped justify violence against Indigenous bodies, lands and waters in Canada.

way. I feel strongly that it is important to both acknowledge and mobilize the privilege to do research in the first place, while also being humble and honest about what I can do with it. I discuss at greater length in Chapter 2 how who I am, and where I am, have shaped the direction of this thesis. But for now, I'd like to end this introduction with reflections about my experience working in the world of institutional settler philanthropy. This experience is what led me to this study. I have woven some memories and stories throughout the thesis, as illustrative examples of how some of the discursive-affective processes I have teased out of the archive can play out in real life.

From 2016-2019 I was employed by an organization that provides grants management services to a group of anonymous donors. The organization essentially provided the staffing and management services that most private foundations have internally. The collective of funders we served shared common granting priorities, and the grantees we worked with were mostly engaged in diverse kinds of work that fell within those priorities, providing services for people in both Canada and the U.S.[9] It was in this space where I first experienced the uncomfortable dissonance of institutional settler philanthropic spaces in Canada, and of some of the regulatory frameworks and ideologies shaping them. While at first I felt excited to be a small part of a system that seemed to be actively trying to do good – to make the world a more equitable place by moving money around – it was not long before I perceived some tensions in the work. I noticed that the power dynamics in grantee relations were uncomfortably lopsided. Even though I was in an entry-level job with no power to shape funding decisions, I noticed that our contacts at grantee organizations sometimes addressed me with deference. I have since read similar experiences shared by others working in foundations (e.g. Villanueva 2018; Wiebe 2020), who found that, once they were on the "money side" of

[9] I will not write details about this organization or identifying details about staff, the funders, or the applicants and grant recipients I worked with, or the asset sizes of the foundations or their yearly disbursals, because I signed an anonymity agreement that lasts in perpetuity. However, I will reflect generally about the work environment, activities and granting priorities of the organization (which are public information and available online).

things, all their jokes were suddenly funny and they were often addressed as the smartest, most important people in the room. When I brought up my discomfort about this to one of my superiors in the organization, she became defensive and quickly retorted that it was really the applicants and grantees who held most of the power in the granting relationships. The conversation ended, and I did not pursue it any further; the discomfort I felt did not go away.

I also learned that although many of the grantees we worked with often served members of racialized and other equity-seeking groups, the funders typically did not consider applications for programs or organizations that targeted specific demographic groups, especially Indigenous and racialized peoples. The issues that the funders focused on were usually deracialized in organizational discourse, treated as something that everyone (regardless of race, gender, ability, etc.) could experience; so the solutions they favoured tended to be framed as "universal" rather than looking to the specific and inequitable distribution of socioeconomic inequities experienced by Indigenous, racialized, gender diverse peoples. I noticed that although some program officers were occasionally successful in advancing funding applications explicitly serving Indigenous or racialized communities, this was usually because they were able to frame the descriptions in a way that fit with organizational priorities. They tended to avoid using language that explicitly pointed to systemic racism, heterosexism, and colonialism as part of the problem, even if applicants were using that language in their own writings and communications. I recall also often hearing remarks, usually voiced by organizational leadership and advisors (all white settlers), that espoused racist mythologies prevalent in settler Canadian public discourse: for example, myths that Indigenous communities are adequately provided for by government funding (so private philanthropy in Canada should not become involved), and racist stereotypes suggesting that Indigenous governments are corrupt or irresponsible with money and therefore should not be funded

philanthropically. Structural racism, coloniality, and white supremacy were words that I used regularly in conversation elsewhere but that were not usually welcome in the workplace. My daily work quickly became a space of deep cognitive dissonance.

In an attempt to wrap my head around this discomfort, I started to do a little research, to see what others in the sector, and what academics, were saying about institutional philanthropy. In 2018 I registered for the Postgraduate Certificate programme in Philanthropic Studies at Kent. I read interesting theory on the complex and contested concept of philanthropy around the world, some lauding its importance and value across time and place, and some critiquing the structures of power it embodies and reproduces. I learned that Indigenous philanthropies have existed since time immemorial across the world, even though many Indigenous languages might not have a word that translates directly to "philanthropy" (Kuokkanen 2004; Fowler and Mati 2019; Couchman et al. 2020). I also read critiques of institutional philanthropy in North America, for example of the ways in which its practice often reproduces and justifies socioeconomic disparities (e.g. Kohl-Arenas 2016; Callahan 2017). I learned of philanthropists and organizations trying to do work that challenged and refused the reproduction of the inequitable status quo, as well as critical attempts to decolonize philanthropy (e.g. Villanueva 2018; Walker 2015).

In the end, my reading and research served to clarify some things, but did not resolve the dissonance. What I learned was that philanthropy itself is a dissonant thing. It is a field marked by contradictions and ambivalence – an ecosystem of actions, people, institutions, ideas, outcomes and discourses that are characterized by dissonance. When I left the organization I worked for to pursue my PhD, I hoped my research would help me further unpack this dissonance, with access to more time and nuanced theory. I proposed a study focused on the complex relations between coloniality

and philanthropy in Canada. My plan was to build on the creative and courageous work of those in the sector bringing decolonial perspectives to philanthropic practice, and to contribute to theory at the intersection of decolonial studies and philanthropic studies. Over time, the project developed into this critical analysis of reconciliation in the settler philanthropy world.

Having completed this doctoral research project I still embody the very dissonance about which I write in this thesis. I believe settler philanthropy's practices and outcomes are always complicated, never monolithic. It has sometimes been, and can and should be, a force for justice and equity, but must also be critiqued for the complex and often obscure roles it (and the structures, organizations and policies that shape it) plays in supporting colonial oppression. The reconciliation change narrative demands in-depth critical analysis because it is both a window to, and influencer of, these durable relations of colonial violence in philanthropy and beyond. I think that drawing attention to issues of power and colonial durabilities in the study of philanthropy and reconciliation in Canada is important, not because I want to demonize the intentions of settlers in philanthropy or dismiss those who believe in the power of reconciliation. Rather, I am interested in how, as affect theorist Lauren Berlant writes, some activities and ideas that are often assumed to be transformative and progressive "also and at the same time support destructive practices of social antagonism": how "genuinely good intentions" can sometimes result in "ordinary terror" (Berlant 2004, p. 6). My goal in this study therefore is to explore dissonant and ambivalent outcomes, especially as they translate through settler philanthropic engagement with reconciliation in the wider field of durable settler colonial relations in Canada. By drawing connections between philanthropic studies, affect theory, analyses of reconciliation and decolonial studies in Canada, I aim to contribute to critical understandings of settler philanthropy. In this thesis, I aim to both trace out the durable nature of colonial relations that are often hard to see in the settler philanthropy sector and in the social world

it touches, and to highlight the constant presence of something else – something more, something that punctuates and refuses the colonial status quo.

Chapter 1 – Durable and dissonant: context on coloniality, philanthropy, and reconciliation

In this chapter, I will provide theoretical and historical framing for my analysis through a thematic discussion of several key bodies of literature that I have brought together in this project. This includes literatures from the fields of decolonial studies and Indigenous studies (especially from the context of present-day Canada), affect theory, and philanthropic studies (primarily from the North American context). Throughout the chapter, I will introduce and explain key concepts that are central to my own analysis of reconciliation, including: settler colonial durabilities and neoliberalization in Canada; colonial recognition, colonial unknowing and haunting; reconciliation as a grand gesture; the concept of dissonance; and the concept of “the minor” and “unruly ruptures.”

The chapter is divided into three parts. In Part 1, I discuss key literatures on settler coloniality in Canada, especially those that position colonial relations as durable, persisting and transforming themselves in the neoliberal present, and taking a specific shape in settler states that is distinct from other forms of colonialism. In this section I also weave in philanthropic studies literature to explore the complex ways that philanthropy in settler states like Canada reflects, acts on and emerges from this wider field of durable colonial relations. These literatures will help me to build context for my own understanding of settler philanthropy and reconciliation in Canada in this thesis. In Part 2, I draw together scholarly critiques of reconciliation in Canada, which theorize reconciliation as a discursive and affective formation with important material implications. In practice, according to Indigenous critics, reconciliation can work to reproduce and stabilize the often unremarked violence of the Canadian neoliberal colonial order discussed in Part 1.

In Part 3, I highlight the arguments of Indigenous scholars and activists that coloniality in Canada is neither total nor inevitable. Indigenous peoples have resisted and existed against and outside of the limits and violences of coloniality since time immemorial. I take specific interest in literatures that explore these connections in the context of giving, sharing, reciprocity and philanthropy. First, I discuss Indigenous-authored literatures on reciprocity and diverse Indigenous ways of giving and sharing. I then unpack literature that envisions practices and philosophies for how institutional philanthropy in settler colonial states can be reframed and mobilized toward the refusal and dismantlement of colonial relations of dominance and violence. Drawn together, this wide range of literatures provides critical context and a conceptual framework for understanding the reconciliation change narrative and its often dissonant expressions and functions in the Canadian settler philanthropy ecosystem.

1.1– Settler colonial durabilities, elimination and philanthropy in Canada

1.1.1 – Colonial eliminationism in Canada

Indigenous and decolonial activists and scholars demonstrate that coloniality has specific modes of articulation in settler colonial states like Canada. The distinctive settler colonial dynamic is often referred to as the "logic of elimination," a theoretical concept usually attributed to Australian historian Patrick Wolfe, but which has been discussed and challenged by Indigenous scholars long before Wolfe's theoretical framework took the field of settler colonial studies by storm in the 1990s and early 2000s (Wolfe 2006, p. 388; Vimalessary et al. 2016; Carey and Silverstein 2020, pp. 5-8). In Canada, settler colonial elimination hinges on ongoing processes of removal of Indigenous peoples and societies from the land and water – whether by physical violence, coercion, the politics of assimilation, or by other means – in order to make lands, waters and "natural resources" (e.g. minerals or lumber) available to incoming settlers (Wolfe 2006; Vimalessary et al. 2016). Thus,

coloniality in Canada takes a different shape from imperial projects elsewhere, where an external force invades Indigenous territories, accumulates wealth on Indigenous lands through violence and enslavement, and then "vacates" (de Leeuw and Hunt 2018, p. 6). Drawing on the scholarship of Mohawk historian Audra Simpson and on the wider global literature on genocide, Ermineskine Cree scholar Matthew Wildcat (2015) argues that settler colonial elimination results in social and cultural death: the elimination not just of people from the land, but of collectives, and of the kinship relations, social infrastructures, legal orders, and modes of governance that uphold them.

Scholars have also discussed the colonial discourses undergirding and justifying elimination in settler colonial states like Canada, in their "astonishing variety, fluidity and internal contradiction" (Douglas and Ballard 2012, p. 245). Discourses produced by churches, governments, corporations, and media, among others, have emerged from and justified the displacement and marginalization of Indigenous peoples and upheld deep disparities of power across policies, institutions and practices (e.g. Banivanua-Mar and Edmonds 2010; Harris 2002). Indigenous theorists and activists emphasize that a key part of colonial eliminationism is "to negate, disavow, distort and deny knowledges, subjectivities, world senses, and life visions" of Indigenous peoples – thus justifying colonizing authorities as they dispossess Indigenous peoples of lands, waters, and resources (Walsh and Mignolo 2018, p. 4). Imported epistemologies, religions, educational structures and social institutions are used to attack Indigenous social and cultural systems, epistemologies, ontologies and institutions (Battiste 2013; Cote-Meek 2014). In turn, physical, social, emotional, and epistemological violence perpetrated by both settler individuals and institutions "clears the way" for the imposition of settler sovereignty and assumptions of entitlement over Indigenous homelands and waters.

Historians and Indigenous studies scholars have demonstrated how the Canadian Justice system (Newell 2013; Hansen 2015; Chartrand and Saverese 2022); extractive economies developed in Indigenous homelands (Westman et. al 2020; Scottie, Bernauer and Hicks 2022); child welfare policy and programming (Blackstock et al. 2007); social sciences research and higher education (Battiste 2013; Smith, Tuck and Yang 2019); disease and public health (Daschuk 2014; Hay 2021); food insecurity (Burnett and Hay 2023); critical infrastructures like roads and dams (Luby 2020); national and provincial parks (Sandlos 2007; Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation et. al. 2023); and many other institutions and sectors have been key sites and instruments of settler colonial elimination. These have all operated within a wider context of broken treaty promises and state policies of elimination. Through such policies, the settler state actively subverts Indigenous sovereignties, to thus disconnect Indigenous peoples from their lands. Among many others, some examples of violent colonial policies in the Canadian state resulting in widespread impacts of "cultural and social death" include: decades-long federal bans on Indigenous ceremonies, gatherings, and cultural practices such as the ban on potlatches from 1885-1951 (Noakes 2023); the violent policing of Indigenous peoples (especially of land defenders and decolonial activists) and police targeting of Indigenous men (Comack 2012; Newell 2013; Crosby and Monaghan 2018; Stelkia 2020); the mass incarceration of Indigenous women (Marques and Monchalin 2020); the mass apprehension of Indigenous children into state institutional care (Johnson 1983; Sinclair 2007); state policies resulting in extreme malnourishment and lack of access to basic human rights and infrastructures like clean drinking water in remote and northern reserve communities (Burnett and Hay 2023; Ansloos 2023). Together, these have all worked to serve colonial state interests of elimination.

As critical decolonial scholars and activists have demonstrated, colonial violence and racism persist in both subtle and overt ways across all institutions and sectors of social life in Canada, and they have deep historical roots. Colonial elimination is a primary outcome and central guiding force even (or perhaps especially) of Canadian institutions and activities that are sometimes assumed to be unmitigated public goods, or products of benevolence. Important decolonial critiques of the helping professions, for example, demonstrate how colonial violence is a founding principle and a persistent characteristic of the "benevolent" sectors of Canadian society, such as public health, social work, and public education. Settler philanthropic actors and organizations have also played roles in the development and support of these sectors. Like settler philanthropy institutions, these sectors/industries, while ostensibly providing care, have historically produced dissonant outcomes, and continue to do so. They perpetuate systems, ways of thinking and actions rooted in colonial violence, and they reproduce notions of white settler innocence and Indigenous inferiority. Indigenous writers have extensively discussed both structural violence, and day-to-day experiences with anti-Indigenous racism across the helping professions (see, e.g., Battiste 2013; Cote-Meek 2014; Gebhard et. al. 2022).

The social work sector, and the Canadian welfare state's child and family services institutions, have carried on the violent work of residential schools into the present (Blackstock 2011; St. Denis 2022). Predicated on racist settler assumptions that Indigenous parents are inadequate caretakers and even dangers to their own children, and that Indigenous families and family structures are inferior to (and "deviant" from) traditional, heteropatriarchal, Euro-Canadian settler family structures, the Canadian welfare state and its many agents and arms have assumed the role of "caring benefactor" of Indigenous children in the late 20th century and beyond (Thobani 2007, p. 109). Practically, this has manifested as the violent apprehension of many Indigenous children from their families and

communities by social workers, state institutions and care organizations. The “sixties scoop”, a period of several decades during which mass state apprehensions of Indigenous children into the welfare system and adoptions into white settler middle class families in Canada and the U.S., devastated family dynamics and violently disconnected an entire generation of Indigenous children from their communities, lands, and identities (Johnson 1983; Sinclair 2007; Blackstock 2011). Like residential schools, the sixties scoop has had long-reaching and traumatic intergenerational impacts, with survivors reporting abuse, disconnection from language and culture, experiences with forced assimilation, and a sense of lost identity (Blackstock 2007).

The overrepresentation of Indigenous children in the Canadian child welfare system has not gone away; the Canadian state continues to apprehend Indigenous children at a disproportionate rate. Even though Indigenous children count for under 8% of all children in Canada, they represent 54% of all children in foster care (Hahmann et. al. 2024). Of these, over half of apprehended First Nations and Inuit children, and three-fifths of apprehended Métis children, lived with non-Indigenous foster parents in 2021 (ibid.). Even though Indigenous activists and scholars (Blackstock 2011; Baskin 2016; First Nations Child and Family Caring Society 2024) and the Supreme Court of Canada (2024 SCC 5) have argued that keeping children in community and developing culturally relevant, culturally safe, and equitable social services programs designed by and for Indigenous peoples are key to addressing these issues, the state’s funding and provision of Indigenous-led child and family services remains inadequate and inequitable. Following a nine-year case launched by the First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada (“Caring Society”), the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal (“CHRT”) ruled in favour of First Nations children living on-reserve in January 2016, finding that Canada’s First Nation Child and Family Services (“FNCFS”) Program and its related funding models are discriminatory contrary to Section 5 of the *Canadian Human Rights*

Act. The Tribunal further found that Canada's failure to equitably fund Indigenous child and family services was discriminatory on the basis of race and national ethnic origin (First Nations Child and Family Caring Society 2016). The case resulted in compensation for victims and an increase in federal funding for services for First Nations children. However, in late 2023 the Caring Society filed a non-compliance motion at the CHRT arguing that Canada had not halted its discriminatory conduct and was not fulfilling the requirements of the CHRT rulings (First Nations Child and Family Caring Society 2024).

Colonial violence and racism are deeply embedded structural realities in healthcare in Canada as well. Greenwood et. al. (2015) argue that colonialism, as an "active and ongoing force impacting the well-being of Indigenous peoples in Canada," is the *key* determinant of inequitable (ill) health outcomes experienced by many Indigenous peoples in present-day Canada – including for example disproportionate levels of chronic illness, food insecurity, mental health crises, infant and maternal morbidity rates, and overall shorter life expectancy (xi-xii). Access to all health care services, but especially to culturally relevant and safe services and health and healing models, is deeply lacking, particularly in Northern and remote communities. Where healthcare services are accessible, Indigenous peoples often face deep-rooted anti-Indigenous racism in Canadian health institutions, whether in institutional policies and actions, or in everyday interactions with healthcare providers (Lavalee and Harding 2022; Hantke 2022). Anti-Indigenous racism in the pharmaceutical industry, public and private insurance systems, and public health benefits programs have also resulted in inequitable policies and a lack of access to medicine and care, with severe and cross-generational impacts on Indigenous communities, resulting in deep distrust of Canadian public health systems (Swidrovich 2022).

The intersections of colonial violence, health care institutions and Indigenous health across the history of the Canadian colonial state has deep roots and has been extensively documented. The spread of "virgin soil" communicable diseases across Indigenous communities in early histories of settler colonial "contact" and beyond was central to the Canadian genocide, with estimates of the devastation of Indigenous populations across the continent ranging from 50-90% loss overall (Daschuk 2014, xi-xii). With the establishment of colonial governance throughout the 19th and 20th century, racist policies both propelled and justified the severe health inequities Indigenous peoples have faced under the auspices of British empire and Canadian state (Kelm 1999; Lux 2001). The Canadian state subjected Indigenous women to forced or coerced sterilization throughout Canadian history (Canada Senate 2022). The federal establishment of Indian Hospitals across Canada especially from the 1930s-1980s was ostensibly to reduce the spread of tuberculosis amongst Indigenous children in residential schools and in Indigenous communities. Yet the hospitals functioned as a means of widespread segregation and control, with Indigenous patients restrained and forced to remain there against their will, at times undergoing experimental treatments, and experiencing other forms of abuse and neglect at the institutions (Meijer Drees 2013; Lux 2016). Canadian public health scientists have also contributed to violent processes of elimination by undertaking what Travis Hay (2021) describes as "invasive acts of medical inquiry" in Indigenous communities, which have produced "scientific knowledge" about the inequitable health outcomes Indigenous peoples experience. That "knowledge" ultimately has rested on blaming Indigenous peoples themselves for inequitable outcomes – rather than the federal policies of relocation, malnourishment and violence resulting in impoverishment and deeply embodied intergenerational trauma (Hay 2021). In many other health-related policies and institutions, colonial violence and control have continued the work of elimination. Public healthcare as a "helping" industry in Canada has always been deeply embedded in the work of colonial elimination, and continues to be.

Education systems in Canada have also been subject to intense decolonial critique. Mi'kmaq critical education scholar Marie Battiste writes that the education system in Canada continues the genocidal work of residential schools. "Indigenous students," she writes, "have been part of a forced assimilation plan" in which "their heritage and knowledge [is] rejected and suppressed" and the ideologies, epistemologies and ways of knowing and being of settlers are consistently positioned as superior, while Indigenous epistemologies, ways of knowing and being are negated. In turn, she writes, Indigenous peoples are distanced from their homelands to "make space" or forced to assimilate to the "dominant" way of being and thus disconnected from place-based ways of life (p. 23-24). In the public education system, Indigenous students continue to face racist hostility and violence from students, teachers, and administrators on a daily basis (McLean 2022). Racism and settler white supremacy amongst teachers in Canadian public schools also function to criminalize Indigenous youth and begin the justification of mass incarceration early on (Gebhard 2022).

The post-secondary world is also experienced as a space of colonial violence. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Taiaiake Alfred, Marie Battiste and other scholars have described how around the world, in university policy and practice, teaching and learning, and research, "[I]ndigenous voices have been overwhelmingly silenced" (Smith 2012, p. 72). Further, colonial violence perpetuated in and by academic institutions is often "hidden behind an ideology of humanism and liberalism" that both justified and concealed the dehumanization of Indigenous peoples and others (ibid., p. 68). Sheila Cote-Meek (2014) describes how Indigenous peoples continue to experience trauma in university classrooms, where they are "inundated by racism" – even (or especially) in classrooms where histories processes of colonial violence are explicitly being discussed. Ultimately, mainstream education "has always been and continues to be part of the colonial regime – one that is marked by

violence and abuse – and a regime that has had devastating consequences" for Indigenous peoples. In short, as Alfred writes, for many Indigenous peoples, "universities are not safe ground…they are sites of colonialism" (Alfred 2004, p. 88).

Across spaces sometimes assumed to be "public goods," these authors show colonial eliminationism continues in complex and often obscure ways. Deep-rooted colonial scripts in these fields locate the source of many issues that the "helping professions" aim to address with Indigenous peoples themselves, rather than as genocidal tactics: outcomes and ongoing realities of systemic anti-Indigenous racism and colonial violence across all sectors and institutions in Canada. These scripts, as Gebhard et. al. (2022) argue, "allow social workers, health care professionals, and teachers to assume the familiar role of innocent do-gooders who simply wish to help and see themselves as providers of what they imagine Indigenous Peoples are lacking." (p. 9). The helping professions, as Gebhard et. al. (2022) write, are institutions that have been critical to the establishment of a Canadian national identity that centres around mythologies of white settler Canadian goodness and benevolence. These mythologies hide the foundations of anti-Indigenous racism and colonial elimination and the reality that these are fundamental to Canada's existence. As Manuel and Derrickson (2017) note, elimination "is not a 'behaviour' that can be superficially changed…It is the foundational system of Canada" (p. 62). This is a key contextual premise for my study of the Canadian settler philanthropy ecosystem's place within this wider foundational system.

1.1.2 – Settler philanthropies and eliminationism

Historians of humanitarianism and philanthropy in the 19th century British empire have cast light on the complex roles of philanthropy and humanitarianism–which have been central to the development of some of the institutions and activities discussed above (and, like those institutions and activities,

are sometimes assumed to be an unmitigated good)–have held in the work of eliminationism in settler states like Canada. Concerned with philanthropy conducted specifically by elite English philanthropists funding humanitarian projects in Indigenous territories where the British established colonies in the 19th and 20th century, David Lambert and Alan Lester (2004) are interested in exposing these tensions. They contend that across the British colonies, colonial philanthropy was distinct from “a broader bundle of colonial projects” of a more obviously dominating or violent nature. They examine colonial philanthropy’s “contestation of, its reflexive definition against and its complicity with those projects” (p. 321). While at times colonial philanthropists actively worked in opposition to some of the most violent imperial processes, they also often funded humanitarian projects in the colonies that resulted in profound harm to Indigenous peoples’ cultures and ways of life. Lambert and Lester (2004) argue that Britons’ philanthropic impulses and activities were characterized simultaneously by “progressive” ideals and “ethnocentric condescension” (p. 331). Practices of colonial philanthropy consistently reflected racialized and gendered assumptions that positioned Indigenous peoples whose lands were being stolen as inferior to white Britons. Colonial philanthropy’s “complicated outcomes,” they suggest, make its history “worthy of more research” (p. 322). Although they do not explicitly engage with theories of colonial elimination, their work does suggest that philanthropy and humanitarianism across Indigenous territories invaded by the British empire were deeply entangled with it.

In her study of the intersections of philanthropy and the welfare state in 19th and 20th century colonial Australia, Anne O’Brien (2015) looks more deeply into these entanglements. She draws attention to British and Australian colonials’ philanthropy, arguing that it had “vast and varied purposes and…shifting, uneven trajectories” (p. 2). First, she demonstrates how the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands was assumed by imperial agents to be a philanthropic

activity: “in the 19th century, colonisation itself – even as it was known to dispossess the original owners [of the land] – was envisaged as a philanthropic solution for Britain's grinding poverty” (O’Brien 2015, p. 7). Meanwhile, charitable interventions in the lives of Indigenous peoples by missionaries, humanitarians and philanthropists were guided by assumptions that Indigenous peoples needed those interventions in order to become “civilized” and be rescued from their existing ways of life (O’Brien 2015, p. 3). O’Brien explores how ideological, discursive and structural shifts in Australian settler society affected philanthropic responses to poverty and Indigenous-settler relations. She finds various philanthropic projects were entangled with the development of the Australian welfare state, influenced by colonial discourses about gender, race, poverty, the deserving and undeserving, and the fit and unfit.

From compensating displaced Aboriginal peoples, to establishing reserve communities, to funding institutions for orphans or the poor, settlers’ philanthropic activities were layered and contradictory. At times, colonial philanthropists collaborated with humanitarians to stop the most brutal types of physical violence against Aboriginal peoples and provide relief for those considered most vulnerable or needy. More often, though, O’Brien shows that philanthropy reinforced colonial violence of more subtle nature and supported the ongoing state projects of Indigenous dispossession and assimilation. She concludes that throughout the history of settler colonial Australian nation-building, “philanthropy not only provided care for those overlooked by the state; it was also central to maintaining the [raced, gendered, colonial] structures of thought and practice that perpetuated the system” (p. 7). It was, she argues, intimately intertwined with the larger project of empire and thus with processes of colonial elimination.

Researchers from the Yellowhead Institute (2021) also argue that, across the Indigenous lands now called North America, the establishment of capitalist economies throughout the 19th and 20th centuries has always depended on the impoverishment of Indigenous communities and their elimination from their homelands and waters. Eliminationist policies in both Canada and the U.S. enabled the vast accumulations of wealth that were the starting place of many of the oldest and largest foundations across the continent. Some examples of the clear connections among colonial elimination, industrial capitalism and institutional settler philanthropies come from the development of the private foundation sector in the late 19th and early 20th century. The first private foundation in the U.S., the Sage Foundation, was established in 1907 by Olivia Sage, who had inherited wealth from her deceased husband, American railroad executive Russell Sage (Philanthropy New York 2008). Sage had amassed his wealth through his activities in the U.S. Stock Exchange and as a director of the Union Pacific Railroad. This was part of the transcontinental railroad, which was central to the violent colonization of Indigenous territories through central and western parts of the continent in the 19th century. As historian Manu Karuka (2019) writes, railway investors like Sage "invested in more than the futures of railroad corporations. They invested in the futures of colonialism" (p. 42). Their activities advanced the spread of American settlers and industries to the west, were bolstered through American policies of ethnic cleansing that forcibly removed Indigenous peoples from their lands before distributing federal land grants to railway companies (Karuka 2019). The first private foundation in Canada was the Massey Foundation, established by descendants of Hart Massey in 1918. This family's fortune came primarily from the success of their farm equipment manufacturing company, the Massey Manufacturing Company, founded in 1847 in present-day Newcastle, Ontario located on the homelands of the Michi Saagig Anishinaabeg (McGregor and Wardrop 2006; Lefèvre and Elson 2020, p. 19). The demand for farming equipment that drove the Masseys' success developed

on lands across the colonial geography that were transformed into agricultural land after Indigenous peoples had been violently removed or coerced to leave. The lands that agricultural families and corporations obtained came directly from these dispossessions, with land rights "unilaterally seized from Indigenous peoples and distributed to incoming white European families" across what eventually became Canada (Rotz 2017, p. 159). Furthermore, Dominion officials created policies that blocked Indigenous communities who had an interest in developing their own agricultural economies in the late 19th and early 20th centuries from doing so in the Western provinces. They even forbade them from accessing the kinds of equipment that the Massey family produced, in order ensure Indigenous farmers on reserves could not compete on with settler farmers (Carter 2019).

Many other foundations on both sides of the border were established through capitalist activities on dispossessed Indigenous homelands, with the help of federal policies advancing colonial elimination, and the enslavement and indentured labour of Black and racialized peoples. John D. Rockefeller established his major foundation in 1913 with an endowment and shares from the fortune he had amassed through his ruthless business practices that developed a monopoly of the extraction and refinement of oil in Indigenous territories across the continent. It began with oil extraction and refinement in the territories of the Shawnee, Miami, Wyandot, Potawatomi, Peoria, Seneca, Ottawa, Delaware and Kaskaskia peoples, who were systematically removed from their homelands in present-day Ohio through (among other colonial processes) the *Indian Removal Act* of 1830 (Walton 2020). Rockefeller's corporation later expanded by acquiring refinery businesses in Indigenous territories all throughout present-day America. Likewise, George Maxwell Bell accumulated his wealth in part through his involvement with the development of the Canadian Pacific Railway and through his investment in the growing oil and gas industry in the homelands of

the Îyârhe Nakoda, Niitsitaapi and Tsuut'ina peoples of the present-day foothills of Southern Alberta in the 1950s and 1960s. Graham established the Max Bell Foundation in 1972 in present-day Calgary, Alberta (Max Bell Foundation 2023).

It is not only private foundations whose sources of wealth are predicated on colonial violence. The first community foundations in the U.S. (the Cleveland Foundation in 1914) and in Canada (the Winnipeg Foundation in 1921) both were established as vehicles to raise and invest multiple donations to be distributed to charitable organizations serving their respective urban communities. Both have been marked as having initiated a global "movement" of place-based and community-focused institutional philanthropy, predicated on pooling philanthropic resources. Both also have their origins in finance capitalism – established through an initial donation made by settler bankers, Frederick Goff in Cleveland and William Forbes Alloway in Winnipeg, whose fortunes came in part from managing the money made through other colonial capitalist activities like those discussed above (Cleveland Foundation 2014; Winnipeg Foundation 2019). Alloway, whose $100,000 initial donation started the Winnipeg Foundation, had been a member the expeditionary force sent to violently subdue Métis activists in the Red River Resistance from 1869-1870 (Bumsted et. al. 2006). He later speculated in scrip, engaging in predatory activities that ultimately resulted in the systematic loss of Métis lands across what is now known as Manitoba (Hanlon 2005). Scrip documents (certificates that were redeemable for land or money) were distributed by Dominion of Canada scrip commissioners to Métis families in the Prairies from 1876-1902; the value of each being an allotment either of 80, 160 or 240 acres, or of between $20-$240. Following the distribution of scrip, speculators like Alloway coerced Métis scrip-holders to sell their land entitlements for extremely low prices and then sold these to chartered banks (Robinson and Filice 2018). His fortune thus was in part directly premised on the dispossession of Métis families. While

the founders of community foundations are lauded for forming a "movement" in institutional philanthropy, the power and wealth that placed them in the position to do so were accumulated through violent processes of coloniality in present-day North America.

A related area in which complex relations between philanthropy and empire have been theorized is in scholarly critiques of American foundation philanthropy in the Global South. A 1982 collection of essays edited by Robert F. Arnove, for example, interrogates American foundation philanthropy practiced by the 'Big 3' (Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations) overseas as a form of cultural imperialism (Arnove 1982). Drawing on Marx and Gramsci, contributors find that while maintaining an "economic and political order, international in scope, which benefits the ruling-class interests of philanthropists and philanthropoids," the Big 3 foundations' activities often "worked against the interests of minorities, the working class, and Third World peoples" – with particular impacts on Indigenous peoples across the African continent (p. 1). At times, it also "supported, created and promulgated educational agendas that supported racial segregation" (ibid.). For example, educational interventions in African states, "narrowly defined vocational education…to train…Africans to become productive, docile, and permanent underclasses" (p. 11). Joan Roelefs' (2003) study echoes many of the conclusions of contributors in the 1982 collection, documenting the "power and reach" of foundations, and their "hegemonic role" in the U.S. and elsewhere (p. 5). Roelefs concludes that foundations' "translation of wealth to power" through grantmaking, and by funding universities and media campaigns, is a threat to democracy and perpetuator of existing inequalities. Further, it promotes the hegemony of racial capitalism at home and abroad. By generously funding causes and organizations "that are ideologically and tactically acceptable to the elite" (p. 141) and by co-opting, transforming and dismantling more radical movements and organizations, foundations become "prime constructors of hegemony" (p. 198-99).

Although such critiques of American imperialism and foundation philanthropy are referring to a type of colonial/imperial and racist violence that is distinct from the processes of settler colonial elimination discussed above, they are relevant. These studies demonstrate that 20th century American foundation philanthropy emerged from and maintained American imperial governmentality, in similar ways to the humanitarianism and colonial philanthropy of the 19th century British empire.

Relatedly, Maribel Morey's *White Philanthropy* suggests that some elite foundation activity in the U.S. reproduces similar racial and colonial inequalities and paves the way for the spread of white supremacy in the U.S. and abroad (Morey 2021). Morey's history of Gunnar Mydal's *An American Dilemma,* a 1944 research study funded by the Carnegie Corporation, demonstrates how largescale philanthropic funding of social sciences research has often functioned to reproduce structures of colonial white supremacy by creating frameworks for social policy that keeps intact white, Anglo-American domination. *An American Dilemma*, she argues, became a central cornerstone of white liberal policy directed toward the control of Black lives, spaces and bodies. And this stretched beyond the U.S.: "Carnegie's expectations for international peace assumed white Anglo-American supremacy and the subjection of colonized people across the Anglo-American world" (p. 8). In these ways, largescale American foundation philanthropy activities both in the U.S. abroad are deeply entangled with larger projects of American imperial governmentality, engaging in activities that have reified and justified global racial-colonial inequalities.

These studies demonstrate that philanthropy and humanitarianism, often uncritically assumed to be public goods, are deeply entangled in the work of eliminationism. They can be intimately tied up with colonial, imperial and white supremacist violence of both overt and diffuse nature, past and

present. These scholars demonstrate how, as Stoler puts it, "the pursuits of exploitation and enlightenment are not mutually exclusive but deeply entangled projects." (Stoler 2009, p. 3). They also indicate however that while philanthropy is often an exercise of power by a dominant party over a less powerful recipient or group of beneficiaries, power relations are also always complex and mutable. Philanthropy's intentions and outcomes in colonial settings therefore can be dissonant, even paradoxical; and they are always tied up with the larger project of empire and empire building. These theoretical perspectives are critical to my own study of settler philanthropies in Canada, as a relation among others in a settler colonial space, which can simultaneously be part of the processes of the concentration and diffusion of settler colonial power.

1.1.3 – Neoliberalization and the durability of colonial violence

Because my study focuses on philanthropic narratives and activities occurring in the 21st century, I pay heed in this thesis to scholars who theorize coloniality as durable, seeking to understand its specificities as they emerge in the neoliberal present, in the form of social and economic policy and discourse, and extractive capitalism. In this section of the chapter, I will discuss theory and literature on the racial-colonial contours of neoliberal capitalism in settler states like Canada, and the implications for settler philanthropies. Because I tend to think of neoliberalism in active rather than monolithic terms, I have adopted the language of neoliberalization (for similar reasons that I prefer to use coloniality rather than colonialism). As Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2009) write, this term reflects dynamism and complexity across time and place, highlighting the shifting assemblage of power relations, affective-discursive formations, institutions, regulatory processes, and state infrastructures defining late 20th and early 21st century neoliberal economic and social policy and public discourse. Peck et. al. (2009) describe neoliberalization as a "hegemonic *restructuring ethos,* as a dominant pattern of (incomplete and contradictory) regulatory transformations and not as a

fully coherent system or typological state form'" (p. 104, as cited in Chun, 2018, p. 424). The restructuring looks different in different places and at different times, but there are a number of shared characteristics, including as Munshi and Willse (2007) summarize, the dismantlement of the social welfare system and subsequent devolution of responsibility for the social safety net onto individuals, corporations, and nonprofits; and the deregulation of labour and trade. In other words, neoliberalization is a current articulation or transfiguration of racial capitalism in settler states, and it is characterized by specific policy patterns of social and economic restructuring focused on "locating all human action in the domain of the market" (Munshi and Willse 2007, p. xiv). Chun (2018) describes it as an "ideological displacement of agency" from the state onto individual citizens (p. 430). But I also see neoliberalization as characterized by processes, ways of thinking, states of being and relationships that permeate daily life. Neoliberalization is both incoherent and emergent: it in some ways shapes all our encounters with one another, but it only *holds* the mystique of coherence and totality because neoliberal relations and discourses often go unseen, unremarked in everyday life (Janzen et. al. 2015).

Many theorists have done important work to demonstrate that neoliberalization, and its very specific formations in North America, is fundamentally raced and colonial.[10] As Cedric Robinson (2020) has written, racism is capitalism's key "epistemology, its ordering principle, its organizing structure, its moral authority, its economy of justice, commerce, and power" (p. li). Dené scholar Glen Coulthard (2015) writes further that the neoliberal racial capitalism Robinson theorizes is founded on the theft of Indigenous lands and colonial eliminations taking place as "capitalism violently [began] sedimenting itself on Indigenous territories" (see also Issar 2021). Similarly, in the introduction to their collection *Colonial Racial Capitalism*, Koshy et al. (2022) argue that

[10] For example, Goldberg 2009;Bhattacharyya 2018; Coulthard 2014 & 2015; Janzen et. al. 2015; Lloyd and Wolfe 2016; Robinson 2020; Koshy et. al. 2022.

"dispossessive regimes of accumulation through differentiation, elimination, expropriation, enslavement and incarceration" are the foundations of racial capitalism and neoliberalization (p. 4). In short, colonial relations of violence continue into the neoliberal present – are indeed fundamental to neoliberalization. In the context of Canada, settler colonial forms and structures take transfigured shapes in the context of neoliberal extractive capitalism.

This is what I mean when I talk about colonial durabilities in this thesis. I intentionally use the word "coloniality" rather than colonialism, to draw attention to what Indigenous critics emphasize is an ongoing state of being, or complex assemblage of colonial structures, systems, institutions, policies, discourses, feelings and ideas, and relationships on which Canada as a nation-state is premised. This assemblage does not have clear spatial and temporal boundaries, or a beginning and end; and it changes over time. Similarly, preferring the term neoliberalization to neoliberalism, critical theorists Janzen *et al.*(2015) write that neoliberalization is like coloniality in that it permeates "institutional relations, professional practices, relationships of care, activism, and teaching" and revolves in large part around the systemic "restructuring of government techniques" (p. 8-9). These have important social outcomes, including the worsening and institutionalization of inequality. In the subsections that follow, I will unpack some of the specific features of neoliberal colonial capitalism in settler Canada with significance to the settler philanthropy sector. I place special focus on neoliberal economies of extreme extraction in Indigenous homelands, and neoliberal policy and discourse focused on socioeconomic restructuring.

Extraction and philanthropy

State-subsidized resource extraction in Indigenous lands, supported through the systemic deregulation of extractive industries, Canadian historian Allan Greer (2020) writes, is the fundamental building block of modern neoliberal states and economies, and constitute the most

recent iteration of coloniality in Canada. As some researchers have argued, neoliberal governments continue to "advance a twenty-first century capitalism grounded in a politics and economy of extractivism" that "perpetuate and further coloniality" (Walsh & Mignolo, 2018, p. 6) by denying Indigenous people's presence, knowledge and sovereignty and expropriating land and water (Yellowhead Institute, 2019). In these ways colonial relations of elimination remain durable in the neoliberal present, often obscured through discourses about the public good and economic development. Anishinaabekwe activist and scholar Winona LaDuke describes such extractive economies as the "wiindigo economy" of the neoliberal Canadian and American states: a "predatory economy rooted in extraction and exploitation," especially of water and fossil fuels, that hinges on "invasions into Indigenous homelands without consent" – reproducing long-term and unsustainable dependency on fossil fuel energy (LaDuke and Cowen 2020, p. 252). Colonial theft of Indigenous lands and "unceasing extraction proceed apace" through ongoing and routine attacks on those who refuse it (especially, LaDuke argues, Indigenous women and sexually diverse Indigenous peoples). Across Indigenous homelands in present-day Canada, extractive coloniality is a reshaping of earlier modes of settler colonial elimination, but the outcomes for Indigenous peoples whose "lands, worldviews and ways of being are…actively and continuously under attack," remain the same (de Leeuw and Hunt 2018, p. 6). Similarly, Clinton Westman, Lena Gross and Tara Joly (2019) write of extreme extractivism especially in the northern Canadian prairie provinces as "part of the broader agenda of settler colonialism: acquiring territory, eliminating (or containing) Indigenous presence, and controlling land and resources" (p. 13). In short, extractivism is deeply entangled with (indeed it is a form of) colonial elimination.

This is an important point of context for the study of institutional philanthropies in settler nation states. Some scholars argue that extreme extraction in neoliberal settler colonial states is key to the

establishment and maintenance of much institutional settler philanthropy there. This is in part because colonial extractions and dispossessions are a key source of wealth and privilege fueling much of the settler philanthropy sector (Yellowhead Institute 2021). In an expansive essay on the history of institutional settler philanthropy in Canada, historians Peyton Carmichael and Peter Elson (2022) argue that "*All* wealth and positional power in Canada have historical roots in the mistreatment of Indigenous nations and their lands." Similarly, critical theorist and Canadian philanthropy scholar Adam Saifer, whose work I discuss at greater length below, writes the "accumulation of philanthropic wealth…is fundamentally racialized because capitalism is *always* racialized" (Saifer 2018, p. 13; see also Ahmad and Saifer 2023, p. 2). As such, most monetary philanthropic activity in present-day Canada – whether the source of its power and wealth is from resource extraction directly from the land, or from any other economic activity taking place on Indigenous lands – is directly or indirectly rooted in modern-day, neoliberal iterations of coloniality (and their entanglements with anti-Black racism, and the exploitation of racialized labourers) since all land on which philanthropy takes place in present-day North America is Indigenous land.

Neoliberal economic restructuring as coloniality

In addition to extractivism, another key defining characteristic of neoliberal economic and political restructuring in Canada and the United States has been what David Theo Goldberg (2008) describes as a "counter-movement" against the state as a caretaker. This has occurred through the privatization of formerly socialized provisions including the funding and delivery, for example, of social services, utilities, health care, and education (p. 275). These policy shifts are bound up with ideologies and discourses of marketization and efficiency. Editors of the collection of essays *Revolution Will Not Be Funded!* present critiques of the nonprofit model in the neoliberal present, arguing especially that it co-opts and diffuses anti-violence and social justice activism and dissent.

They explore the ways specifically that neoliberal restructuring has resulted in the worsening and institutionalization of inequality – the harmful outcomes of which have always been inequitably distributed: with Indigenous and racialized peoples bearing the brunt (Munshi and Willse 2007, xv; Koshy et al. 2022). In the Canadian context, for example, in 1996, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien placed a 2% cap on annual increases on all core funding to First Nations social services and programs on reserve, severely restricting the state capacity to respond to increased price and volume pressures in the need for social services. While on-reserve populations grew from 1996-2006 by 29%, austerity measures directed at reserve communities resulted in severe cuts and long-lasting shortages for First Nations-operated schools and other services. As Saifer (2020) points out, the effects of neoliberal austerity "magnified income inequality across most of Canada" but they "disproportionately punished racialized and Indigenous communities that were already experiencing significantly higher poverty rates than white communities and overrepresentation in low-income and non-unionized work." In other words, some critics argue that the inequalities generated and exacerbated through neoliberal policies of austerity and corporate deregulation do not just disproportionately fall on Indigenous and racialized peoples, but in fact depend on ongoing attacks on their ways of life, social collectivities, and modes of governance (see, e.g. Wildcat 2015).

This said, by pointing to the inequitable and racialized outcomes of the retrenchment of the social welfare state in settler colonial places is, critics of neoliberal restructuring are not necessarily suggesting that the welfare state itself was at its heart anti-colonial or even equitable. On the contrary, as discussed in the previous sections, the pre-1980s welfare state has played an active part in Canadian genocide against Indigenous peoples (e.g. in Indian residential schools, Indian hospitals, child removal, publicly funded sterilization efforts and in other policies and institutions).

Sunera Thobani's study of Canadian nation-building demonstrates how the Canadian welfare state played a critical role in the entrenchment of a "complex racial hierarchy…that introduced and sustained force relations not only among settlers and Aboriginal peoples but also among other racialized groups ranked in the Canadian hierarchy as lower than whites but higher than Aboriginal peoples" (p. 17). As Wolfe and Lloyd (2016) write, many of the products and systems of the Canadian social welfare state were essential to the colonial dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands for the "titanic growth" of industrial capitalism, and later for neoliberal capitalism (p. 111). For this reason, social work scholar Kristin Smith (2015) argues that mourning the welfare state is an example of white/settler liberals' "historical amnesia, obscuring a form of mental repression in which every trace of the colonial past is effaced" (p. 25). In other words, for racialized and Indigenous peoples, the "death" of the welfare state in Canada only continued and deepened existing colonial violences in new ways. Neoliberal policies of austerity and retrenchment, and the dismantling of the Canadian welfare state, are simply the most recent iteration of colonial eliminationism to make room for the hegemonic growth of racial capitalism in Canada and in other settler colonial states.

1.1.4 – Neoliberal restructuring and philanthropy in North America

Critics of elite and institutional philanthropy in North America have argued that neoliberal restructuring has specific outcomes for philanthropic institutions and sectors. Certain forms of philanthropy emerging in this context and in response to these policy changes both contribute to and justify socioeconomic inequalities of neoliberal extractive capitalism, and that the retrenchment of the welfare state has worsened. In *Just Giving,* Rob Reich focuses on charitable tax laws in the U.S. that support and subsidize private philanthropy: "the sum total of which help to give [it] shape, structure, and social meaning" (2018, p. 26). He finds that, embedded in and

supported by these structures, “philanthropy has an essentially rocky relationship with equality” (p. 69). It is, he suggests, more of “a mechanism for the public expression of [individual] values or preferences” (especially of those of the rich and powerful), rather than a mechanism for redistribution and equality (p. 93). Substantial charitable tax benefits mean that wealthy donors “are subsidized to exercise a liberty they already possess” (p. 8), but because most elite philanthropic giving supports institutions and causes of interest to the rich rather than social and economic programming for the poor, that subsidized liberty “is not often a friend of equality, can be indifferent to equality, and can even be a cause of inequality” (p. 69). Tax-subsidized philanthropy in America, he fears, is a tool to maintain American plutocracy – a “sometimes objectionable exercise of power” that occurs at the expense of other citizens (p. 18).

Other critics take special interest in market-based ideologies directing philanthropic practices in the neoliberal context, taking a form often described as the “new philanthropy” or strategic philanthropy by proponents and “philanthro-capitalism” by detractors (Eikenberry and Mirabella 2018; Herro and Obeng-Odoom 2019). Michael Edwards (2008), for example, writes that philanthro-capitalism emphasizes the use of “market mechanisms, technology and ‘big data’ to guide decisions”, treating the impact of philanthropy like “rates-of-return on investment” (Edwards 2015, p. 34). It encourages a “results-oriented framework” of evaluation that applies “standardized outputs as indicators of success” of funded initiatives, often without contemplating the cost to the recipient/grantee of measuring impact for a funder’s benefit (p. 35). Edwards argues these approaches to institutional philanthropy widen the power gap between givers and recipients, and between rich and poor. He concludes that, “embedded in economies and cultures of inequality, paternalism, hierarchy and control,” philanthro-capitalist approaches emerging partially in response to the “relentless” marketization and commodification of social services in neoliberal states, reifies

the "power imbalances between donors and recipients" (p. 44). It also limits the capacity of philanthropy to engender greater equality in society by de-emphasizing and disempowering social justice initiatives on the ground.

Jessica Sklair's work on elite philanthropy in Brazil demonstrates similar processes taking place outside of North America. In *Brazilian Elites and their Philanthropy*, Sklair follows trends of philanthro-capitalism and market-based philanthropy over a decade of ethnographic research amongst wealthy families and corporations in Brazil (Sklair 2022). She argues that the entanglements of market-based ideologies with private capital, inheritance, and philanthropy together contribute to "the upholding of Brazil's unequal socioeconomic structures" in both private and public spheres (p. 4). Elsewhere Sklair argues that engagement with philanthro-capitalism and other forms of financialized philanthropy are key to succession planning for wealthy families, mobilized by older generations to convince younger ones to "unite around the collective project of the preservation of family wealth" while engaging in philanthropic activities assumed to alleviate poverty and contribute to the "common good" (Sklair and Glucksberg 2021, p. 315; 326). In the end, Sklair's work concludes, elite philanthropic practice in Brazil upholds and justifies a status quo characterized by "staggering levels of social and economic inequality" through the advancement of a belief that large accumulations of private wealth have nothing to do with that inequality (2022, p. 163).

As the above critics argue, some philanthropic institutions and practices, and the neoliberal regulatory frameworks governing them, can be mobilized to shape social life in ways that benefit the already powerful and wealthy. Other Marxist-inspired critiques of elite North American philanthropy have made similar arguments – that philanthropy reflects and perpetuates inequities of

social power and protects the hegemony of economic elites (Odendahl 1990; Ostrower 1995; Roelefs 2003; Giridharadas 2018; Callahan 2017). What such critiques do not do usually is explicitly or substantively address the raced and gendered colonial contours of these issues (with the exception of Sklair's work, which does unpack the colonial origins of Brazilian wealth accumulation and elite family identity-building – see Sklair 2022, chapter 1). A focus on elites' power over a homogenous "everybody else" elides the specificities of race and gender experiences: lenses that an analysis of coloniality and philanthropy in Canada like mine must centre.

There are some important interventions from literature in the U.S. context that are relevant here. Editors and contributors to the 2007 collection, *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded* (second edition 2017), explore the effects of the neoliberalization of the nonprofit sector in the U.S. Drawing on theoretical and activist frameworks of the American prison industrial complex and academic industrial complex – which underscore and problematize the deep ties between the private or corporate sectors and, respectively, prisons in America and western academic institutions – essay authors argue that neoliberal austerity policies have worked together to subsume social justice movements and anti-violence movements into what they call the nonprofit industrial complex. Ultimately, they argue that neoliberal restructuring has in many ways "undermine[d] the revolutionary potential of shared experiences of oppression in capitalism" (Munshi and Willse 2007, p. xvi). This has had specific and severe effects on the work led by women and gender diverse activists, and BIPOC-led movements. Neoliberal regulatory frameworks enfold the nonprofit and philanthropic sector into a larger colonial system in which anti-colonial dissent is managed and controlled through incorporation "into the state apparatus" (p. 9). As editors Munshi and Willse write, "doing the work of the state," the voluntary sector and philanthropy thus become implicated in the system producing and reproducing colonial and racial inequalities: "keeping in

place the status quos of state-sponsored and supported forms of inequality and disenfranchisement" (p. xvi). Furthermore, other authors demonstrate that the devolution of responsibility from government to charitable sector, and concurrent development of government policy regulating the charitable sector since, have also disproportionately affected racialized and Indigenous communities and organizations (and many other equity-seeking communities and organizations), and the parts of the charitable sector that are led by and serve them (Jones de Almeida 2007; Sonpal-Valias, Sigurdson and Elson 2016).

Some researchers have also shone critical light on the contemporary "colonial project" of elite philanthropists funding education policy and programming primarily in communities of colour in the United States. Pauline Lipman (2015), for example, describes the work of billionaire venture philanthropists funding programming and policy advocacy to restructure urban school districts that "predominantly serve low-income African American, Latino, and other students of color" (p. 241). She argues that this activity constitutes a "new colonialism" with "serious consequences" for students of colour as "a few super-wealthy individuals decide what is best for low-income communities of color, driving public policy and reshaping public institutions to fit their goals" (p. 243). Venture philanthropy, she concludes, has done little to improve education outcomes for most students, but rather worked to "undermine" communities' self-determination and cohesion (p. 255). Lipman is among many others who consider billionaire philanthropists' and philanthrocapitalists' influence on public education, especially in public schools primarily serving children of colour in the U.S., to be a form of modern-day imperialism and a perpetuation of deep-rooted socioeconomic inequalities and racist disparities (see, e.g., Tomkins-Stange 2016; Baltodano 2017; James-Gallaway 2019). As these studies suggest, philanthropic activities and trends in settler nations are deeply entangled with durable processes of neoliberal-colonial eliminationism, the

disempowerment of racialized communities, and the entrenchment of structural white supremacy and colonial violence. These processes are often obscured through discourses and mythologies around the universal public benefit of largescale philanthropic investments into public spaces.

Neoliberal restructuring, coloniality and the charitable sector in Canada

The above studies also have relevance in my study. Some scholars argue that neoliberal marketization, restructuring and institutional philanthropic activities also have important colonial foundations and outcomes in Canada. In part, this is because the "traditional caretaking functions of the modern state" – including the funding and delivery of social services – have contracted significantly and been devolved to charitable and philanthropic organizations, to lower levels of government, to corporations, and to individuals. While federal and provincial levels of government have devolved the responsibility of service delivery to the charitable and philanthropic sector, contracting third party organizations to deliver programs and services previously delivered by the state, the amount and availability of state funding, according to critics of this restructuring, has not matched the level of need (Elson 2011). Nonprofit organizations are also subjected to "relentless economic rationality by which every policy and practice is measured against cost efficiencies and profitability" (Janzen *et al.* 2015, p. 8). As authors in *The Revolution will not be Funded!* argue, this onslaught of "economic rationality" has shifted the focus of social justice and anti-violence movements away from political advocacy, toward fundraising, grant-writing, reporting, marketing, and demonstrating an organization's "efficiency" and "effectiveness" (which are inevitably defined in market terms).

Researchers have demonstrated how, through austerity measures starting in the 1980s, the welfare state in Canada (as elsewhere) shrank, and in turn the size, capacities of and expectations for institutional philanthropy, individual givers, community organizing and the voluntary sector

expanded enormously (Elson 2011; Elson 2016; Elson and Carmichael 2022). Between 1975-2001, the number of registered charitable organizations in Canada doubled, from 35,000-71,000, because federal governments turned from providing social services directly to funding the third-party delivery of those social services by charitable organizations (Hall et al. 2005). However, the growth in organizations (reflecting the growth in need) was not matched by an equitable increase in available public money for service delivery; although government was now contracting charitable organizations as third-party social service providers, a series of radical cuts in federal funding to reduce federal debt in the 1990s resulted in growing competition in the sector for increasingly limited availability of public money to fund the activities that nonprofit and community organizations were now tasked to deliver (ibid.; Elson 2011, p. 73). As Peter Elson (2011) writes in his extensive history of the settler philanthropy and nonprofit sector in Canada, rather than strengthening the nonprofit and philanthropic sector, "successive waves of neoliberalism" characterized by periods of severe austerity, shifts in charitable tax law, and discourses and policies advancing the marketization of nonprofit activity, have led to a substantially "deteriorated" relationship between the growing sector and all levels of government (p. 73). Ultimately, he sees the relationship between Canada's voluntary sector and neoliberal governments to be "one of mutual isolation and suspicion" or indeed, "open antagonism" (p. 73). He argues this has disempowered philanthropy and voluntarism, suggesting that improved relations with all levels of government would result in a stronger sector (Elson 2011, p. 165).

Additionally, changes to the Canadian *Income Tax Act*–the federal legislation that governs and regulates charitable giving and activities in Canada–intending to "encourage, facilitate and reward charitable giving" over the course of the 1980s-early 2000s were partially intended to fill the funding gap (and reflected dominant discourses about the individual responsibility of citizens –

rather than the state – in addressing public needs) (Saifer 2020b). Some critics of charitable tax law argue that Canadian tax subsidies problematically positioned philanthropic giving and the nonprofit sector as a replacement for, rather than a complement to, the Canadian welfare state (Brooks 2001a; Brooks 2001b). They also find that Canada's charitable tax laws functioned to empower the wealthy at the expense of organizations and institutions that primarily serve poor and equity-seeking communities (Broder 2002; Phillips 2018). Peter Elson (2011) and Susan Phillips (2018) argue that in the Canadian context, charitable tax laws regulating philanthropic activities intensified existing socioeconomic disparities that disproportionately affected racialized and Indigenous peoples in Canada – and then tasked an already strained philanthropic and charitable sector with addressing the problem, commissioning them to do what the state used to do without matching the demand with adequate funding. Meanwhile, Saifer and Ahmad (2023) argue, "myths of private sector efficiency and efficacy, which maintain that markets are more rational and, therefore, impactful than public or nonprofit sector approaches to social change" obscured the colonial dynamics of wealth and power accumulation on which much elite philanthropy, positioned in neoliberal discourse as the alternative to the state, depends. In complex ways, then, neoliberal regulatory frameworks and discourse both maintain and obscure the durable relations of colonial elimination in which settler philanthropic practice is already deeply entangled.

An important example of the colonial outcomes of inequitable charitable tax laws in Canada has to do with political advocacy. While on the one hand preferential tax treatment appeared to provide high-level state support for philanthropic and nonprofit activity in Canada, it also stripped voluntary organizations of their capacity to engage in advocacy, restricting the amount of "political activity" in which they could engage. Managed by the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) the *Canadian Income Tax Act* stipulated that registered charities were allowed only to spend maximum

10% of their resources (including staff or volunteer time) on political activities from 1980-2018 (Imagine Canada 2018). Such activities must only be ancillary to the main purposes of the organization. A key problem with the legislation was that "political activities" under the *Act* were only defined vaguely, and usually identified on a case-by-case basis by of the CRA, when organizations applied for charitable status, were audited or else appealed denials or revocations of charitable status in the Federal Appeals Court. Organizations deemed by courts or the CRA to be engaging in political activities beyond the maximum were at risk of losing charitable status. This has been discussed at length by contributors to a scholarly collection on charitable tax law and advocacy in Canada (Mulé and Desantis 2017). Authors demonstrate how successive governments have threatened, reduced funding to, and undertaken systematic audits of voluntary organizations that challenge or contradict government activity. This has led to a phenomenon contributors, as well as sector leaders, describe as advocacy chill: when government restrictions on political activities significantly reduce certain organizations' ability and desire to engage in advocacy, because of fear of losing tax privileges and, in turn, the ability to raise money from philanthropic sources that require tax receipts. Editors Mulé and Desantis (2017) suggest that the state typically becomes more vigilant about political activity under certain conditions such as during elections or after tabling controversial legislation (see also Elson 2011, p. 73).

These laws thus have the effect of stripping voluntary organizations of their capacity to advance structural change, a reality inequitably affecting the political agency of Indigenous-led and other minority-led organizations with (or seeking) charitable status (Parachin 2017; Ballard 2017; McMahon, Hudson and Fabian 2017; see also Lee 2023; Nakua 2023). Authors argue that the inequitable distribution of advocacy chill amongst Indigenous, racialized, and other equity-seeking groups in Canada has occurred in three ways: first, by targeting the work of registered charities that

are primarily BIPOC-led; second, by limiting policy and advocacy work overall by registered charities; and third, through the replacement of larger scale government funding for social welfare with short-term, ad-hoc contract funding. Combined with the larger neoliberal regulatory framework, advocacy chill has thus had impacts on the long-term sustainability of voluntary organizations led by those who depend on strong advocacy work to advance the concerns and goals of the communities they serve.

In addition to these issues, Damien Lee (2023) asks readers to consider that the very existence and nature of charitable tax law in Canada is at its core colonial. Indigenous peoples, Lee argues, experience the CRA's regulatory frameworks for charitable activities as a continuation of coloniality and eliminationism. He demonstrates how under the existing neoliberal policy framework in Canada, Indigenous leaders and initiatives are required to incorporate into the sector and become "intelligible" to the colonial state "by following provincial or federal legislation." That is, to be eligible for much philanthropic funding, Canadian policy requires that Indigenous organizations and communities apply for recognition from the state through registering legally as nonprofits or charities under the *Income Tax Act* .[11] If they accept the recognition (i.e. take charitable status) then Indigenous leaders are subject to governing technologies that subdue Indigenous political orders and sovereignties and diffuse Indigenous resistance to the colonial state. Lee's analyses suggest that neoliberal restructuring and charitable tax law have entrenched colonial relations of violence and domination in the sector because it undermines Indigenous communities'

[11] Dene scholar Glen Coulthard, among others, theorizes colonial recognition as a key apparatus of present-day colonial durabilities at the state level. I discuss colonial recognition, and its relevance to my study of reconciliation and settler philanthropy, later in this chapter. Here, Lee (2023) is referring to Coulthard's theorization of the liberal politics of recognition that aim to reconcile Indigenous assertions of self-determination with "settler state sovereignty" through formal state recognition of Indigenous rights. Under this framework, colonial durabilities are reproduced by convincing Indigenous peoples to "identify, either implicitly or explicitly, with the profoundly asymmetrical and nonreciprocal forms of recognition either imposed on or granted to them by the settler state and society" (2014, p. 25)

expressions of sovereignty and requires Indigenous-led organizations to focus on maintaining recognition from the state in order to maintain financial viability, rather than advancing a decolonial agenda.

While my study of reconciliation in the settler philanthropy sector in Canada does not delve into these policies in detail, I do consider them to be important structuring features of the "ecosystem" of colonial relations in which settler philanthropy is situated – from which it emerges and to which it responds. What the above studies suggest is that, just as many expressions and institutions of philanthropy around the world are inseparable from the history and present of capitalism, so too are they bound up with the durability of colonial relations in the neoliberal present. In this study, I am working from the premise that the inequalities with which Callahan, Sklair and Edwards, among others, are concerned are fundamentally racialized and products of coloniality. They are means whereby colonial relations of domination become durable. The legal positioning of settler philanthropic actors as leaders in solving racialized socioeconomic disparities, while disempowering those communities and organizations most powerfully positioned to address them, has echoed into the "age of reconciliation." This has shaped much philanthropic discourse and practice, with specific implications for reconciliation – which I explore in detail in the chapters that follow.

Discourses of the post-racial, nation-branding and philanthropy

The colonial contours of neoliberalization can be obscured in public consciousness through the propagation of myths of the post-racial popularized in modern neoliberal societies. As critical theorist David Theo Goldberg (2015) writes, the myth of the post-racial is a key feature of neoliberal discourse, under which economic and social "success and failure" are defined as being directly related to an individual's work, performance or merit participating in the market economy

rather than being directly tied to structural, deep-rooted inequities. Race and racism are assumed to be phenomena of the past, beyond which democratic neoliberal states have progressed. As he notes, “relations of racial dominance, their conception and legitimation, are structuring features of modern civil society and modern state formation” so claims that the present is de-racialized, that race has “ended” in the neoliberal present, are really refusals of the violent and deadly ways that “racisms continue to be pressed into practice” (Goldberg 2009, pp. 49 & 34). Elsewhere, he writes that neoliberalization renders invisible “the terms of reference, identification, analysis, and so accountability as well as responsibility” for racial violence in the present social world (Goldberg 2016, p.2280). Thus, under the “post-racial” ideologies of progressive neoliberalization, racism and the durable nature of coloniality can constantly be refigured and concealed.

In *Exalted Subjects,* Sunera Thobani (2007) analyzes discourses of multiculturalism and diversity as one of Canada’s most prominent iteration of neoliberal post-racial discourses. Working with Michel Foucault’s concept of exaltation, Thobani (2007) theorizes the Canadian settler state as built on a “complex racial hierarchy” that has “introduced and sustained force relations not only among settlers and Aboriginal peoples but also among other racialized groups ranked in the Canadian hierarchy as lower than whites but higher than Aboriginal peoples” (p. 17). These hierarchies translate into state action, producing “differential rights” and treatment between “exalted” nationals, i.e.: White Canadians of British/European descent, in relation to their “Others” (p. 10). Starting in the late 1970s, Thobani writes, an increase in the “proximity of racialized Others” resulting from expanding immigration in the 1970s and 1980s triggered angst amongst white Anglo-Canadians about the perceived precarity of settler white dominance. In response, discourses and national policies of diversity, cultural pluralism and multiculturalism “enabled the nation’s self-representation on the global stage as urbane, cosmopolitan, and at the cutting edge of

promoting racial and ethnic tolerance," allowing for the white settler subject to remain "exalted" in the Canadian racial hierarchy while also pretending that the violence of the racial hierarchy did not exist (p. 144). Thobani argues that state and institutional commitments to multiculturalism and inclusion from the 1980s onwards in Canada have been key to the "self-promotion" of a national identity as tolerant, peaceful and inherently good, while also devaluing Indigenous people's claims, ways of life and sovereignty as original inhabitants of the land.

The myths of the post-racial, and discourses of multiculturalism and diversity in Canada, have important implications and articulations in the settler philanthropy sector. In much of his research, critical theorist Adam Saifer draws on the work of Thobani to discuss how multiculturalism, the myth of the post-racial, and other concurrent discourses have fed into philanthropic policies, practices, and discourses in Canada. He focuses on contemporary social justice philanthropy, specifically "art for social change" (AFSC) philanthropy, arguing it is "fundamentally shaped by the intersecting dynamics of capital, race, settler-colonialism, and nation-building" (p. 8). He describes a process called philanthropic nation-branding, whereby philanthropists and philanthropy institutions engage in activities that advance mythologies of a Canadian exceptionalism, multiculturalism, "niceness," and progressiveness. These mythologies also position philanthropy as having important roles in protecting and reflecting those presumed identities for the Canadian state. Despite some philanthropic actors' "sincere commitment to social justice work", Saifer finds that the common "sanitized" racialized and colonial discourses of Canadian nationhood driving AFSC philanthropy make it deeply contradictory. Saifer (2021) argues that nation-branding "directly conflicts with the country's ongoing history as a white settler-colonial nation-state" and obscures the processes of violence and accumulation that "enrich its wealthiest citizens and many of its most prolific donors" and philanthropic organizations (p. 561). "The discursive truths of the exceptional

Canada" as he writes, can "justify and maintain violent systems of oppression directed toward historically marginalized populations" (2019, p. 99) – and settler philanthropy can at times play key roles in those processes.

These critiques have important implications for my study of the relations of Canadian settler philanthropies to coloniality, in part because many of the foundational characteristics of the post-racial and multicultural discourses discussed above have echoed into settler-state expressions of reconciliation, as I will discuss in Part II. Across this thesis I will be exploring the settler philanthropy sector and reconciliation through the lens of this broader theoretical and historical context. In the next section I will discuss critiques of reconciliation that focus on how its uptake in Canadian public discourse has obscured and reproduced colonial durabilities in the neoliberal present, across sectors and institutions.

1.2 – Reconciliation and colonial durabilities

It is in the context of durable neoliberal-colonial relations of violence, and concurrent public denialism of their existence in Canada, that reconciliation discourse has taken hold in more recent years. In this section, I will further develop the theoretical and historical context for my study of engagement with reconciliation in the settler philanthropy sector through a discussion of some of the critical literature on reconciliation in Canada. I will introduce key concepts of theoretical importance to my own study, including colonial recognition, colonial unknowing, haunting, and the grand gesture.

Social critics, academics and activists have extensively analyzed what critical theorist David Gaertner describes as the "genre" of reconciliation. Proponents of reconciliation across the Canadian state believed that engagement with reconciliation could enable profound transformation across Canadian society. In *Unsettling the Settler Within,* historian Paulette Regan (2010) focuses on the importance of settlers individually embracing the discomfort of learning, listening humbly to Indigenous peoples' perspectives and experiences, and actively engaging in truth-telling to "unsettle" the self, toward reconciliation. This is key, she writes, to achieving "moral justice and repair[ing] broken relationships" (p. 211). Legal scholar Michael Asch (2018), among others (e.g. Miller 2017; Raybould- Wilson 2019), argue a renewed awareness among Canadians of historical treaty relationships (broken by settlers past and present) is a key element of reconciliation, which could address the "profoundly wrong" dynamic resulting from the residential schools and surrounding colonial policies and practices (Asch 2018, p. 29).

Yet Indigenous critics have also advanced key critiques, primarily arguing that although reconciliation discourse focuses on recognitions of past wrongs, and advocates for movement toward a transformed future, the colonial violence of the present lives on, unacknowledged and unchecked. At best, critics argue, Canadian performances of reconciliation become a "romantic attempt to smooth over Indigenous-settler relationships while leaving the status quo untouched" (Davis et al. 2017, p. 399). At worst, reconciliation discourses co-opts the conciliatory language of settler remorse to disguise ongoing colonial violence in Canada and continue with public and state-sponsored refusals of more substantive and radical change, thus "mainstreaming, dispersing, infusing, or shoring up white privilege by keeping it firmly in positions of power" (Smith, Tuck and Yang 2019). Others have described reconciliation's public uptake as no more than a rhetorical checkbox or bandwagon, participation in which improves institutional and political optics. Gikino'amaagewinini

(2017) writes of reconciliation as "the latest buzz word in the present arc of our ongoing colonization" (p. 107). Michelle Daigle (2019) calls reconciliation a "spectacle" that fetishizes Indigenous people's suffering and centres "hollow performances of recognition and remorse" in a way that occludes the "larger terrain of settler colonial dispossession and violence that Indigenous peoples continue to resist on an everyday basis" (p. 703). Thus, she argues, Indigenous dispossession and the expansion of extractive economies in Indigenous lands, as well as the ongoing violence against Indigenous women, queer, Two-Spirit and trans individuals, continues unremarked (p. 704). For these reasons, some theorists argue, reconciliation ultimately appears to be more "about rescuing settler normalcy, about ensuring a settler future" rather than effecting genuine structural and systemic change toward decolonial futures (Smith, Tuck and Yang 2019; p. 16; Yellowhead Institute 2021).

Drawing heavily on Indigenous critics of reconciliation, David Gaertner (2020) unpacks the long historical genealogy of the "genre of reconciliation" in the Western imagination (p. 20), arguing that reconciliation narratives like those embodied in Canada's TRC, have usually functioned to absolve the state and protect its interests. According to him, "reconciliation can and will be used as yet another means to protect the interests of state authorities while paying lip service to an international moral code" and contains "a much more insidious inflection of power: one that does not extend authority with explicit displays of force, but rather conceals power beneath a cowl of decency and goodwill" (p. 26). In other words, under the guise of transformative discourse and action expressed by reconciliation, colonial relations of violence persist.

Further, Gaertner argues that, through state-articulated reconciliation frameworks steeped in performances of state remorse and subsequent policies of compensation, antagonistic relations persist. He describes state-defined reconciliatory compensation as the product of an "infection" in

which settler discourses of compensation "first, cannot get over itself as the beneficent giver of gifts, and second, refuses to acknowledge what it continues to take from Indigenous peoples" (p. 174-175). Compensation frameworks function as closures that signal the ostensible "end" of settlers' and settler states' responsibility, and are situated as the solution for "past wrongs" in Indigenous-settler relations, which are assumed to be solvable. The payment of a debt through compensation forecloses the possibility of any further responsibilities to address durable structures of coloniality in the present and imagine something different for the future. For these reasons, Gaertner (2020) writes, reconciliation functions to "obstruct intellectual access to the ongoing histories of settler violence that sit at the core of Indigenous-settler relations" (p. 5). He describes the "shallow" nature of state iterations of reconciliation which do not attend to the "labyrinthine structures of racism, Indigenous dehumanization, and white supremacy" on which settler societies are founded (and which enable technologies of violence to exist in those societies) (p. 244). He writes that when "left to fester below the surface" durable structures of coloniality "survive to rebirth the very same systems that settler society" in its embrace of reconciliation "gleefully proclaimed to be dead" (p. 244). Even where racism and colonial violence are recognized in the present, spatial and temporal distancing frames them as a "vestige" of the past or as an unwelcome, localized anomaly.

These critics suggest reconciliation discourse can function to relegate colonial violence to the past or to position it as an aberrance to Canada's imagined reputation as a progressive and multicultural nation – reputation upheld through post-racial and multicultural discourses and philanthropic nation-branding discussed in the previous sections. In these ways, as many Indigenous scholars and activists argue, reconciliation in Canada has served to maintain the colonial status quo. Despite being all about change, it is fundamental to stabilizing and obscuring colonial durabilities. This is all important to

my own analysis because I am interested in exploring how reconciliation narratives treat "colonial history with clear temporal and spatial demarcations" in ways that have specific and dissonant outcomes for settler philanthropic practice (Stoler 2016, p. 25). In the next subsection I will discuss some of the specific ways this occurs, through affective-discursive expressions of reconciliation in Canada.

1.2.1 – Colonial recognition and colonial unknowing

The status quo-protecting nature of reconciliation persists in part through two discursive-affective processes: what Indigenous theorists have called colonial recognition and colonial unknowing. These processes have important application in my analysis. I am interested in casting light on some of the ways recognition and unknowing occur in the expression of reconciliation in the settler philanthropy sector, and in thinking through their material outcomes. In this subsection I will unpack relevant theory on recognition and unknowing to establish context for the chapters that follow.

Dene scholar Glen Sean Coulthard famously introduced the concept of colonial recognition as a technology of the colonial state in the Canadian context in *Red Skin, White Masks* (2014), building on Hegel's theory of recognition and Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952). Coulthard understands recognition as the "modus operandi of colonial power relations in Canada" in the latter decades of the 20th century, wherein settler domination no longer, for the most part, takes the form of unconcealed violence against Indigenous peoples, but remains "structurally oriented" around legalizing the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous peoples of their homelands. Coulthard writes that the liberal politics of recognition try to reconcile Indigenous people's assertions of self-determination and sovereignty over the land with "settler state sovereignty" through formal state recognition of

Indigenous rights. Under this framework, colonial durabilities are reproduced by convincing Indigenous peoples to "identify, either implicitly or explicitly, with the profoundly asymmetrical and nonreciprocal forms of recognition either imposed on or granted to them by the settler state and society" through, for example, land claims, modern-day treaties, and the institutionalization of Indigenous rights in Canadian courts and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (Coulthard 2014, p. 25). Where Indigenous governments accept "rights" and recognition within this fundamentally unchanged neoliberal-colonial framework, the dispossession of Indigenous lands and waters can continue through the very same mechanisms that grant state recognition. Thus, as he explains, "recognition will always be determined by and in the interests of the master or in this case the colonizer" (2015).

Other theorists focus on more discursive and affective elements of recognition that occur in dominant strains of reconciliation in Canada. Recognition in this context, at the surface level, appears to be about acknowledging and addressing a problem caused by colonialism (that is, the long-lasting traumas and widespread social impacts of residential schools). But it also plays a central role in reinscribing the durable colonial status quo. A key point of critique that Indigenous critics raise of recognition in reconciliation discourse is that it typically treats colonial violence with spatial and temporal demarcations: recognizing its existence, but relegating it to the past (and specifically to the history of residential schools). Drawing on Coulthard, Mohawk historian Audra Simpson (2016b) writes that under reconciliation discourse, settlers' and settlers states' recognitions of and contrition for past actions, and claims to want to do better in the future, produce temporally restricted frames of engagement between states and Indigenous peoples. Simpson argues in turn that colonial recognition refuses to see or address ongoing relations of violence and dispossession in the present. Thus, recognition in the form of apologies and commitments to reconciliation can be key to the stabilization and essentialization of the colonial state. As Eva Mackey (2013) shows

in her critique of state apologies in the reconciliation era, this type of recognition can thus be a "performance of other, more subtle forms of supremacy that are still deeply embedded in the settler nation state and its institutions" – which continue to appropriate land and subject Indigenous peoples to colonial norms, naturalizing settler dominance (p. 58).

Colonial recognition in reconciliation, then, often is entwined with another, ostensibly contradictory process: colonial unknowing. Sarah Kizuk (2020) explains that colonial recognition in the reconciliation dynamic "requires a 'certain kind of forgetfulness'…in order that the logics of elimination may continue unfettered," quietly and unremarked in the background. In a special issue of *Theory and Event* on coloniality and unknowing, Manu Vimalessary et al. (2016) discuss colonial unknowing as an "act of ignoring." They write that colonial unknowing is "aggressively made and reproduced" – that is, it is an active choice made by people and states, rather than a passive matter of collective amnesia. Vimalessary et al. (2016) call into question the "more inclusive regimes of colonial knowing" such as recognition and reconciliation, which they argue are always entangled with unknowing and therefore cannot dismantle colonial structures and relations of violence. Rather, colonial unknowing can be central, they argue, to what Stoler (2016) calls the ongoing "malleable process[es]" that allows settler Canadians to "sever colonial pasts from their contemporary translations" (p. 14-16). I am interested in this thesis in foregrounding colonial unknowing in settler philanthropic discourse as obstinate acts of ignoring.

Unknowing is often a response to what Avery Gordon (2008) and R.L. Bergland (2000), and theorists of Canadian coloniality who draw on their work (e.g. Ghaddar, 2016; Baloy, 2016; Fortier 2022), call hauntings. Hauntings, according to these theorists, make visible the present durabilities of coloniality. They are, as Gordon puts it, "one way in which abusive systems of power make

themselves known and their impacts felt in everyday life, especially when they are supposedly over and done with…or when their oppressive nature is denied" (p. xvi). They are reminders of "the living effects, seething and lingering, of what seems over and done with, the endings that are not over" (Ibid. p. 195). Sometimes, hauntings are also reminders that Indigenous peoples and sovereignties, contrary to settler assumptions, are still present and have always been so, according to Bergland (2000). The continued "ghostly" presence of Indigenous peoples and their resistant and persistent assertions of sovereignty remind North American settlers of "the fragility" of national identity and colonial supremacy (p. 4). In response, American writers engage in discursive removals. Studying specifically the tendency to write Indigenous peoples as specters, Bergland (2000) writes that "white writers effectively remove them from American lands, and place them, instead within the American imagination" (p. 4). Several scholars have taken theories of haunting into Canadian colonial studies. In the Canadian context, Natalie Baloy (2016) writes that, despite colonial erasures that are ongoing in the neoliberal colonial present, "Indigenous people return again and again to exercise their sovereignty and refuse conditions of disappearance and display [i.e. colonial recognition]" (ibid.). Drawing on Gordon's and Bergland's theories of haunting, she refers to this phenomenon as revenant spectrality. Removals and the spectralization of Indigenous peoples – their contrived absence – from archives and from public consciousness are key to colonial unknowing in Canada.

The disappearance and spectralization of Indigenous peoples are a concern in the reconciliation change narrative, but my interest in this thesis is more on the spectralization of colonial and racist violence that the reconciliation change narrative sometimes enables. J.J. Ghaddar (2016) discusses state erasures of information from national archives housing records related to residential schools, especially through the destruction of records, extensive redactions to existing records, or

generations-long prohibitions on records access. Ghaddar describes such erasures as "a crucial arsenal of colonialism" that has the effect of protecting "white settler individual and national identity" when hauntings raised by Indigenous survivors of colonial violence question the presumed "goodness" of Canadianness (Ghaddar p. 18). Ghaddar writes that haunting can be deeply felt: "Discarnate yet real, horrible yet irresistible, the spectre in the archive reminds us that past and present violence and dispossession cannot be ignored, even when inconvenient or disturbing" (p. 25). Yet, the impossibility of ignoring hauntings does not necessarily mean that they always lead to transformative outcomes.

Craig Fortier (2022) discusses this kind of haunting at work in commemorative/historical interpretations of the Humber River in present-day Toronto. He explains that "state-sponsored" memorialization relies on the outright erasure of "death-making and dispossession wrought by settlers" from the narrative, in order to naturalize the presence of settler sovereignty in Indigenous territories and "absolve [present-day] settler society of complicity" (p. 260 & 268). He writes that even in instances where interpretations are intended to be inclusive of Indigenous peoples, they often tend to eradicate Indigenous sovereignty and protect settler futurity as an inevitability (p. 266). Settlers' recognitions of the meaning and significance of haunting can lead to the active ignoring that Vimalessary *et al.* describe. I aim to interrogate the presence of these types of discursive silences and removals as expressed in the archive of texts I have assembled, in order to understand their functions in and for the settler philanthropy world.

Hauntings can also trigger affective performances and experiences of settler shame, guilt, empathy and compassion, as well as settler anxiety, which often result in unknowing. Affect theory on compassion, empathy, shame and remorse are relevant here. In their introduction to *Compassion:*

The Cultural Politics of an Emotion, feminist affect theorist Lauren Berlant (2004) explains that compassion can at times be useful for "shoring up" the very privilege that allows one to be in the position to experience compassion in the first place. For example, discussing the rise of compassionate conservatism in neoliberal Western nation-states, Berlant argues that the inequitable outcomes neoliberalization and affective public performances of compassion are deeply entwined. Restructuring away from the state provision of a social safety net has been accompanied by public calls to individual and collective compassion. Where the state's provision of care recedes, the individual's, or the nonprofit's, or the corporation's, compassion is imagined to fill in the gaps – inspiring those in privileged positions in the neoliberal state to step in to help those most affected by recession and austerity measures. In turn, "the embodied indignities of structural inequality" are reframed in public discourse as individual problems that compassionate individuals can help assuage. As such, Berlant emphasizes how things that are assumed to be "forms of progress" (e.g. public emphases on private expressions of compassion) can "also and at the same time support destructive practices of social antagonism" (p. 5). Recognition of another's pain, assumed to trigger compassion as Berlant's critique suggests, ultimately produces unknowing. Unknowing reproduces the pre-existing structural conditions that created the other's pain in the first place, and that go ignored in the moment of recognition and compassion.

Similarly, in *The Cultural Politics of Emotion,* feminist affect theorist Sara Ahmed discusses emotions in terms of their cultural, social and political functions. She interrogates the connections amongst emotions, language, and bodies to think through how certain feelings "stick to" certain types of bodies through repeated associations. In her chapter "The Contingency of Pain" she writes how others' pain can be evoked in public discourse "as that which demands a collective as well as individual response" (p. 20). She explores how in some national political discourse, others'

suffering becomes “our pain” or “our sadness” – and the possibility of overcoming someone else’s pain (or helping someone else overcome their pain) grants oneself a sense of empowerment. Ahmed turns then to a discussion of the politics of pain and shame. Discussing the final report of the Australian national inquiry *Bringing them Home,* which (in a similar way to the Canadian TRC) gathered survivor testimony of the policies of assimilation under which Indigenous children were forcibly removed from their families in Australia, Ahmed shows how Indigenous people’s intergenerational pain becomes a subject of “national shame” in Australia. A focus on Indigenous people’s pain without reference to the historical and ongoing source of pain (from which white settlers in Australia continue to benefit), “white readers are allowed to disappear from this history,” and the white nation becomes cleansed of its past national sin through “its expression of shame.” Indigenous people’s pain and suffering, Ahmed argues, is thus mobilized to absolve the white population of complicity and also to continue the project of assimilation of Indigenous peoples through “inclusion” into the dominant (white) community (p. 36). In the reconciliation dynamic, then, Ahmed’s theorization suggests that recognitions can lead to unknowing through performances of shame, contrition and compassion.

Feminist affect theorists’ readings of pain, shame, and compassion in the Canadian colonial context are salient to my own analyses of colonial recognition/unknowing in the reconciliation change narrative. Sarah Kizuk’s work on settler shame and reconciliation draws on Ahmed and others to explicitly connect the politics of settler shame to the politics of reconciliation, recognition, and unknowing. They write that in the reconciliation paradigm, a settler’s recognition of Indigenous suffering (and of that settler’s complicity in that pain) often produces settler shame, which Kizuk sees as “an affective experience of a privileged class” (p. 164). While shame may be an opening toward transformation it may also be “easily appropriated back into narratives of Canadian

goodness" (p. 165). Sudden senses of self-reflexivity, triggered through recognition of Indigenous suffering, can be a means of resituating settlers as "good" and committed learners on the reconciliation journey, while simultaneously removing them from responsibility for the structural realities which cause the suffering in the first place. The responsibility to change is tied moreso to the desire "to fix the image of the settler" but not in ways that challenge the structural relations of violence where settlers got the image from in the first place (Kizuk, 2020, p. 166). Unknowing thus results in a "the re-instantiation of the white or settler subject as a self-aware, self-determining, and proud subject" (Ghaddar 2016, p. 18) by reifying mythologies of Canadian national identity as commonsense and refusing complicity in the ongoing violence of coloniality in the neoliberal present. Recognizing pain or suffering can trigger a desire to act on the part of settlers, but the source of the suffering or pain about which the settler subject feels ashamed gets lost in the narrative. The political implications of settler compassion and shame, these authors suggest, are the reification of settler dominance and the stabilization of settler identities.

Affective experiences of shame and compassion, then, do not necessarily lead directly to largescale shifts toward decolonial possibilities. Indeed, as Berlant (2010) puts it "shifts in affective atmosphere are not equal to changing the world" (p. 116). This may be because, as Pedwell (2021) suggests, "persistent forms of racism" (and, in settler states, durable colonial violence) often "actively resist efforts to bring them to conscious awareness" and "aggressively defend against transformation." The possibility of transformation "risks bringing shameful values to conscious attention" and perhaps is also "perceived to entail a loss of advantage or control" (p. 74). Theories of affect and discourse in reconciliation narratives across settler states discussed above demonstrate that co-constitutive processes of recognition and unknowing can work together to disguise the present durabilities of coloniality in Canada, and close off the possibility for decolonial shifts in practice.

The unknowing/recognition dynamic in reconciliation narratives thus produces what Tuck and Yang (2012) call "settler moves to innocence," which absolve settlers of complicity in the very violence that reconciliation purports to be addressing. Feelings of settler guilt and responsibility may be assuaged without a settler ever having to relinquish "land or power or privilege, without having to change at all" (Tuck and Yang 2012, p. 10). These perspectives are key to my analysis of the reconciliation change narrative. They also point to a fundamental type of dissonance at the heart of reconciliation – that durable, structural, and obscure forms of colonial violence often remain untouched, while dominant discourses and affective performances of reconciliation claim to advance (or at least express a desire to advance) major social transformation.

1.2.2 – Reconciliation and the grand gesture

Because I am interested in reconciliation as a change narrative – a bundle of discourse and affect that is ostensibly expressed with the goal of effecting social change – I also draw in this thesis on some of the theoretical literature on change. In particular, philosopher Erin Manning (2016) differentiates between two types of change. First, "grand gesture" changes are the large-scale and revolutionary shifts in history (real or perceived) that are often imagined to be where the "real" social change happens, but that in reality often only serve to maintain the status quo. Manning argues that grand gesture narratives of change tend to draw the most public focus, but are not necessarily "where the transformative power lies." Rather, they are simply "easier to identify" than what she describes as "the nuanced rhythms of the minor" (p. 1). Grand gesture formulations of change "operate within the bounds of the possible" and "mobilize around the solidity of narratives already composed" (p. 222). Manning explicitly discusses reconciliation as a grand gesture. She asks rhetorically, "what does the act [of reconciliation] actually give voice to? What does it mobilize? What work does this grand gesture do other than get us, we the ones who stand firmly on

the side of nonvictims in the [I]ndigenous context, off the hook?" (223). "Despite its flash," she argues, grand gesture reconciliation does not make way for genuine transformation because, as Indigenous critics discussed above have demonstrated, reconciliation happens within durable boundaries of colonial domination that "continue unaltered" (p. 224).

Manning theorizes in contrast the "minor gesture" types of change, which "initiate the subtle shifts that created the conditions for this [major], and any change" in the first place (p. 1 & 222). As she suggests, beyond and outside of the grand gestures, there have always been ways of "being rhythmically, differentially in-act, of idling no more and asking, collectively, what else? What else can be imagined?" (p. 227). In the context of the grand gesture of reconciliation, she points to the ongoing resistance, refusal and activism of Indigenous peoples as expressions of the minor, which refuse and punctuate the presumed totality of durable coloniality. These offer emergent possibilities not necessarily yet actualized or imagined – towards futures that break from the "bounds of the possible" and "the narratives already composed" (Manning 2016, pp. 2-3). Pedwell (2021) builds on this theorization, describing minor gesture change as "immanent and ongoing" rather than a grand point of arrival (p. 11). She argues that social progress is not necessarily the product of any "dramatic rupture with the past" but rather results from the "emergent dynamics" in which pre-existing realities and habits are remade and the "latent possibilities of the past are rearticulated" towards the potential for something different.

In this thesis I apply theory on the grand gesture and the minor to the context of settler philanthropy actors engaging in reconciliation. I am interested in identifying the tensions and limitations of reconciliation narratives performed in the settler philanthropy sector as reproductions of the status quo, and thus as iterations of the grand gesture. I am also interested in exploring

refusals and resistance that perforate grand gesture reconciliation and present alternative possibilities. To expand on Manning and Pedwell's theorizations, though, I also suggest here that it is because of minor and immanent changes and mutated habits (which often go unmarked) that coloniality is so durable. While social transformation in a minor key, as Manning and Pedwell imagine it, can open possibilities beyond and against the status quo, minor changes to the shape and expression of coloniality in the neoliberal present are also central to reifying the status quo. Colonial durabilities can thrive on the minor. Their "bold-faced or subtle traces" in contemporary Canada are often harder to see or hear under the major gesture of reconciliation (Stoler, 2013, p. 6). The transfiguration of coloniality, according to decolonial scholars, is often a response to anxieties produced by the awareness of the inherent precarity of colonial supremacy (Thobani 2007). In other words, durability does not equate to immutability or inevitability. Rather, the durable nature of colonial relations has always been premised on shifts and transmutations of colonial power, which usually take place under the radar – often beneath the awareness of those who benefit most from such shifts. This serves to assuage anxieties resulting from the inherent precarity of relations of dominance. In short, then, colonial relations are durable *because* they change and because they are subject to change (i.e. because they are precarious) – and reconciliation plays an important part. However, as I will discuss in the third section of this chapter, Indigenous scholars and activists remind us that there are always other forms of dissonance that refuse the major: "minor" gestures, ruptures, refusals and resistance that punctuate the presumed totality of coloniality, and exist beyond and without reference to it.

1.2 – The minor and the dissonant: reciprocity, reparations and refusals

A final key point of context for my analysis comes from Indigenous studies and decolonial studies scholars who argue there is always more to the story than durable colonial relations. Indeed,

colonial relations are durable in part because they remake themselves in the face of the "something else" that threatens their totality. Ongoing acts of "anticolonial refusal and Indigenous resistance," writes historian Penelope Edmonds (2016), "rupture the politics of consensus so often demanded by the settler state and into which Indigenous peoples are interpellated" (p. 11). As Vimalessary et al. (2016) argue, "centuries-long histories of indigenous self-governance, in all their variety, are indispensable to decolonization in practice, and to challenging the presumptions of liberal political form and the unremitting ecological and social crisis that is capitalism." Furthermore, as Alice Te Punga Somerville and Daniel Heath Justice (2016) argue, there is always more to Indigenous lives than "how they engage colonial subjects" (p. 241). Indigenous People's lives, sovereignties, ways of being, and collectivities sometimes present expressions of resistance to coloniality, but also have always existed beyond and without reference to it (i.e. not needing coloniality to exist). In this section, I engage with these perspectives, with specific focus on Indigenous philanthropies, systems of giving and sharing and, at times, decolonial expressions imagined for settler philanthropic practice.

1.3.1 – Indigenous systems of giving, sharing, and reciprocity

I focus in this section on Indigenous articulations of reciprocity as something that pushes beyond colonial relations of domination. I will begin by engaging with some of the ways that giving, sharing and reciprocity have been conceptualized in Indigenous-authored literatures. This diverse body of research provides important context for my analysis in the chapters that follow, especially for following threads of anti-colonial resistance and refusal across the texts in my archive.

Although European and North American men are typically credited with the development of theories of reciprocity and gift theory in the philanthropic studies, anthropological and

philosophical literatures (e.g. Malinowski 1922; Mauss 1990; Derrida 1992; Bourdieu 1997), Indigenous peoples have been thinking and doing reciprocity and "the gift" in diverse and dynamic ways since time immemorial. Anthropologists have often focused on the socio-economic functions of giving, sharing and reciprocity, exploring how it can hold many purposes including upholding personal reputations, maintaining cohesion, redistributing resources and managing/maintaining power relations. Systems of reciprocity in some Indigenous societies has historically functioned as a sort of "social glue." They also focus on "the gift" as a determinant of power and as having a "stabilizing function" in the structure of social interactions of various Indigenous communities (Komter 2007, p. 93). These researchers theorize reciprocity as an exchange and redistribution of material goods, but also as key to structuring social relationships. A key emphasis of Indigenous writers on reciprocity and the gift that is not clearly foregrounded in the settler anthropological literature is that, as Sami scholar Rauna Kuokkanen writes, "the gift, in Indigenous worldviews, extends beyond interpersonal relationships" to encompass active relations amongst humans and the natural world: "intimate and intricate relationships with the land and community" are affirmed and established by the gift (Kuokkanen 2004, pp. 80-81). Indigenous articulations and conceptions of the gift and of reciprocity hinge on diverse and local understandings of human relations to land and water. Kuokkanen's expansive work on reciprocity and "the gift" provides some important framing for my understanding of reciprocity in this thesis. Taking care to not suggest that "the gift" or "reciprocity" are monolithic or homogenous, Kuokkanen writes of Indigenous societies' systems of reciprocity and sharing as expressions of collective "identity, culture, and values," as well as means whereby social and kinship networks are maintained (Kuokkanen 2011, p. 217). Reciprocity and "the gift" are the organizing principles of many Indigenous societies, through which a sense of interdependence and interconnectedness flows. She extends the relational and reciprocal nature of gifting beyond personal relations to "all my relations": not just humans, but the environment and

other non-human relations. In many Indigenous societies, she argues, "the gift…is a reflection of a particular world view characterized by a perception of the natural environment as a living entity which gives its gifts and abundance to people if it is treated with respect and gratitude" (Kuokkanen 2004, p. 81). Through reciprocity, sharing and gifting, intergenerational relations amongst humans, and between humans and the rest of the world, are "actively recognized" and this creates a "collective sense of respect, reciprocity, and responsibility" (p. 81). In short, as Kuokkanen's studies of Sami gift economies suggest, reciprocity and the gift can be critical and holistic infrastructures that define and shape relations across generations and with the physical environment and spiritual world.

Over the next few paragraphs, I will focus on several locally specific articulations of reciprocity, giving and sharing from specific Indigenous cultures and geographies. In the diverse lands of what is now called Canada, "philanthropic practices were, and continue to be, deeply engrained in Indigenous ways of being and doing" (Couchman *et al.* 2020, p. 130). The diverse and "complex legal, social and political systems" of many Indigenous societies in Canada have thrived on nuanced concepts and practices of giving and sharing, horizontality and reciprocity (ibid). These are iterated in diverse ways from one community and environment to another. Philanthropic relationships and actions play out in highly formal and structured cultural mechanisms that vary from one community to another, such as "potlatches and gifting, giveaways and sharing traditions" (ibid., p. 134). Practices of gifting, sharing and reciprocity in Indigenous communities across Canada function as important social infrastructures through which relationships amongst humans, and between humans and the environment, are shaped and maintained.

Sylix author Jeanette Armstrong (2021) has written similarly that in the Sylix social world, social/economic relations of giving, sharing and reciprocity are deeply connected to Sylix teachings about the land and water. In the desert ecosystem that makes up her homelands (commonly known as the Okanagan in present-day southern British Columbia), relations of reciprocity begin with the understanding that "the fragility of the eco-system requires absolute knowledge and understanding that there must be care not to overextend our use of it" because doing so would affect the well-being and survival of future generations. As she writes, "the land is a body that gives continuously, and we as human beings are an integral part of that body." For these reasons, relations of reciprocity, of giving and sharing, must govern human interactions and social structures, as well as human relations to the non-human world. Armstrong recalls seeing giving and sharing practices at work in the winter dances, which are large communal gatherings key to maintaining kinship relations and redistributing wealth and privilege. She writes that her mother and grandmother and other family relations taught her that "giving is the only way to be human, that if you don't know that giving is essential to survival, then you don't know how to be human yet." Armstrong's writings suggest that giving, sharing and reciprocity show up in particular ways in the Sylix world – and that they are part of building collective identity, living in relation to the land, maintaining kinship connections, and redistributing wealth and power.

Similarly, Stó:lō scholar Dara Kelly has written extensively of Xwélmexw economies of affection, which centre reciprocity, relationship and sharing through gathering ceremonies commonly referred to as potlatches in ethnographic literature (Kelly 2017; Kelly and Woods 2021). Kelly argues that ceremony is key to drawing diverse Coast Salish peoples "together in a continuous self-sustaining network of interdependence." In Stó:lō worldviews, "human existence represents only one element of a far greater economy in which the environment, other living species and ancestors

are part of an eternal exchange," and for this reason "acknowledgement of the interconnectedness between human and Spirit World is paramount" (Kelly 2017, p. 15). Living in reciprocal relation with multiple generations of human and non-human relations is a key focus of Stó:lō ontologies. Furthermore, the ceremonial gatherings on which Kelly focuses bring maintain social, economic and affective connections amongst large family groups and communities spread across large distances along the West Coast (p. 18). Kelly writes that because of colonial/federal legislation banning Indigenous peoples from gathering for most of the 20th century, Stó:lō peoples today "face residual barriers" to their practices of sharing and reciprocity, through which they historically shaped and expressed "spirituality, governance, leadership and economy" (p. 4). She contends that revitalizing Stó:lō and wider Coast Salish ways of being in relation and knowledge through the resurgence of Indigenous ceremonies and economies of affection is key to advancing the self-determination of Coast Salish people, as well as their freedom from colonial "unfreedom."

What the above authors suggest is that relations of reciprocity, interconnectedness, and giving and sharing have for many generations been critical to the maintenance of local and collective identities, relations to the environment, kinship relations, and social and economic infrastructures. These systems have also changed over time. Colonial laws and the theft of Indigenous lands have limited communities' freedom to practice and maintain these relations. However, the resurgence of reciprocity and systems of giving and sharing, as Kelly suggests, is positioned in much of the literature as a clear refusal of the totality of colonial violence.

This literature provides helpful theoretical context for my own analysis, especially when following threads of dissonance in the archive of texts I analyze. Indigenous articulations of reciprocity and the gift offer an alternative to the dominant compensatory dynamics of reconciliation discussed by Gaertner (2020), in which state recognition, contrition and compensation function as closures that

signal the ostensible "end" of the state's/settler's responsibility and the solution for "past wrongs" in Indigenous-settler relations. Conversely, radical reimagining of relationships hinge instead on reciprocity and amply supporting "meaningful, comprehensive, and sustainable systems of contemporary indigenous self-governance" (Kuokkanen 2011, 217). Shifting perspectives in this way opens up the possibility for settlers to engage in an "enduring relationship built out of the persistent necessity of being relation to the other" but in a way that centres Indigenous ways of being and relating (Gaertner, 2020 p. 149). Reciprocity is, then, in some ways an invitation to dissonance: refusing colonial and patriarchal systems of debt, transaction and compensation at the heart of the reconciliation narratives advanced by the neoliberal-colonial state, as well as the structures of colonial domination entrenched through settler philanthropic practices, discourses and state regulatory frameworks. I draw Indigenous theories of reciprocity into my study, exploring them as minor gestures and dissonant refusals that punctuate the colonial status quo in/through settler philanthropy.

1.3.2 – Refusing the colonial status quo in and through settler philanthropies

In the North American philanthropic studies and sector literature, some authors and activists have also advanced practices and philosophies for institutional philanthropy that reject dominating and colonial power dynamics discussed in Part 1. For example, Lumbee activist and philanthropy critic Edgar Villanueva's *Decolonizing Wealth* (2018) reflects on his experiences as an Indigenous man working for a small private foundation focused on public health in North Carolina. He says that during his time in working the sector, he learned that the basis of "traditional philanthropy" (by which he is referring primarily to philanthropic institutions like foundations) is to preserve wealth extracted from Indigenous lands on the backs of enslaved and exploited peoples of colour, and withheld from the public purse, as it is locked "in tax sheltered foundations" (p. 6) Ultimately, he

says, "what ails philanthropy" is the colonial "virus" that is built into its systems and structures. He argues further that "mostly white saviors and experts use this hoarded wealth to dominate and control – obviously or subtly – the seekers and recipients of those funds" (p. 80). Because of this, Villanueva argues, despite philanthropic narratives about change and transformation, philanthropy cannot "touch the underlying system of privilege and power because that's what grants them their status and position in the world" (p. 97). These structures maintain the divide between white settlers and everybody else – in short, keeping colonial relations of domination durable.

Villanueva offers a decolonial alternative: a seven-step process for those in philanthropy to reorient their relationships with money away from accumulation and extraction, toward seeing money as medicine. He writes that "if it's used for sacred, life-giving, restorative purposes, [money] can be medicine" (p. 9). The process he suggests begins with continuous and repeated reflection on the colonial and white supremacist underpinnings of all wealth, privilege and power in present-day North America, followed by deliberate actions to dismantle structures of white supremacy at work in the daily processes and practices of institutional philanthropy. For example, he argues that at least half of the people who decide where philanthropic money is directed "should have intimate, authentic knowledge of the issues and communities involved" (147). In turn, philanthropic money can be used to fund solutions led by Indigenous, Black and other racialized communities for a better future. He also calls on institutional philanthropy organizations to commit 10% of their endowments to reparations funding for Black and Indigenous peoples.

Villanueva's call for reparations has been echoed in other writings and presentations that he, and the organization he co-founded (the Decolonizing Wealth Project), have since published. He highlights the push for reparations at the state level that Black Americans descended from enslaved

peoples have been demanding for hundreds of years, and notes that these calls for reparations are intertwined with calls for decolonial reparations to Indigenous communities (Florant et al. 2023; Daniels 2023; Daniels 2024). Villanueva argues that reparations must be advanced to redress historical colonial violence against Indigenous lands and peoples, but that commitments to reparations through philanthropy must also "intentionally transform the systems" that created the need for reparations in the first place. Through decolonizing and reparative practices, Villanueva imagines philanthropy's potential as a "legitimate tool of healing and reconstructing the world" (2018; p. 111).

Similarly, in a 2022 article on reparations, Aria Florant and Venneikia Williams (2022) advance reparations as a "new philanthropic model" focused on substantive transfers of assets "coupled with a comprehensive racial repair framework." They imagine the radical possibilities of philanthropic foundations and elite donors shifting their practices from making grants to more substantively moving assets to fund anti-racist movements and invest in Black communities. They argue that shifting assets in this way can address the deep racialized wealth disparities that exist because the "privileged few" (mostly white people) amass(ed) a great deal of wealth through the "depressing of wealth of so many others, especially Black and Indigenous folks." Reparations philanthropy, they suggest, should be framed not as a destination but a long-term and challenging journey characterized by givers who "are willing to share power." This, they contend, might lead to the possibility of "a new world" where wealth is not hoarded and philanthropy, as it is commonly practiced in the present, is unnecessary.

Articulations of decolonial and reparative philanthropic practices also share conceptual frameworks with literatures on trust-based, participatory and radical philanthropy practices. Herro and Obeng-

Odoom (2019) describe radical philanthropy as a counter-possibility to the models of philanthro-capitalism and "new" or strategic philanthropy discussed in Part 1 of this chapter. They argue that radical philanthropies have emerged as direct responses to post-racial discourses, and to the inequitable (always racialized) dynamics of power that certain expressions of philanthropy employ. Radical philanthropy explicitly understands the problems it seeks to address as rooted in coloniality, white supremacy, and military and economic warfare. Herro and Obeng-Odoom argue that it in turn "refers to a collective set of principles intended to help in reshaping the entire philanthropic landscape" (p. 887). As a philosophy, they write, radical philanthropy should lead to specific, intentional shifts in practice embraced by philanthropic actors, including shifting decision-making power to those with lived experience. Radical philanthropy, these authors argue, also requires directing ample, long-term and unrestricted philanthropic funding with few or no strings attached, toward communities, organizations and grassroots initiatives that have historically been excluded from philanthropic funding.

Hunnik, de Wit and Wiepking (2021) take up the conversation about unrestricted funding as an important possibility for shifting power dynamics in and through philanthropy. They argue that increasing the flow of unrestricted funding – that is, granting for general operating costs or programs/projects of a recipient's choice – can break what some critics have described as the "nonprofit starvation cycle," allowing recipient organizations to address their needs more meaningfully and flexibly. This term, coined by Ann Goggins Gregory and Don Howard (2009), refers to processes that "starve" nonprofit organizations by strictly directing philanthropic funding toward programming and limiting the flow of funding to overhead costs, such as staff salaries, training and professional development, strategic planning, technology and building costs. This tendency, Goggins Gregory and Howard write, comes from "deeply ingrained" ideas and

unrealistic expectations among philanthropic and government funders that nonprofits must focus strictly on programs and services but "scrimp" on the infrastructures necessary to delivering them. It is a key outcome of neoliberal restructuring and the relentless subjection of every sector to market concepts of efficiency and profitability in North America discussed in Part 1. Gregory and Howard contend that increasing the flow of funding to overhead costs will "achieve more for beneficiaries in the long term." In other words, the effectiveness of charitable and philanthropic activities will increase when the nonprofit starvation cycle ends.

Hunnik, de Wit and Wiepking (2021) argue that in order to address such issues, unrestricted funding must be brought into a larger assemblage of practices and policies often called in the literature trust-based or participatory grantmaking. Gibson and Bokoff (2018) describe participatory grant-making as a response to growing public demand for "accountability, transparency and collaboration" across sectors, including the philanthropic/civil society sector. They write that "an increasing number of funders are seeking ways to challenge existing practices and respond" to these demands by shifting the power[12] from a small number of donors, foundation staff or boards to members of communities most affected. This includes shifting the power not only over funding decisions but also over the development of funding strategies and practices, priorities and programs. It is an effort to "break down barriers that keep people powerless through an approach that realigns incentives, cedes control, and upends entrenched hierarchies around funding decisions" (p. 8). Shifting power to communities in this way, they write, takes time and resources, because participatory grant-making is "process-oriented, iterative, and relational" and outcomes are not always easily standardized or quantifiable (Gibson and Bokoff 2018, p. 8). Authors describe participatory grant-making as values-based, transparent, community-centric, and process-oriented,

[12] #shiftthepower is a social media movement focused on transforming philanthropic practice through participatory and equity-focused practices.

meaning that building relationships and navigating issues together, and being open to the immanent and unexpected is as important as "seeing" the outcomes of a particular grant.

Gibson *et al.* (2024), among others, have characterized trust-based philanthropy in similar terms. Trust-based philanthropy is theorized as an "approach to philanthropy that attempts to address power imbalances between foundations and nonprofits and is rooted in a set of values that advance equity, shift power, and build mutually accountable relationships." Proponents of trust-based philanthropy describe this philosophy as being actioned in specific ways (similar to participatory grant-making but distinct): "through multiyear unrestricted funding; streamlined applications and reporting; and a commitment to transparency, dialogue, relationship-building, and mutual learning." They distinguish between trust-based philanthropy and participatory grant-making by suggesting the participatory grant-making embraces the same values, but that trust-based philanthropy adds the dimension of ceding power over decision-making. Ultimately, these philosophies challenge, and aim to dismantle, structures of inequality, that I argue are always raced, gendered and colonial in the context of settler colonial Canada.

In similar ways, Wrobel and Massey (2021) have articulated a model for institutional philanthropy and donors to "let go," ceding power to recipients and communities, and embracing trust-based and participatory models of philanthropy. They argue that in order to shift power and resources into the hands of those who are most affected by the issues philanthropists and philanthropic institutions aim to address, givers and grantmakers must "embrace previously unthinkable levels of intellectual humility" (p. xxii). The best way to do this, they write, is to "step back" and to "let go." They describe "letting go" as a radical way to decolonize practices in institutional philanthropy and amongst largescale donors, offering alternative forms of giving and sharing that centre reparations,

anti-colonial practices, and shifted power dynamics. Participatory funding models and collective/grassroots giving present "concrete structural reform that can make a meaningful difference" in issues of equity and diversity in philanthropy, they write (pp. 68-69).

Participatory grant-making and trust-based practices are by no means perfect or "complete" templates that can be stamped onto any funding relationship. As some scholars in the wider literature have argued, even well-meaning efforts by funders to share power with recipient groups can sometimes reify dominating (racial-colonial) relations of power in "more subtle, less visible, and even unintentional way[s]" (Hunnik et al. 2021, p. 40; see also Ostrander 2004; Silver 2006). Efforts to negotiate power over philanthropic funding can "become a means of reproducing it" (Silver 2006, p. 5). For example, in her ethnography of the Boston Women's Fund from 1995-2000, Susan Ostrander (2004) outlines efforts to address the "power imbalance by bringing grantees into grant decisions…in an effort to democratize the funding base and blur the stratified divisions between those who give money and those who seek it" and finds the outcomes to be deeply contradictory (p. 30). She concludes that taking a participatory and feminist approach to philanthropy can generate "relational practice that strengthens accountability…and holds value for philanthropy overall," but that it is also often difficult to avoid "funders' power over resources" becoming the "dominant influence" (p. 43). Similarly, Ira Silver (2006) draws presents a case study of the Chicago Community Initiative of the 1990s, a philanthropic attempt to collaborate on community solutions in response to the L.A. riots (in order to prevent the same from happening in Chicago). The initiative convened funders, nonprofit leaders and community members from Black and other racialized communities. Silver finds that the rhetoric of collaboration surrounding the Initiative's establishment usually did not reflect the reality of decision-making on the ground. He concludes "negotiating power can become a means toward reproducing it" both *within* the

philanthropic relationship and outside it (p. 5). He argues that collaborative and participatory approaches to grant-making could at times in practice be more rhetorical than anything else: fostering the kinds of social change that leave untouched underlying relations of inequality (p. 12).

Proponents of trust-based and participatory grant-making in the wider literature often point out that these models do not offer simple solutions and must be approached with care and commitment. When that happens, they can help address inequitable colonial relations of power within philanthropy (and in the social issues philanthropists seek to address) that disproportionately affect racialized and Indigenous peoples, as well as members of other equity-seeking groups (Chioke Williams and Bonner 2024; Salehi 2024). For this reason, Williams and Bonner (2024) write that commitments to advancing racial justice in the philanthropic sector without active efforts to shift internal power dynamics through trust-based models amount to nothing more than "window dressing." Wrobel and Massey (2021) argue that giving up control and giving amply with an eye to addressing inequality is not only a means to respond to the current "crisis of faith in philanthropy" resulting from disparities of wealth between those with and without power over philanthropic decision-making. It is also a way to move toward a more equitable and decolonial future (p. 170). But, the work requires time and genuine, active work to refuse durable colonial relations in philanthropic interactions and beyond.

Literature on decolonial, reparative, participatory and trust-based philanthropy discussed here provide critical context to my study. In my analysis, I will look to some of the ways that Indigenous critics of reconciliation and settler philanthropy (and some allied settlers) build on the ideas discussed above to push beyond the typical offerings of "grand gesture" reconciliation, instead imagining ways of "being rhythmically, differentially in-act, of idling no more and asking,

collectively, what else?" (Manning 2016, p. 227), engaging in what Manning calls the minor. These articulations are central to understanding the "what else" there could be, both in and beyond reconciliation for the settler philanthropy world.

Conclusion

My goal in this chapter has been to establish context for my study of the reconciliation change narrative, by drawing on a wide range of literature from decolonial and Indigenous studies, philanthropic studies (especially in North America), and affect studies. I draw these diverse literatures together to frame my analysis of the reconciliation change narrative as a study of the complex roles settler philanthropies play in the wider field of colonial relations in present-day Canada. I began with engaging theory on settler coloniality to establish my conceptual framework of colonial durabilities in which and from which reconciliation narratives, and settler philanthropy, emerge. I also drew on philanthropic studies literatures to demonstrate the complex space that philanthropies can occupy in the field of neoliberal-colonial relations in settler states like Canada. These literatures suggest philanthropy cannot be disentangled from coloniality, and also that the nature of the entanglements has always been fraught and complex: that "pursuits of exploitation and enlightenment are not mutually exclusive but deeply entangled projects," as Stoler writes (2009, p. 3). The literature suggests that the activities, institutions, and policies of settler philanthropies in Canada may at times function as a tool and an outcome of overt violence and elimination on Indigenous lands and peoples, maintaining dominant, white settler power. At others they may embody softer, more diffuse forms of domination, obscuring and eliding those dominating eliminationist relations simultaneously. Settler philanthropic actors respond to problems created by coloniality even as they support and benefit from it. In turn, philanthropic practices, policies, and discourses obscure its durable and amorphous presence.

In Part 2, I discussed literatures on reconciliation in Canada, especially those that refer to concepts of recognition, unknowing, and haunting. The theoretical perspectives discussed here are critical to my own framework that positions change narratives like reconciliation as discursive and affective bundles, and my analysis of these affective/discursive entanglements and their material outcomes. The literatures I discussed in this section are key for understanding how the change narrative functions sometimes to reify, and sometimes to challenge, durable colonial relations at work in and around the settler philanthropy ecosystem in the neoliberal present (established in Part 1 of this chapter). The dissonant expressions and functions of reconciliation in the settler philanthropy world have a long genealogy that has been helpfully theorized in the above literature.

Finally, in Part 3, I introduced literatures demonstrating that colonial relations of violence, though pervasive and durable, are neither total nor inevitable. I discussed how Indigenous-authored theories of reciprocity, giving and sharing position them as resilience mechanisms in the face of colonial violence. Others show that they are expressions of the durable Indigenous sovereignties that exist beyond and outside of coloniality. That is to say, Indigenous ways of giving, sharing and reciprocity are not always reactionary and do not necessarily need the pressures and violences of coloniality to exist. They have been thriving and maintaining communities since time immemorial. These theorizations are helpful for framing my own textual analysis as I unpack some of the alternative and resistant articulations for or against institutional settler philanthropy in the archive of texts I assembled. Furthermore, literature on decolonial, reparative, trust-based and radical possibilities for philanthropy discussed in the second section of Part 3 provides further context for my analysis of other alternative articulations for (or against) reconciliation which offer possibilities for doing settler philanthropy “otherwise”: outside the limitations of the grand gesture reconciliation.

By weaving together this wide range of literatures, I am trying to establish the concept of dissonance to frame my analysis. In the case of this study, I perceive dissonance in terms of tensions: especially tensions between what dominant strains of reconciliation purport to be doing (advancing transformation) and what Indigenous critics say they are often doing in reality (obscuring and maintaining colonial durabilities). These tensions play out most often through the affective-discursive processes of recognition and unknowing (which, as discussed throughout this thesis, appear to be dissonant but in reality are co-constitutive). I am interested therefore in unpacking the reconciliation change narrative as a "grand gesture" and a "narrative already composed." In its dominant articulations reconciliation can overshadow the minor, protecting settler dominance in the face of precarity, and as such it does not allow room for the genuinely decolonial. Reconciliation as discourse and affective performance can sometimes function to obscure the durable nature of colonial violence that are the basis of the Canadian nation-state and of Indigenous-settler relations, and of institutional settler philanthropy. Throughout this thesis, I apply theoretical perspectives from the literatures discussed above to unpack some of these dissonant expressions and outcomes of reconciliation in settler philanthropy.

As authors discussed in Part 3 argue, though, dissonance also can take the form of alternative possibilities and minor gestures that resist and refuse colonial violence. They imagine possibilities hinging on settler de-centring, reparations, reciprocity and the advancement of Indigenous sovereignties. These articulations are central to understanding the "what else" there could be, both in and beyond reconciliation for the settler philanthropy world. Alternative possibilities thus push to destabilize the enduring undercurrents of coloniality through explicit settler de-centring. In some cases, Indigenous critics refuse reconciliation completely, presenting possibilities beyond engaging

with “colonial subjects” by divorcing Indigenous sovereignty from coloniality. In the next chapter I will discuss the methodological approaches I have employed to unpack the functions of dissonance in the reconciliation change narrative as expressed through texts produced by and for the settler philanthropy sector.

Chapter 2 – Journeying through the methodology

Introduction

This chapter has been among the most challenging to write and the one that I avoided the longest. This is because I have always felt uncomfortable around methodologies. I do understand the need to go beyond having an interesting idea and to come up with an ethical plan and a reasonable justification for how put the idea to work, but the concept of writing a "replicable" recipe for a research project has always rubbed me the wrong way. I've often felt uncomfortable with what Kenneth Plummer (2001) describes (and sociologist C.W. Mills famously critiqued in 1959) as the social sciences' "worship" of methodology. Or as sociologist Avery Gordon (2008) puts it, the "bloodless categories, narrow notions of the visible and the empirical, professional standards of indifference, institutional rules of distance and control," which are often rooted in "barely speakable fears of losing the footing that enables us [social researchers] to speak authoritatively and with greater vale than anyone else who might" (p. 21). The emphasis on methodological rules, boundaries and categories is a site of struggle for me: things that, as Gordon's words eloquently describe, I have often associated with self-centring, and disciplinary and professional fencing/space-claiming. Sometimes, I think that an over-reliance on methodological rules can embody some of the "grand gesture" processes I see at work in the reconciliation change narrative: centring settlers, pre-determining the rules of engagement, and functioning in the realm of commonsense assumptions, all which keep coloniality and white supremacy firmly in place.

Despite all my hesitancy and discomfort, though, here I am writing a methods chapter to fulfill the requirement and demonstrate that I didn't just wander through a PhD without a plan (or at least not for all of it). Still, I have tried to proceed without presuming to know the path ahead or the shoes I need to traverse it, embracing uncertainty and a readiness to pick things up along the way. This is

the approach that I like best. Going this way is challenging and generative, resulting in ambivalence and dissonance. So what follows will likely not satisfy a reader expecting an instruction manual that summons pre-fashioned methodological tools or categories. The reader will note that systematic details, lists of steps, numbers and "data" will be less present than reflections on my approach to assembling and analyzing a textual archive. My toolbox has been iteratively designed, deconstructed, and reconstructed multiple times over the course of this project. It is through a series of shifts and unpredictabilities that things eventually coalesced into this study.

This chapter is divided into four sections: first, a general overview of the research project, research questions, and my approach to critical textual analysis, which draws on theoretical and methodological approaches from Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and affect studies; second, a discussion of the textual archive I have constructed and my justification for focusing on the organizations and texts that I did; then an overview of my analytical approach; and finally a section about limitations, and about how the project has changed over time in response to ethical and political concerns. My unresolved ethical and epistemological tensions around methods have raised questions for me about doing this research project at all, and about the ways I've chosen to do it. Some of these tensions will become clear in that final section. My closing remarks on self-positioning and research as an act of love and service will hopefully give an idea of where my mind and heart have been (and where they have travelled), throughout this programme.

2.1 – Overview of the project and research questions

This thesis presents a critical textual analysis of what I call the reconciliation change narrative, as articulated and performed by and for people in the settler philanthropy sector in Canada. The study aims to respond to the following questions:

- How do people in the settler philanthropy sector engage with reconciliation as expressed across the texts analyzed?
- What are the discursive and affective contours of the reconciliation change narrative, and some of the critiques of, and resistant alternatives to, its dominant strains, as expressed across this archive of texts?
- What does the change narrative and its critiques and alternatives say about settler philanthropy's place in the wider environment of colonial relations in Canada?

To get at this analysis, I have built an archive of diverse texts produced by four intermediary organizations in the philanthropic sector (Philanthropic Foundations Canada [PFC], Community Foundations Canada [CFC], Imagine Canada, and the Circle on Philanthropy), plus one sector publication (*The Philanthropist*). These are discussed at length in Section 2.2.

I decided to pursue textual analysis because it can tell us a lot about the social world that other qualitative research approaches might not, as Aimee Grant writes (Grant 2019). For example, textual analysis gets at representations (i.e. how philanthropic actors want to be seen), and how they perceive, define, communicate and package the problems they believe are worth addressing, whereas other qualitative methods like interviews or focus groups might be more useful for understanding the experiences and interpretations of philanthropic actors. I will draw on a mix of tools from critical discourse analysis (CDA) and post-colonial critical discourse analysis (PCDA), as well as approaches and theoretical perspectives from feminist affect theorists, to analyze the archive of texts I have assembled, with the aim of exploring the expression and material outcomes of what I call philanthropic change narratives.

Change narratives, like the reconciliation change narrative, are the stories that philanthropic actors tell, consume and perform about social problems (problems perceived to exist both in the wider social world and in the practice of philanthropy itself), and about philanthropy's imagined role in addressing them. They are part of how philanthropic actors 'see' and define problems of perceived importance, and they shape decisions about which ones get attention or resources at a given time, and about what solutions could be, and which are most desirable. They help shape giving decisions, and direct and inform policies, donation and granting practices, organizational cultures, sectoral trends and power relations across the settler philanthropy ecosystem. In short, they are central to defining what matters to philanthropic actors, and to shaping what they do about it. Change narratives are products of both discourse and affective experience and performance, which I understand as entangled and not discrete. I will discuss my understanding of discourse and affect, and my engagement with them to analyze texts, below in Section 2.3. I have constructed an expansive textual archive to analyze reconciliation – a key change narrative articulated by and for settler philanthropy, especially after 2008. I will discuss my process of collecting texts next.

2.2 – Building an archive

The size and contents of my textual archive changed significantly over time. My initial collection of documents encompassed about 700 digitized or online texts produced from 1972-2022, which I gathered through a comprehensive (and ongoing until 2023) search of the four intermediaries' websites, social media profiles, and press releases. Through a series of critical readings, exclusions and coding processes, I gradually reduced this to an archive of 156 texts mostly produced from 2008-2022. Part of the reason for the substantial reduction is that I had initially planned to analyze four different change narratives expressed through texts since the 1980s, but then decided later to shift my focus strictly to reconciliation. I had felt that each of these change narratives could be

analyzed as lenses on the settler philanthropy's complex roles over time in the shifting environment of neoliberal-colonial relations in Canada since the 1970s. However, after I wrote a first draft of my chapter on reconciliation, it became evident that I could spend an entire thesis writing about just one of any of these change narratives.

The first of the other three change narratives I had planned to write about came from a prevalent theme I had identified across articles from the *Philanthropist* from the mid-1980s through the mid-1990s, in which authors focused on Canadian philanthropy's role in protecting Canada's international identity/mythology of a multicultural, tolerant and inclusive nation. Drawing heavily on discourses of multiculturalism, authors emphasized the importance of distinguishing Canadian philanthropy from American philanthropy, and of building a "truly Canadian" reputation for philanthropy. For my second change narrative, I would have focused on texts from the 1990s-early 2010s from *The Philanthropist* and related texts produced by the predecessors of Imagine Canada and PFC, which focused on some sector leaders' concerns about a lack of race and gender diversity in the philanthropic and charitable sector. Finally, I also identified a change narrative based on a perceived need to justify the existence of the voluntary sector and increase its reach and effectiveness through evidence-based and data-centred approaches to philanthropy, charity and service delivery, as well as "effective giving" strategies. This change narrative was expressed frequently and in different ways across texts by all the organizations throughout the decades.

Ultimately, I decided that focusing on different aspects of reconciliation across all my chapters would allow me to provide a much more nuanced and focused analysis of fewer texts than the broader focus on four narratives would allow. While focusing on several change narratives might have allowed me to analyze many more documents and potentially draw much broader conclusions

about philanthropy and coloniality, I felt that I would necessarily lose some of the depth and nuance that a more focused analysis on one change narrative would allow. Nonetheless, many of the themes, ideas and discourses I identified in my initial reading of these earlier change narratives echo into the reconciliation "era" as well, so the analysis I had begun for those other change narratives was not wasted.

My focus on intermediaries allows me to take a wide view on settler philanthropic practices and perspectives related to (or against) reconciliation. I chose to focus on PFC, CFC, Imagine Canada, the Circle and *The Philanthropist* in part because they have all been publicly involved in the broader sectoral movement toward reconciliation, each releasing public statements and resources related to reconciliation and adjacent ideas and concerns. Staff and leadership at these organizations began discussing reconciliation after former Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper's formal public apology to residential school survivors in 2008. The Circle, the newest of the organizations, and the only Indigenous-led one, was established in the aftermath of the apology, and became a leading voice in the reconciliation conversation (and, later, a leading critic of reconciliation). The texts produced by these organizations also convey messages from a diverse range of Indigenous and non-Indigenous authors, including staff from the intermediaries themselves, but also often from guest speakers and authors. Leaders, contributors, members and readers have grappled with the roles and responsibilities of Canadian philanthropy in the reconciliation "moment" and also discuss relevant issues of interest in the decades preceding that echoed into the reconciliation change narrative (such as ideas about diversity and inclusion). To varying degrees, each group has contributed to, and sometimes led, sector conversations around reconciliation through public statements, land acknowledgements, blog posts, research reports,

webinars, conference sessions, and other types of resources. Their publications therefore provide important perspectives on reconciliation and the settler philanthropy sector.

As critical parts of the philanthropy ecosystem in Canada, intermediaries themselves also provide an interesting and important lens because of their unique and often contradictory roles as mediators and influencers. There are many different types of intermediaries shaping new ideas and practices and reflecting existing ones, in the North American sectors and elsewhere. Some scholars from the field of philanthropic studies have written on these complex roles, usually referring to a wider range of different types of intermediaries, including for example donor advisors and financial advisors acting as intermediaries to individual donors (Beeston 2018; Alberg-Seberich 2018; Wymer et. al. 2012); desk staff as intermediaries of global humanitarian organizations (Krause 2016); and even intermediary giving and granting mechanisms such as private foundations, donor advised funds (Ostrander 2007), and giving circles (Eikenberry 2009).

In some cases, researchers suggest that intermediaries can effect greater impact and more equitable and democratic philanthropic practices. For example, Beeston (2018) and Alberg-Seberich (2018) each discuss how individual donor advisors can shift potential givers' activities away from simple financial transactions to intentional and rewarding charitable investments, potentially resulting in more giving that can contribute to a public good. Other times, scholars suggest that intermediaries can play roles in entrenching existing inequitable relations of power. For example, Ostrander's analysis (2007) of philanthropic intermediaries in American philanthropy finds the growing popularity of intermediaries such as donor advised funds, donor-controlled nonprofits and donor advisers led to an increase of dominating, inequitable relations of power in philanthropy between 1990 and 2007. Rather than inspiring reciprocal, "give and get" interactions, Ostrander argues

intermediaries reduce "direct interaction, dialogue, or on-going connection between donor and grantees" (2007, p. 363), increasing distance between donors and recipient groups and restricting opportunities for power to be negotiated. Still others argue that the outcomes of intermediation in the philanthropic world can be both dominating and inequitable as well as something otherwise, sometimes at the same time. Eikenberry (2009) has explored the ways that collective giving circles (which take many forms from very structured to loosely organized) as intermediaries draw together givers from many backgrounds and levels of wealth and result in more engaged, community-oriented philanthropic giving. Yet she questions the potential roles of giving circles and other such collective mechanisms in redistributing wealth and funding social welfare, suggesting that philanthropic practices centred on donor experiences and engagement cannot adequately replace the state's role in providing the social safety net.

In this thesis, I am focused on a specific subset of intermediary organizations in Canada, whose roles and impact in the settler philanthropy sector are similarly complex. CFC, PFC, Imagine Canada, the Circle, and *The Philanthropist* are related to the above types of intermediaries because they exist to inform and advocate for philanthropists and philanthropic organizations, but they are different because for the most part they are not directly involved in the distribution of philanthropic money (like donor advised funds, foundations and giving circles are) and they do not primarily work with individual donors (like donor advisors and desk officers do). These organizations work more on a sectoral level, aiming both to inform and influence practices and policies, but also to advocate on behalf of members within the wider regulatory framework structuring philanthropy in Canada. Intended to inform practices, policies and decisions, these intermediaries act as conveners, resource nodes, advocates and influencers. The resources they publish – and the discourses and sentiments they shape, embrace and convey – reach a broad membership base that includes private and public foundations, community foundations, individual givers, charity leaders, registered

charities, grassroots organizations, giving circles and advocacy groups. Because of their 'in-between' positions and diverse audiences, their texts touch on issues of perceived importance across the sector and can influence philanthropic activity on a broad scale.

My analysis focuses on the many roles and outcomes of these intermediaries' change narratives within the sector. Like the types of intermediation analyzed by other scholars above, these are also often complex and dissonant. Intermediary organizations are deeply embedded in the development, framing, and maintenance of change narratives about what is perceived to be going wrong (and why) and how philanthropic actors can work to fix it. For the most part, their stated purposes and missions have to do with inspiring change, informing the improvement of Canadian philanthropy, and imagining 'best' or 'better' practices, relationships and policies for members and for the wider sector. As such, they are ostensibly focused on inspiring transformation. The texts I analyze reflect the perspectives and priorities of third parties to philanthropic practice and policy – and thus they may at times serve to influence ideas and practices in the wider sector. Sometimes this can be radical and disruptive. For example, in the later years of its existence, the Circle has produced more texts that urge settlers in philanthropy to "decentre" themselves, and to consider a future in which settler philanthropy as it is presently understood no longer even exists.

Yet, I also think through the ways that intermediaries' narratives can be deeply embedded in the process of maintaining colonial status quos. Sometimes texts reflect and reproduce perspectives that are already prevalent and that in turn reproduce status quos; in many of the texts I analyze in the chapters that follow, for example, leadership of these intermediaries reproduce narratives that centre settlers and settler philanthropists as leaders and beneficiaries in the work of reconciliation in ways that ultimately obscure ongoing relations of violence and inequality in and beyond the

philanthropy ecosystem. Furthermore, intermediary change narratives are embedded in and reflective of colonial durabilities, but also influence and at times question and challenge those. Through change narratives like reconciliation, settler philanthropy actors take part in the discursive and affective processes of claim-making that lead both to the reproduction of status quos and the opportunity for otherwise possibilities. Often both of these things are occurring at the same time, and in the same text. I explore these tensions and processes of dissonance in the context of philanthropic intermediation at length throughout the chapters that follow.

Because intermediaries' change narratives both inform and are informed by the actions and concerns of a large membership base, they may say something about settler philanthropy as an ecosystem, whereas a focus on one or several foundations, for example, would say more about one organization's, or a subset of organizations', perspectives on reconciliation than on broader views from settler philanthropy. The change narratives communicated across this archive of texts are as much about the settler philanthropy ecosystem itself as they are about the social issues philanthropists and philanthropy organizations seek to address. Sometimes, intermediary texts are also responsive to narrative shifts surrounding them: they operate within and through a wider framework of sociocultural and political discourse and affect that is shifting all the time. For these reasons, intermediaries like the ones I focus on here provide a useful lens onto the diverse and ever-shifting landscape of the settler philanthropy ecosystem and engagement with reconciliation there. In the next section, I provide brief overviews of each organization, including the history of their development, their stated missions, programming and membership, as well as their role in the reconciliation movement in the sector.

2.2.1 – Overview of organizations

PFC, established in 1999, is the main umbrella organization that convenes private foundations in Canada. It serves a wide range of purposes for private foundations. The organization's main roles include political advocacy on behalf of the foundation philanthropy sector (i.e. lobbying on behalf of the sector with respect to policy that affects it); providing professional development opportunities for leaders, board members and staff of private foundations; producing guidance for foundation practice; engaging in research; and convening members at gatherings. Through these activities it aims to inform the practices, values and missions of its member organizations and thus influence Canadian institutional philanthropy more broadly. It regularly offers to its members (and in some cases to the wider public) symposia, conferences, workshops and webinars throughout the year, along with blogs, newsletters and practice guides to inform foundation practice and policy.

Presently, PFC's membership base includes 133 organizations, which are solely institutional philanthropic funders: private and public foundations and other structured funding bodies. Although its membership base represents a small fraction of the foundation landscape, nearly 60% is made up of the largest foundations in Canada (in terms of asset size and grant distribution) in Canada. Member organizations are also quite diverse, ranging from small (< $1,000,000 in assets) to very large (> $1 billion in assets) private and public foundations serving regions across Canada through a diverse range of charitable and granting programs. PFC's audience, while a small fraction of the foundation sector as a whole, is reflective of the large and diverse private foundation community across Canada, and it often positions its members as representatives and leaders of that wider community (PFC 2022).

PFC leadership were among a small group of settlers in the sector who took the lead on promoting reconciliation from 2008 onward, with a specific focus on its application to foundation philanthropy. PFC leaders were central to the development of the *Declaration,* and of The Circle. A number of PFC member organizations as well, such as the Laidlaw Foundation, McConnell Foundation, Martin Family Initiative, Inspirit Foundation, among others, were vocally involved in the early years of reconciliation in settler philanthropy. Because of the roles PFC has played in the reconciliation dynamic, I draw on many of its documents in this thesis, especially blog posts, practice guides, and recordings of webinars and conference sessions the organization has hosted over the years.

Community Foundations Canada (CFC) is the leading convener of Canada's community foundations. In 2023, all 207 community foundations in Canada had membership. Unlike PFC, membership in CFC is strictly for community foundations, and it is not voluntary (i.e. all community foundations are automatically members of CFC). Private foundations cannot apply for membership, but staff from private foundations and other organizations can access CFC's resources and attend their biannual conferences and other events. According to its database, CFC members hold assets of $7.44 billion (CFC 2022) and in 2018 organizations granted $293 million to registered charities.[13] Like PFC, CFC functions as a convener, resource node, and a content-creator that both oversees and aims to influence the work of community foundations across the country. CFC also designs and delivers nationwide funding initiatives in partnership with member foundations and in some cases with other funding partners.[14] These initiatives distinguish CFC from the other organizations I focus on, which do not administer funding programs (although they do sometimes work to draw attention to them).

[13] CFC stopped reporting total granting amounts across all members in annual reports after 2018.
[14] See https://communityfoundations.ca/current-initiatives/.

CFC hosts an information platform called the Learning Institute, which houses learning resources on many themes including reconciliation, as well as informational resources and professional development toolkits and guides. It also hosts a conference every two years. It states that a key purpose of these resources and events is to increase capacity in the sector, help community foundations respond to emerging and complex social challenges and opportunities, and increase the impact of community foundations.[15] In this thesis, I draw on many of the resources this organization has produced as part of its learning program, including blog posts and newsletters, webinars and conference session recordings, and several guides and toolkits.

CFC staff and leadership have played a significant role in the framing and uptake of reconciliation in the settler philanthropy sector. Along with PFC, CFC leadership were among the developers of the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action*, and CFC has provided guidance for a number of individual community foundations engaging in reconciliation-focused philanthropic work. CFC leadership sometimes position the organization as a model of reconciliatory learning and action to inspire more of the same not only amongst member foundations, but across the sector as a whole. Because of this role, CFC's publications, recordings and other texts are critical to this thesis.

Imagine Canada was created in 2003 through an amalgamation of two intermediary organizations: the Coalition of National Voluntary Organizations (CNVO), established in 1974, and the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (CCP), established in 1981. Its current stated mission (as of 2023) is to "strengthen Canadian charities and nonprofits so they can better serve individuals and communities

[15] See https://communityfoundations.ca/about-learning-institute/.

both here and around the world" (Imagine Canada 2022, p. 7). It does not limit its membership to funding institutions, but is also open to charitable organizations that do not distribute funds and to not-for-profit organizations that do not have charitable status under the Canadian *Income Tax Act*. As of 2022, it had at least 260 members from many subsectors of the Canadian philanthropy ecosystem, including various types of charitable organizations such as private funding organizations (e.g. foundations), conveners, service-delivery organizations (e.g. food banks) YMCAs, United Ways, Humane Societies, educational institutions, hospitals, and many others (ibid., p. 25-31).

Imagine Canada presents itself as a convening association, policy advocate, and knowledge centre for the sector. It produces research relevant to the sector (such as studies of Canadian giving behaviour and surveys about the impact of COVID-19 on the charitable sector), advocates to government on the sector's behalf, and generates practice guides and manuals for members (such as guides on increasing diversity in the workforce of Canadian nonprofits). Imagine Canada also administers a blog called *Blog 360*, which publishes thematic articles about issues of importance to the voluntary sector in Canada.

As of 2023, Imagine Canada is not a signatory of the *Declaration* and did not play a role in its creation. The reason is not clear from any of the texts I have reviewed. My initial assumption about Imagine Canada's non-participation was that it does not consider itself a philanthropic funder (or representative of funders), and the *Declaration* is framed as a document for "key nongovernmental funders." The majority of the now 86 signatories are foundations and United Ways. However, there are some signatories that, while part of the wider philanthropic ecosystem, are not necessarily "funders", including for example, the Edmonton Catholic School Board, the Pride Winnipeg

Festival, Inc., and the Jane Goodall Institute of Canada. This does not mean, however, that Imagine Canada has not been engaged with reconciliation. While this organization has not been as vocal or publicly active in the reconciliation space as PFC, CFC and the Circle, several of its texts are important to my analysis. Its Land Acknowledgement states that the organization's staff are "actively engaging in training and education related to reconciliation and decolonization." It further commits the organization to "listen, learn, establish meaningful relationships with our Indigenous sector colleagues, engage in courageous conversations, and take actions that advance reconciliation in the nonprofit sector" (Imagine Canada 2023). Some of its publications, conference recordings and other resources suggest that staff and members were concerned with reconciliation and Indigenous-settler relations in Canada especially in the early years of the "reconciliation era." Imagine Canada staff have also written and spoken on reconciliation in other texts that were not published by the organization, which are reviewed at greater length elsewhere in this thesis. Since 2019, Imagine Canada has also made contributions to sector discussions about diversity, equity, and inclusion, and about anti-racism and gender equity, as well as other topics relevant to my analysis.

The Circle on Philanthropy (formerly called the Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples and before that the Circle on Aboriginal Grantmaking in Canada), is the only Indigenous-led organization amongst the four whose publications make up my archive. It is a member-based intermediary that aims to "transform philanthropy and contribute to positive change with Indigenous communities by creating spaces of learning, innovation, relationship-building, co-creation and activation." It advances this mission through a number of activities, events, resources, and communications for members. The Circle works with Indigenous-led, -informed, and -

benefitting organizations aiming to foster more ample and responsive support and funding from settler philanthropy.

Although now almost totally Indigenous-led and -staffed (with the exception of one settler member of the "Governing Circle"), the organization's origins are a little more complex. It came together after meetings in 2006-2008 among four settler groups: the McConnell Foundation, the Ontario Trillium Foundation, Gordon Foundation and an anonymous private foundation. As current Circle CEO Kris Archie recently stated, the Circle was created mostly by settlers "out of a desire to enable [funding] from philanthropy to flow into Indigenous organizations, programming and communities" (Archie 2021a). Its goals have changed since then, from serving as a networking organization to becoming a unique intermediary and as Archie describes "a movement for sector transformation" (Ibid.). Eventually, the organization also went from being administered by non-Indigenous people in the private philanthropy world to being primarily administered by Indigenous leaders "imbedded in the sector and their communities" and "committed to supporting Indigenous philanthropy" (Couchman, Struthers and Wiebe 2020). Governing Circle members Stephen Couchman, Marilyn Struthers and Justin Wiebe indicated in 2020 that the group has since aimed to build a "community of good dialogue" through events and learning resources such as All My Relations gatherings, Partners in Reciprocity learning series, and frequent webinars and occasional themed or regional in-person learning events.

This organization's membership includes a mix of Indigenous-led organizations and initiatives, as well as settler-led charities and philanthropic institutions (such as foundations and United Ways). It also is the only organization that distinguishes Indigenous-led organizations. Its current membership includes 39 of what it labels "philanthropic organizations" – mostly private and

community foundations, but also United Ways, corporations, and other types of charitable organizations; as well as 58 "Indigenous-led organizations," including Indigenous philanthropic funds and funding collaboratives; advocacy organizations; Indigenous land defenders; food sovereignty initiatives; Indigenous-led research and education organizations; Friendship Centres, and many other types of organizations.

Like the other organizations I have studied, the Circle also releases resources intended to inform philanthropic practice (such as research reports, toolkits and guidelines), offers fee-for-service events and opportunities, and hosts and records free webinars about various themes and topics. It hosts the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* on its website, and calls on signatories to activate their declarations through policy and practice. While reconciliation featured frequently in the resources and language of the Circle in the first decade of its existence, by around 2017, organizational leadership started to move away from reconciliation discourse in framing its work, for reasons discussed at greater length in the chapters that follow. The Circle's resources before and after this time are a critical part of the archive I have assembled because they reflect Indigenous voices and have played an important role in both shaping and critiquing the reconciliation change narrative in the settler philanthropy sector.

The Philanthropist is a widely read online journal produced by and for people in the Canadian philanthropic and charitable sector that "strives to generate content that promotes informed and constructive critiques, conversations and debates about the role of the nonprofit sector in Canadian society."[16] It publishes submissions from a wide range of contributors from across the sector and other sectors, aimed at generating dialogue and informing practice. It was established initially in

[16] See https://thephilanthropist.ca/about/.

1972 to advance informed discussion about charity law, tax law and the roles of the charitable sector in relation to a shifting public sector and welfare state. By the early 1980s, the goals of the journal changed somewhat because of a new affiliation with the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (one of Imagine Canada's predecessors). The journal's editors broadened the focus to discuss the identity, importance, goals and roles of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in Canada and to encourage more public support for it. Much of this discussion was reacting to the context of a shifting political-economic order in the 1980s, characterized by welfare retrenchment and charitable tax law shifts discussed in the previous chapter.

In more recent years, *The Philanthropist* has published extensively on the roles of the philanthropic and charitable sector in Indigenous-settler relations, on reconciliation and decolonization, on complex power dynamics in philanthropy, poverty and injustice, and on many other subjects relevant to this thesis. The publication often hosts Indigenous authors (much more frequently than the texts produced by the other settler intermediary organizations I have studied in this thesis); although this really only became common after 2008 (after Stephen Harper's public apology to residential school Survivors) and moreso after 2015 (after the release of the final report of the TRC). In alignment with the 2015 release of the *Declaration*, *The Philanthropist* hosted a special series of articles on philanthropy and Indigenous peoples. This special series lasted for three years and then was rebooted again in 2020 after a two-year pause. Prior to the so-called "reconciliation era", some of the leading voices on multiculturalism, diversity and inclusion (which were critical predecessors to the reconciliation change narrative) also published in *The Philanthropist.*

Because of its role in disseminating ideas, and its contributors' roles in articulating and shaping the reconciliation change narrative, I rely frequently on this publication to supplement my analysis of

texts produced by Imagine Canada, CFC, PFC, and the Circle. Throughout my comprehensive online searches, I was unable to access texts by PFC and CFC produced before 2011 (the organizations only began digitizing their texts after that time), so articles from *The Philanthropist* also played a critical role in filling that gap. Furthermore, all four organizations have used *The Philanthropist* as a platform for communicating ideas, news and organizational information. For these reasons, the archive on which this thesis depends refers to dozens of texts published by diverse authors in this publication.

2.2.2 – Gathering texts

PFC, CFC, Imagine Canada, The Circle and *The Philanthropist* have produced thousands of texts in various formats throughout their existence. Some of these texts are available to members only, but many are public-facing. From the rich and vast assortment of documents produced by these intermediaries, I have constructed a multi-textual archive characterized by a diverse range of ideas, discourses, sentiments, and narratives of relevance to my study. The core of my analysis consists of 156 texts, narrowed down by a series of coding steps and through my iterative process of analysis, which I will explain next. My archive only includes texts that were available online.

Gathering the texts to build the archive has been an ongoing process involving constant movement between theory and "data collection." I agree with CDA scholar Michael Meyer (2001) that in a project this size, data collection is not a phase with clear temporal boundaries – starting and ending before analysis begins (p. 23). Rather, analysis and archive building were always entangled, as my ongoing engagement with the texts themselves and with theory changed how I see the world and shaped the project. I gathered texts, analyzed, and wrote, not in strictly demarcated phases but in this sort of weaving. I started by gathering articles from the *Philanthropist.* Because my initial

research plan had been to analyze multiple change narratives over time, I downloaded every article published since *The Philanthropist's* inception in 1972 except for book reviews. All *Philanthropist* articles were available through its website either in the form of digital scans or fully digital articles and were downloadable by volume, issue number, author, and date. I systematically downloaded every article available this way in chronological order. By this process I initially gathered about 600 *Philanthropist* articles.

From the websites of the intermediaries, I also downloaded any practice guides and toolkits providing guidance for philanthropic organizations, as well as thematic research reports. Again, because my initial research plan had been to analyze change narratives since the 1980s, I started by downloading every practice guide and research report available on the organizations' websites. This initial download yielded 18 practice guides/toolkits published by all four organizations from 1996-2022, 12 research reports published by Imagine Canada, five research reports published by PFC, three published by CFC, and four published by the Circle. I narrowed the number for my core archive of text down to only include those published from 2008-2022 after I shifted my focus to reconciliation.

All four intermediary organizations have also posted recordings of webinars and conference sessions on their websites and on their YouTube channels since 2011. I narrowed the number of recordings I downloaded and coded through inclusion criteria, because to have downloaded and transcribed every available recording online (including those not necessarily relevant to my study) would have been very costly. In my initial collection phase, I began by downloading all recordings with a title or description containing any of the following keywords: effective, impact, community, Indigenous, Native, Métis, First Nations, Aboriginal, reconciliation, decolonization, reserve, Truth

and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), inequality, diversity, inclusion, equity, equality, multicultural, poverty, race/racial, colonial, Declaration (in reference to the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action*), effective, impact, power, evidence. This initial download yielded a total of 43 recordings. I added 14 more that were posted in 2021-2022 after I had shifted the temporal scope of my project (bringing the total to 57). I had these recordings transcribed by a professional transcriptionist before I added them to my database. In addition, since 2020, The Circle has hired graphic artists to produce live, digital graphic recordings of all its webinars and conference or gathering sessions and, from 2023-2024, posted many of these on its website. I have downloaded and included every graphic recording posted there and included it in my archive. This includes eleven graphic recordings from the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit, which the Circle co-hosted with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of B.C. from June 23-25, 2020, and one graphic recording of a webinar co-hosted with PFC and CFC in March 2021. As I will describe below, I narrowed the total number of conference proceedings and webinars included in the archive significantly through targeted keyword searches during deep reads.

Finally, PFC, CFC and Imagine Canada each hosts a blog or newsletter where leadership, staff and guest writers post short articles. PFC's blogs and newsletters are available on its website under its "Resources" page and "News and Insights" pages. CFC's can be searched and downloaded through its "News & Journal" page and its "Learning Resources" pages. Imagine Canada's blog, called the *360 Blog,* is available publicly on its website. I downloaded every blog post and news article available on these websites from 2008-2022. The Circle does not have a blog of the same size as the other organizations, but it does frequently publish short articles and updates on its website, all of which I downloaded and included in my archive. Again, I narrowed the total number of such

blog posts, newsletters and articles in the archive significantly through targeted keyword searches during deep reads.

As I have already hinted, an important change in the development of the archive occurred when I decided in 2022 to reduce the temporal scope of the project. Initially, my research plan had been to analyze multiple change narratives as articulated in texts produced since 1972. However, in my second year of gathering texts, I decided I could focus my entire thesis on the reconciliation change narrative alone. So, I shifted my temporal focus from 1972-2020 to 2008-20. Although I do refer to earlier texts for context and comparison in some of my chapters, the main archive I analyze starts in 2008. This is because published discussions of reconciliation in the philanthropic and charitable sector mostly began after former Prime Minister Stephen Harper's formal apology to residential school survivors, televised in June 2008, which also initiated the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada – as indicated in the timeline I have provided in the introductory chapter to this thesis. Additionally, when first I made this change I had planned to limit the date range of my texts to pre-pandemic (1980-early 2020). However, there was a strong resurgence of reconciliation language in the sector in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and to the widespread uptake of the Black Lives Matter movement in the wake of the murder of George Floyd. This swelled further in Summer 2021, after ground-penetrating radar surveys identified an estimated 200 unmarked graves of children at Kamloops Indian Residential School in Tk'emlúps territory. The event sparked a "reignition" of reconciliation discourse in the settler philanthropy sector (and across the Canadian public). For this reason, I expanded the temporal scope of my study to include texts up to the end of 2022.

I stored and classified all documents in NVivo. In my initial review of every source, I sorted texts by metadata, including author, corresponding organization(s), date, issue and volume numbers, and any relevant personal or professional information about the authors/speakers I could extrapolate from the text (i.e. if they identify their organizations, state their pronouns, ancestry, ethnicity, specific professional position within their organization, etc.). I also developed a list of keywords to further narrow my focus only to texts related to reconciliation or other adjacent topics. My initial list of keywords included all the keywords in the first column of the table that follows (or any variations or derivations thereof). Additional keywords also emerged as I reviewed the sources more deeply, read theory, and especially as I engaged with new sources emerging in 2021-2022 (since the language in public discourse related to reconciliation changed during the later reconciliation resurgence). New keywords I added after expanding the scope of my project are listed in the second column of the table that follows.

Initial keyword list	Additional keywords added after 2021
Aboriginal	ally
Colonial	anti-racist
community	BIPOC
culture	Black Lives Matter
Declaration	Every Child Matters
decolonization	fragility
diversity	ground penetrating radar
equality	inequitable

First Nation	justice
inclusion	movement
Indigenous	oppression
inequality	racism
Inuit	reparations
Métis	resilience
Native	resistance
poverty	self-determination
race	sovereignty
reconciliation	structural
reserve/reservation	systemic
Residential school	violence
Settler	white
	white supremacy

Using these keywords in a total search of the full collection of texts, and narrowing the date range to exclude most pre-2008 texts, I further reduced the size of my archive. I excluded any texts that included keywords the search yielded but that had different meanings not directly relevant to the topic. For example, the keyword search for the term "reserve" yielded results that had nothing to do with First Nations reserves or Indigenous communities but rather were using the verb "reserve" or referring to the cash reserves of charitable organizations; sometimes the keyword search "community" yielded results that had only to do with the Canadian philanthropic community at large and not with its connections to Indigenous and other equity-seeking communities.

Taking into account all of these inclusions and exclusions, and any additional sources published from 2020-2022, the number of texts included in the archive came to 156, including:

- 30 *Philanthropist* articles
- 32 webinar/conference recordings
- 24 annual reports
- 24 blog/newsletter articles
- 4 practice guides/toolkits
- 23 research reports
- 19 "other" types, such as infographics, social media postings, book sections, and other articles not published in *The Philanthropist.*

Appendix II contains a chart with information about all the texts in the archive.

It is worth noting that not all organizations are represented equally in the archive of texts that came from this process: that is, I have not included an equal number of texts for each organization. This is not because I felt one organization was less important or relevant than another, but rather because some generally publish more than others, and because some published more on reconciliation and adjacent issues than others. Specifically, The Circle, PFC and the *Philanthropist* have more publications included in my archive than the others do. However, staff and leadership from all four of the organizations have published in *The Philanthropist,* so their perspectives will be included here even if their organizations' documents do not appear as frequently. Furthermore, in addition to staff publications, members of the organizations also publish in *The Philanthropist* and other publications, and I include these perspectives (for example, staff from the Calgary Foundation and Vancouver Foundation, both members of CFC, publish frequently on reconciliation and Indigenous issues). Also, some documents published by one organization may be collaborative texts that involve representatives from others. For example, a number of PFC webinar recordings

include representation from CFC and the Circle. I will note as well that I have included some texts authored or published by other organizations outside of the four intermediaries – including organizations and individuals who are members of the intermediaries, as well as organizations doing work alongside or in collaboration with the intermediaries and their members. There are also some names of individuals who will become very familiar to readers because they are frequently mentioned in my analysis, especially Wanda Brascoupé Peters and Kris Archie (CEOs of the Circle), Hilary Pearson (President of PFC), Sara Lyons (a VP at CFC and a board member of the Circle for some time), and Tim Fox (VP of Indigenous Relations and Equity Strategy at the Calgary Foundation as well as a member of the Circle's governing board). Again, this is not because I consider these authors to be more important than others, but because their professional positionality within the sector from 2008-2022 meant that they were frequent commentators on reconciliation and other related issues at critical times during the time period I have studied.

2.3 – Analyzing the reconciliation change narrative: A critical textual analysis

Here I will briefly discuss the analytical steps I have taken to draw conclusions about the functions and outcomes of the reconciliation change narrative and its discursive-affective entanglements. First, I will establish my understanding of discourse and affect, which I see to be entangled in philanthropic change narratives like reconciliation: a central perspective guiding my analysis. As Eve Sointu (2016) notes, "discourse[s]…suffuse affective experience" and "social meaning saturates the very fabric of our being" while discourses and discursive structures also "always carry affective weight" (p. 325). This also has implications for the flow and shape of power, which can circulate both through discourse and affectivity – and through the entwining of both (Liljeström 2015, p. 17). My specific interest in this thesis is in the ways such entanglements in the reconciliation change narrative reflect, respond to and shape durable colonial relations in settler

Canadian society, and in turn what this has meant for the practices and outcomes of settler philanthropy.

Discourse, central to how people describe and define the social world around them, is part of historically and socially specific systems of knowledge-making and representation – the ways in which people construct meaning and make the world meaningful. Discourse is also always tied to and shaped by social relations of power. French philosopher Michel Foucault famously situated discourse as key to the production of knowledge and in turn to the shaping and exercise of social power. The "manifold relations of power" that make up and flow through the social world, he says, "cannot be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (p. 93). He continues, "we are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth" (p. 93). Discussing Foucault in an exploration of discourse and representation, cultural theorist Stuart Hall writes that discourse "defines our objects of knowledge" and thus frames how "a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about. It also influences how ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others" (p. 29). Taking these perspectives, Foucauldian critical discourse analysts have investigated discourse not just for its meaning-making value, but also as a product and producer of relations of power in the social world (see e.g. van Dijk, T.A. 1993; Wodak 1996; Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000, p. 450; Fairclough 2004; Weiss and Wodak 2007, p. 15; Fairclough 2010). CDA scholar Linda Graham explains, "when 'doing' discourse analysis within a Foucauldian framework, one looks to statements not so much for what they say but what they *do*" (Graham 2011, p. 667), because as Blommaert (2005) puts it, "there is a lot that language does to people" (p. 13). When thinking about discourse, therefore, I am interested as much in what discourse *does* as in what it says.

Because I am interested specifically in what change narratives do to people (and what people do with them) in settler colonial contexts like Canada and in the settler philanthropy ecosystem, I situate critical discourse analysis (CDA) in close dialogue with theory from decolonial studies, and draw on methods from post-colonial discourse analysis (PCDA). As Caroline Hodes (2018) and Ruth Sanz Sabido (2019) show, PCDA is concerned primarily with the discursive reproductions of colonial relations, institutions and interests in colonial places – the ways in which colonial discourses and logics sustain relations of domination and violence. In other words, discourse embeds colonial durabilities. A key focus in this thesis therefore is on the functions of colonial discourses embedded in settler philanthropic change narratives like reconciliation, which at times go unperceived – the ways in which discourse reproduces, informs, and maintains colonial relations of elimination and, at times, challenges or reimagines them.

Yet there is more to the social world than discourse. Affect theorists point to other things that occur and exist beyond, alongside or around discourse, which are just as critical to the constitution and expression of social power (Liljeström and Paasonen 2010; Berlant 2010; Ahmed 2014; Pedwell 2014; Stewart 2017). Affect means different things to different theorists, and therefore the study of affect is wide ranging and does many things. Seigworth and Pedwell (2023) describe affect studies as evolving and mutating, "a rangy and writhing poly-jumble of a creature" that "shimmers" in different ways across many different spaces and disciplines (p. 4). I tend to focus in this thesis on the parts of the field that theorize affect as embodied experiences and expressions beyond just what we say, think or know: experiences that are sometimes intertwined with feeling, emotion, and sentiment. I like Gregg and Seigworth's (2010) theorization of affect as "those visceral forces beneath, alongside, or generally *other than* conscious knowing that can serve to drive us toward

movement, thought, and ever-changing forms of relation" (p. 3). Feminist affect theorist Marianne Liljeström (2016) emphasizes a theoretical focus on "sensual qualities of being, the capacity to experience and understand the world in ways that are profoundly relational and productive" (p. 16). Just so, the world people experience, Kathleen Stewart (2017) tells us, is not "simply anchored in the consciousness of the humanist subject or its categories of thought" (p. 194). In other words, discourse, language and conscious knowledge alone cannot capture what it *feels like* to be, or fully articulate how people experience and relate with/to the world around them.

Like discourse, affective experiences, expressions and performances are also a significant part of the durabilities of colonial relations. Winona LaDuke and Deborah Cowen (2020) write that settler coloniality is not purely technical or physical but also produced through and with "feelings, ideas, and attitudes." Quoting Ruth Wilson Gilmore, they describe coloniality alongside white supremacy as deeply affective: built on "an infrastructure of feeling" (p. 253). Affect is also central to the reconciliation change narrative. Reconciliation is not just something that people in the settler philanthropy world think or say; it is deeply felt (and often expressively performed). The affective is thus just as important as discourse to shaping the social world and reproducing or transforming colonial relations. I am interested in understanding what roles affective performances and experiences in the reconciliation change narrative play in situating settlers in philanthropy in relation to the field of durable colonial relations in which reconciliation is imagined.

2.3.1 – Thematic coding and analysis

Once I had narrowed down my archive of texts, I began the work of thematically coding them. I identified common patterns across texts and coded these, using a number of different criteria, which expanded and shifted over time. Some of the key thematic criteria I generated from this

archive, which informed the analysis in the chapters that follow included: distinguishing between texts that advanced and critiqued reconciliation (or did both); identifying if texts were authored by Indigenous or settler individuals (or both); noting the historical and social context of the text's production, where possible; identifying the professional and social positionality of authors and speakers in various texts, where possible; coding imagined roles of settlers and settler philanthropy in the reconciliation dynamic as they are expressed throughout the texts (for example, roles of settlers as funders or as policy advocates); and identifying texts that do not explicitly use the language of reconciliation but engage with topics and ideas that are relevant to it. Some of the thematic coding I undertook involved revisiting texts many times, as my reading of theory (and the ongoing shifts in the discourse of reconciliation since 2020) changed what I was looking for. For example, as I began to engage with affect theory (a development that occurred late in my analytical process, as I discuss further below), I revisited all of the texts I had gathered to add a layer of thematic coding that could reflect their various affective elements and their tonal qualities, including expressions of urgency, discomfort, hopefulness, compassion, shame, remorse, and apology.

My analysis hinges on the perspective that the words and images that form each of the texts in this archive must be understood as part of a "total set of features" that is intricately connected (Blommaert, 2004, p. 3). These must be analyzed together, as parts of one set. Discourse and affect are deeply intertwined; content (i.e. words and images) cannot be separated from the form or genre of the text and mode of expression; and these cannot be separated from historical genealogy and socio-political context. In the chapters that follow, I employ mixed approaches from CDA, decolonial studies and affect studies to analyze the following interrelated features of the texts:

historical and sociopolitical context; textual genre/form; content and silence; and affective contours of texts. I will discuss these next.

Historical and sociopolitical context

The texts I analyze are not simply compilations of words on a page, but productions and events. In other words, texts and their content are always constructed, received, and filtered within specific historical and socio-political contexts. When, where, by/for whom and under what circumstances each text was generated are important points of context that affect the shape and articulation of the reconciliation change narrative in a variety of ways. Many CDA scholars stress the importance of attending to changes and continuities in social discourse and also emphasize that context and language are "inextricably bound together in the production of meaning" (Bloor and Bloor 2013, p. 27). Good discourse analysis historicizes discourses, attending to the ways they are adapted and reframed over time, as well as the situations, institutions, people, processes and ideas that they shape and are shaped by. A key analytical starting point for my study then is to identify social-historical context, colonial genealogies and intertextuality of the reconciliation change narrative and the texts in which it is expressed. Across all Findings chapters, therefore, I attend to the historical context of the texts.

The reconciliation change narrative has been expressed in different ways by different people over time, which indicates that reconciliation itself is a complex concept whose meaning and application is still contested in the world of philanthropy. I concentrate to some extent on the historical events, processes and relations that led up to texts' production, what other discourses preceded and shaped the change narrative, and how the narrative has changed over time. In different ways in each chapter, therefore, I ask questions about who generated a text, who participated in its consumption, what were their positions and objectives in the settler philanthropy ecosystem, and what were their relationships to one another both in terms of the broad scale (i.e. within the wider settler

philanthropy ecosystem) and more locally, in terms of the creation of the text. Asking questions about why organizations began to include reconciliation in their publications and programming after 2015, for example, or why *The Philanthropist* established a new series on philanthropy and Indigenous communities when it did, is just as important as analyzing the words themselves.

Moreover, the identity and positionality of authors, their intended and actual audiences, their subjects of discussion, and anyone else involved in the textual event are important to identifying the material functions of a text. CDA theorists Weiss and Wodak (2003) indicate that no discourse is the product of just a single actor (p. 14), and the identities of people doing the discursive act (i.e. writing, editing, speaking, etc.), of those receiving it, responding to it, or intended to receive it – and the relations among all of these actors – matter in the production of texts. The various actors involved represent a diverse range of organizations, roles and positions in the settler philanthropy ecosystem, and are both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people who wield varying levels of privilege and power. They include practitioners, foundation staff, sector leaders, politicians, business leaders, philanthropy analysts, social critics, nonprofit leaders, academics and social justice activists. The way different parties interact in the formation of a text is key to understanding its outcomes. For example, in some of my analyses of conference sessions, I attend to the social and political locations of various participants (e.g. where there are multiple co-panelists) in the production of the text. As I show in chapters 4 and 5, in some instances, bringing settler and Indigenous individuals with varying levels of professional leverage together on a single stage can have important impacts on the way a message is articulated and received. Some of the strongest critiques of settler philanthropy and dominant reconciliation frameworks are voiced by Indigenous women and women of colour who author texts across this archive. Sometimes, where these authors advance critiques of reconciliation and settler philanthropy, settlers in positions of power who are

sharing the stage reframe their critiques in ways that make them more palatable to an audience dominated by settlers. In turn, such acts of reframing critiques reproduces colonial relations of violence in philanthropic spaces and limits the possibilities of mobilizing settler philanthropy toward decolonial futures (Buchholz et al. 2020). I aim to take into account identities and positionality (who they are and how they are situated politically and professionally in the settler philanthropy ecosystem, and in the wider ecosystem of colonial power relations) when foregrounding content and critiques.

I also aim to trace what decolonial historian Ann Laura Stoler describes as the "colonial genealogies" of the reconciliation change narrative and thus expose the "durabilities" of colonial relations that the narrative reflects and responds to. A critical focus of my analysis is the longer genealogy of colonial relations of power that "underpin the production" of discursive content in the settler philanthropy sphere (Sabido 2019, p. 20). Setting settler philanthropic actors' discourses and affective expressions in the wider context of Indigenous-settler relations in Canada–that is, attending to the "social structures and processes" wherein philanthropic actors create meaning–is key to meaningfully analyzing their content, and understanding their shifting functions and material effects (Fairclough 2004, p. 9; Wodak and Meyer 2001). Each text's discursive-affective entanglements are always occurring in conversation with many other texts in a wider social field, where colonial power is shaped, negotiated, reproduced and challenged. I explored some of the complex colonial genealogies of reconciliation and of the Canadian settler philanthropy ecosystem, in the previous chapter. I aim to weave the analytical threads I established there throughout my discussions in the Findings chapters.

Genre and textual form

Another critical part of my analysis is observing the forms in which the change narrative is expressed – the genre or types of texts in which it appears. Stoler (2009) refers to this method of

identifying form and (thus) function as reading "along the grain," seeking out "the principles and practices of governance lodged in particular archival forms" (p. 20). In other words, I aim to understand the dissonant functions and social power of particular *types* of texts, assuming that each is different. The reconciliation change narrative is expressed through dozens of texts taking many different forms, including written declarations and public commitments to reconciliation, *Philanthropist* articles, practice guides, blog posts, and recordings of symposia, conference sessions, and webinars. Each has a different intention and function, style, voice, potential audience and outcome, and as discussed previously is shaped by the moment in which it is created. For this reason, each text cannot be weighed or analyzed in the same way.

Different types of texts are analytically interesting and relevant for different reasons. For example, conference and webinar proceedings are analytically interesting in part because of their wide reach. Imagine Canada's and PFC's conferences and symposia typically see anywhere from 150-300 audience members from member organizations as well as guests from outside the sector. Many are representatives of the largest foundations in Canada, as well as charitable organizations of many types, so these events may have the potential for widespread impact on institutional philanthropic practices. Additionally, these events bring settler philanthropy actors and organizations into dialogue with the wider field of social actors, ideas, institutions, communities talking about reconciliation, and thus are a helpful lens onto the ways that change narratives can filter into the philanthropy ecosystem. The Circle's webinar recordings are also analytically interesting texts because they tend to reflect a mix of perspectives primarily from Indigenous speakers and authors but also from settlers and other visitors. They shed light on shifts in tone and tenor over time with respect to reconciliation; whereas webinars from 2014-2016 (hosted by the Circle's first CEO, Wanda Brascoupé Peters) tend to be more about educating settlers in philanthropy about what

reconciliation could mean for them, those from 2017 onward (hosted by the Circle's current CEO, Kris Archie, and Shereen Munshi, the Circle's Director of Partnerships and Strategic Communications) tend to avoid use of the term reconciliation, are more critical of settler philanthropy practices, and urge settlers to do the work of educating themselves.

As such, I am looking for several specific things when I analyze the texts and their various forms. I think through how they are intended to be received, and what their producers do to ensure they are received in that way. I am also interested in what (if it is possible to know) is edited out during their production. Such contextual elements are significant to understanding the power of the reconciliation change narrative in and for settler philanthropy across different types of texts, each of which can be drawn together to form a sort of mosaic of discursive-affective moments that point to the change narrative's significance and potential material functions for the settler philanthropy ecosystem.

Content and silence

Also central to this analysis is the content (i.e. the actual words and/or images) that make up the texts. My analysis focuses on the ways reconciliation is described and defined, and how various contributors articulate reconciliation as a concept, ideal, or course of action for settler philanthropy organizations and actors. I focus especially on how the roles, responsibilities and intentions of settler individuals and the settler philanthropy sector are articulated. I attend to word choice and key words, the use of tense and pronouns, word order, repeated vocabulary and themes, and motifs that appear across the archive in the construction of the reconciliation change narrative. These work together to imbue the concept of reconciliation with meanings particular to the settler philanthropy ecosystem. For example, in Chapter 3 I explore some of the key roles that settler and Indigenous authors in this archive envisioned for settler philanthropy in the early days of reconciliation: roles

of funders, partners, and advocates. In Chapter 5 I discuss a common motif of the settler learning journey, which positions settler learning (both an intellectual and "felt" learning) as a key part of the journey toward reconciliation in Canadian philanthropy.

I also aim to identify what the texts do not say – omissions and obfuscations, which are equally analytically rich. One way I identify these types of silences is by evaluating texts alongside other critical discussions of reconciliation and settler philanthropy. Their critical perspectives, which I draw from sector publications written by Indigenous authors, social media accounts of several key Indigenous critics of the settler philanthropy sector, and blog posts and press releases, have been key to identifying potential silences and omissions in my main archive. Situating my analysis of the reconciliation change narrative in the settler philanthropy sector in dialogue with these critical articulations, and with scholarly critiques of reconciliation discussed in the previous chapter, is helpful for identifying its material functions. In each chapter, I review critical academic analyses of reconciliation to assist in the work of reading between the lines and identifying obscured meanings or omissions. Specifically, I explore discursive acts of spatial and temporal distancing, vagueness, renaming and omission in the texts (especially in Chapter 4). Through these discursive forms of silencing, of unknowing, coloniality's durable presence can be disguised or cloaked. The language of unknowing makes the colonial nature of some settler philanthropic change narratives, practices and institutions – even those with good intentions – appear to be something other than colonial violence.

Affective contours of the reconciliation change narrative

This critical analysis also pays heed to the mode of expression by which content and silence are articulated – the rhetorical devices, emphasis, voice, and tense that characterize the communication of the reconciliation change narrative at various times and places throughout this archive. Stoler

(2009) emphasizes the importance of "prose style, repetitive refrain, the arts of persuasion, affective strains" by which content is articulated: their "tone and temper" (Ibid., p. 2). Just so, my critical analysis will involve identifying *how* the content of change narratives is commonly expressed. I focus on linguistic and rhetorical devices; metaphor and imagery; tone, stress and emphasis; syntactic structure; punctuation; and tense, all of which play a part in the affective articulations of the reconciliation change narrative by and for settler philanthropy.

Reconciliation is a deeply felt thing. There is frequent talk of the "felt" impetus and effects of reconciliation in the texts I have reviewed. I trace these out across my chapters, following threads of urgency, anxiety, compassion, shame and discomfort throughout some of the texts in my archive. In Chapter 3, for example, I explore the intense sense of hopefulness and urgency that surrounded the release of the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action,* and the sense of disappointment and cynicism that followed several years later. Such affective shifts point to the fundamental point of dissonance at the heart of the reconciliation change narrative as a grand gesture: although all about largescale transformation, it can often work to maintain and obscure colonial durabilities in and through the practices of settler philanthropy. In Chapter 4 I explore how colonial hauntings (reminders to settlers that coloniality is present and that they are complicit) sometimes trigger settler discomfort, which settlers in this archive often respond to through discursive processes that lead to colonial unknowing. In Chapter 5, I discuss how settlers in philanthropy engaging in learning journeys on the way toward reconciliation are often triggered to feel remorse, empathy and compassion when they 'see' Indigenous suffering for the first time. These triggers are assumed to be critical impetuses toward action. I argue however that affective experiences like these do not necessarily lead to transformative action, but rather often can lead to closures and colonial extractions.

Context, form, content, silence and affective contours of the reconciliation change narrative as expressed across the texts I analyze all have important outcomes and functions for settler philanthropy. The fact that reconciliation across this textual archive has been expressed, embraced and critiqued in different ways by different people over time points to its fundamental dissonance. Change narratives and the discursive-affective entanglements that shape them are products and producers, as well as signifiers, of complex relations of power, colonial violence, and resistance in settler philanthropy ecosystem and beyond.

2.4 – Journeying through the methodology: shifts, ethical tensions, and limitations

2.4.1 – Shifts and tensions

Like most PhDs, my thesis journey has been very much a shifting undertaking. The methodological approach, and the overall focus of the project, have each changed significantly over the past five years. The COVID-19 pandemic, various ethical and political considerations, and my development as a researcher and as a person all contributed to shifts leading up to the current project. I'll explain some of the shifts and ethical considerations most pertinent to my PhD journey now.

The plan to conduct a critical textual analysis of intermediary organizations' documents was a fairly recent development. Originally, I had envisioned a more community-engaged project, centring on dialogue with leaders and staff involved in fundraising at charitable organizations that are led by or that serve Indigenous communities, as well as staff from settler-led philanthropic organizations. My plan had been to combine textual analysis with interviews and focus groups. I was just seven months into my PhD project when the COVID-19 pandemic took hold of the world,

and talking to people as a research methodology suddenly was out of the question. In the first several months of the pandemic, I began to shift my focus toward documents. Philanthropic and charitable organizations produce myriad texts in diverse formats, and I figured these could be a good place to begin. Initially, my plan was to review documents from a much larger field of organizations, including specific foundations and other issue-specific influencers (such as the International Funders of Indigenous Peoples organization, the Canadian Environmental Grant-makers' Network, Charity Watchdog, among others). While this wider field may have granted me much broader view of the sector, over time I realized I would need to travel to access many documents that were not available online, and this possibility would also have required in-person meetings and interactions. Until mid-2021, this was simply not practically or ethically feasible. Ultimately, I determined that focusing only on digitized documents released by the four pan-Canadian intermediaries – CFC, PFC, Imagine Canada and the Circle – and supplementing this with reference to articles available from *The Philanthropist* would provide me with sufficient materials to build an interesting and diverse archive of texts.

By summer 2021, the possibility of travelling for research or doing interviews emerged again, and after gathering many texts from the above sources, I returned to thoughts of talking to people. I considered doing several "expert" interviews with individuals working in or influencing the sector, including both Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders. My plan was to interview people remotely (i.e. via email, zoom or phone), and ask them a small number of questions that could potentially shed light on change narratives of relevance to the original iteration of this project. I successfully applied for ethics approval through the university and began sending out requests for interviews to people I knew in the sector in late summer and early autumn.

However, for both practical and ethical reasons, I eventually changed my mind. I remember that in September 2021, Circle CEO Kris Archie tweeted about how across the philanthropy sector, settlers interested in learning about reconciliation and their role in it often sought out direction from Indigenous peoples, while Indigenous peoples who shared knowledge and time with them often were not being adequately or meaningfully compensated for their time and labour. She urged white settlers in the sector asking for knowledge or guidance from Indigenous people to "show up" in reciprocity rather than placing the burden of their journeys on them:

> If you have an ask for me, or other Indigenous people you know, work with, have seen speak, follow on twitter or just like & wanna be pals with – if you have an ask of my time, my relationships, my wisdom, my expertise – then all I ask of you is to also SHOW UP.
>
> I mean really – truly SHOW UP 1st by expressing how the thing you want is something that will bring increased support, dollars, amplification & energy for the benefit of Indigenous peoples, their nations, their communities, their innovations, solutions & leadership ON THEIR TERMS.

Archie's way of showing up also involves "doing your own homework," by which she means that settlers can do most of the work themselves, without needing to mine Indigenous knowledge-holders and communities for information to help them along the learning journey. Archie's words struck me. Although I do feel a strong impetus to do research that has a purpose beyond the academic world and that could have meaningful uses, I struggled to work out some of these tensions. I felt that many of the questions that I had planned to ask "expert" interviewees would really just make them repeat what they have been saying and writing for years. Why not read and listen deeply to what already has been said, written, and otherwise recorded, rather than extracting time and knowledge from individuals who carry the burden of working toward advancing justice on limited budgets, often with strained organizational capacity? In addition to these political considerations, I was unable to generate interest amongst settler leaders in the sector to whom I had

sent inquiries. I received no responses to my initial requests for interviews. It may be that some were not interested in participating in the study for various reasons. It may also be that individuals and organizations across the sector, settler and Indigenous alike, were unable to respond to my request given the major capacity and finance challenges that many philanthropic and charitable organizations faced during the pandemic.

In the end, I decided to forego the interviews altogether. While there are important limitations to focusing on documents and not talking to people, which I discuss in the next section, the texts I have focused on provide deeply valuable lenses onto the Canadian sector, including onto settler philanthropic activities and ideas, their engagement with reconciliation and other common narratives, and their intentions and perceptions. Furthermore, Indigenous leaders, activists and critics in the sector have been writing and speaking about philanthropy's relationship to coloniality for decades, recording this knowledge in journal articles, newsletters, conference and webinar sessions, blogs, social media, and many other spaces. I decided to analyze these diverse recordings rather than making people repeat them. Their words and thoughts are a cornerstone to this analysis.

I have already discussed two other major changes to the project having to do with the temporal scope of my archive, which materialized later in the process. First, the way people talked about reconciliation in the Canadian philanthropy sector changed as a result of the pandemic, the public uptake of the Black Lives Matter movement in 2020, and the findings of the ground-penetrating radar research in Tk'emlúps territory in 2021. For these reasons I extended my overall timeframe from pre-pandemic to 2022. Then, in June 2022, once I realized just how large my archive was after my first round of gathering texts, I also decided to narrow my focus from multiple change narratives to just the reconciliation change narrative. I felt that I could write three empirical

chapters about reconciliation alone, and go into much greater depth about of its various discursive-affective formations and outcomes, and the significance of these for the settler philanthropy ecosystem.

A final methodological and theoretical shift happened around the end of 2022, when I began to grasp the importance of affect theory to my analysis. My PhD journey had been challenging on a number of levels for me (as I am sure just about any doctoral student can say!) – with financial struggles, family health issues, the stress of the COVID-19 pandemic arriving during my second semester as a PhD student, and the pressures of work and life compounding the usual isolation, loneliness, and anxiety that seem to be 'normal' for PhD students. Then in November 2022, pain and confusion overwhelmed everything else when my sibling died by suicide just days after their 34th birthday. At first, my other siblings and I were totally immobilized following their passing. But after about a month or so, I decided I needed to keep working. It might have been folly or coping; perhaps I should've taken a leave and deferred my studies. Nevertheless, doing something felt necessary at the time. But the only thing I could do with any real attention was read, so I focused on the works of feminist affect theorists that my supervisor Carolyn had previously recommended. I started with Pedwell (2021), Manning (2016), Seigworth and Gregg (2010), Ahmed (2014) and Berlant (2004), and then kept diving down further into the complex world of affect, finding much to grab hold of. In the intensity and strangeness of my family's collective grief, this literature felt somehow like a lifeline to reality. I found the beauty of so much of the writing of feminist affect theorists to be deeply inspiring. As I was reading during these painful months, it became clear to me that I really could not understand the reconciliation change narrative, or the world of settler philanthropy, without explicit reference to the things that precede and exceed discourse. These, as I have already explained, are deeply entangled with discourse.

I decided therefore to re-visit all of my textual sources as simultaneously discursive and affective productions, thinking about those things that exist beyond and alongside discourse – whereas previously I had only been influenced by CDA approaches. Because this part of the analysis came much later in my PhD journey, I spent time with just a corner of the sprawling field of affect studies, especially focusing on that which connects directly to reconciliation. I narrowed my focus to affective dynamics I recognized most often in the texts I study here, and those which decolonial studies and Indigenous studies scholars have previously highlighted in their critiques of reconciliation, including a focus on the politics of compassion, empathy, shame, apology and remorse – as discussed in the previous chapter. While I would not call this a dissertation in affect studies, it does draw on parts of the world of affect studies in key places, where I felt it could not be passed over.

2.4.2 – Limitations

There are several limitations to the project that I will discuss here. First, there are important limitations to focusing strictly on written texts. Without talking to people (i.e. conducting interviews with people in the sector) about their experiences, intentions and perspectives, I am limiting my view to what has been curated, digitized and published. All my sources are representations that have been produced, edited and distributed by those who either lead the conversations that these organizations facilitate, or who were invited to participate in them. As such, this study cannot (or can only indirectly) observe the perspectives of those not involved in the production of the texts, and (in most cases) of the audiences of the texts, or the experiences and understandings of individuals who work in the organizations or consume their products.

I also should point out that although I am focused on intermediary organizations with a wide reach, I by no means can (and would not claim to) reflect the huge diversity of settler philanthropies across Canada in this study. As I discussed in the Prefatory Note and Introductory chapter, the Canadian philanthropic/charitable sector is vast, diverse, and shifting all the time; it also is not reflective of the full scale and scope of what I consider to be "settler philanthropy/ies" or philanthropy in general – in all their complexity and local specificity. I would not attempt to encompass the fullness of these things in this study. I am, rather, interested in some of the mainstream ideas and themes driving more politically "progressive" sides of the settler philanthropy world – and only those that have been picked up and reproduced among the people who have the privilege and resources to be able to shape the conversation publicly (or in many cases to challenge it). I am interested in how *some* philanthropy actors working in or adjacent to the institutional/sectoral locations of Canadian settler philanthropic activity think and talk about reconciliation. There are certainly many organizations whose work does not touch on reconciliation or on other adjacent topics like inclusivity or equity. There are probably also many other organizations that are focused on reconciliation or related work that I have not included here, whether because they have not published about it, or because they are not interested in "making a big splash" about their activities, or because they simply are members and therefore are not represented by the intermediaries that are the focus of this thesis.

In addition, taking the broad view that I have by focusing on intermediaries might be a little limiting in terms of the depth I can achieve. Were I to focus on just one or two non-intermediary/umbrella philanthropic organizations' engagement with reconciliation, I might be able to do a much deeper dive into the reconciliation change narrative in action, and draw broader conclusions from the local particularities I studied. To some extent, looking at umbrella

organizations means I lose some of this depth. Nonetheless, for the reasons I have already described in section 2.2.1, I contend that intermediaries' texts are worth analyzing – they are important spaces where change narratives are discussed, shaped, challenged and reimagined. There is value, I think, in reviewing the vast and rich archive of texts that these intermediaries have produced. I have found that there is much to be analyzed there. These organizations each have played unique and important roles in the expression, dissemination and interpretation of that change narrative. For this reason, I think my archive is a rich drawing together of many diverse types of texts that can shed light on divergent genealogies, functions and potential outcomes of the reconciliation change narrative and settler philanthropy.

Another key ethical or political limitation to this study is that I am privileging primarily settler-led institutions that have produced and curated the documents that form my archive. The texts I review reach to a dominant philanthropy audience – mostly settler or non-Indigenous individuals and organizations – and therefore mostly touch on what I refer to as settler philanthropies. As I noted in the Preface, settler philanthropy refers to acts, relations and institutions that have too often enjoyed the universal name of just "philanthropy" but that, in Canada, should be understood much more specifically – as generated, led and practiced primarily by and/or for non-Indigenous peoples, institutions and causes (see Archie 2021b). These are not necessarily always exclusive of, but are also not typically representative of, Indigenous peoples, perspectives and philanthropies. I may therefore be entrenching the limited, settler/White/Western-centric scholarly representations that concern and frustrate some critics of much of the philanthropic studies field (such as, for example, Srivastava and Oh 2010 p. 470; Mahomed and Moyo 2013; Mottiar and Ngcoya 2016) – even though I am taking a critical view of them. By drawing heavily on Indigenous-authored texts, and by situating my critique of settler philanthropy actors' expressions of reconciliation within the

theoretical world of affect and decolonial theory, I aim to address some of these tensions in the chapters that follow.

Paying attention to affect, and listening radically for the sounds of the minor, and of alternative possibilities expressed by Indigenous authors in my archive, is critical to responding to this limitation, and to one other related ethical limitation of my analysis. Indigenous scholars tell us that hyper-focus on colonial violence and durabilities risks ignoring the creative agency and alternative futurities advanced by Indigenous peoples (Carey and Silverstein 2020). This is an important process of omission that characterizes much of the historiography of post-colonial studies. Indeed, for some critics of the field, the uptake of white settler colonial studies has obscured "the long-standing and rich genealogies of Indigenous writings" (ibid.). Corey Snelgrove et al. (2014) argue that "the work and resistance of Indigenous peoples is overshadowed" in much of the framing of settler colonial and post-colonial studies. (p. 6). I agree; while I do think that work that theorizes and sheds light on the complexities and durabilities of coloniality is critical, it is also deeply important that resistance, agency and "otherwise possibilities" be brought to bear when discussing coloniality. As discussed in the previous chapter, colonial relations of violence and domination are durable, but they are neither totalizing nor inevitable. There is always something else, and something more.

Relatedly, in the context of philanthropic studies, Beth Breeze (2021) expresses concern that hyper-criticism of philanthropy risks overlooking the agency of recipients in the philanthropic relation. Thinking through some of the reasons that critiques of philanthropy "stick," Breeze points to Ben Whitaker's (1974) critique of hyper-criticism, who suggests that it is a way to rationalize the "meanness" (i.e. the lack of generosity) of those critics whom he describes as "comfortably-off

arm-chair revolutionaries" who feel compelled to compare themselves with generous givers (in Breeze 2021, p. 138). This may be the case for some critics. But Whitaker's words fail to reflect how the strongest and soundest critiques of coloniality and settler philanthropic institutions and practices do not come from "arm-chair revolutionaries" but from those peaceful Indigenous activists defending their homelands from extractive violence in frozen northern snowscapes, standing face-to-face with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers armed with assault weapons and attack dogs (Rotz, Rück and Carleton 2020). Or from the Indigenous and racialized, queer, neurodivergent, disabled, and otherwise Othered folks working on the frontlines of the charitable sector, witnessing and experiencing colonial violence in daily interactions and at a structural level. Or from the settler philanthropists quietly engaging in relations of reciprocity and reparations in the background, as alternative possibilities to mainstream institutional practices that can reify colonial power dynamics.

Ultimately, my point here is that critiques of settler philanthropy and of coloniality are critical for envisioning other possibilities beyond the grand gestures of reconciliation. But they must also be balanced, as Lakota Historian Claire Thomson writes, by "bringing focus to Indigenous experiences, perspectives, ideas without essentializing, while also giving credit, acknowledging agency, restoring humanity, and accepting complex realities" (Thomson 2022, p. 46-47). One of the ways I aim to do this throughout my thesis is by explicitly thinking through the alternative possibilities emergent across the archive I have constructed. Highlighting complex and sometimes contradictory articulations of and against reconciliation is key to this process.

Conclusion – on research as love

My critical textual analysis explores what the reconciliation change narrative, as a bundle of affect and discourse expressed in the settler philanthropy sector, tells us about settler philanthropies' complex roles (perceived and actual) in the field of durable colonial relations in Canada. To get at this, I have assembled and analyzed a diverse and mixed archive of texts produced by organizations that explicitly make it their aim to influence and inspire change in the settler philanthropy world. The texts I have reviewed have much to say not only about reconciliation, but also about the entanglements and roles of individuals, institutions, actions and discourses, feelings, and priorities in the settler philanthropy world as they relate to the wider field durable colonial relations in Canada.

I have also tried to be explicit about how I got here – what I had hoped to do, what I ended up doing, why and how things changed over time, as well as what ethical and political considerations influenced me throughout the journey. As I noted in the introductory chapter, I feel that taking oneself out of the research narrative (for the sake of the mythological concept of "objectivity") is disingenuous. But more importantly it takes away from the power of research to be something else – something beyond knowledge "for the sake of knowledge" – something generative. For me, my position as a white settler living and working in Indigenous lands, who has worked in the settler philanthropy world, comes with responsibility and obligations. Because I am focused on social justice-oriented research I also believe I have a duty to say something that could be translated to meaningful practice. I believe that, unless it is undertaken for love – out of "humility, compassion, and a willingness to fight against human injustices" (Giroux 2010, p. 719), academic research is vain. bell hooks (2000) tells us that love is an action: an everyday choice to serve (p. 216). It can never coexist with domination or injustice (what Paolo Freire [1970] might deem lovelessness).

The point of research, then, is simple: to act and to serve, and never to oppress. Research as love must thus begin with a recognition that our ability to research in the first place is a privilege, and that such privilege can and should be made to serve. Social research should have the potential to expose and oppose lovelessness in the academy and the wider world, striving to enact, embody and generate love within and outside the ivory tower – within and beyond the confines of a journal or conference. Research as an act of love takes as a given that intellectual thought alone is not enough.

Yet, research as action comes with its own kind of "self-ennobling" thinking about the good one can do (Sharpe and Spivak 2003, p. 609). Even the most well-intentioned, collaborative, "equity-focused" research can be an act of violence. As Audre Lorde (1984) pointed out, ostensibly emancipatory scholarly knowledge is too often disconnected from the people it claims to be for and about. Just so, "to affirm that men and women are persons and as persons should be free, and *yet to do nothing tangible* to make this affirmation a reality, is a farce," writes Paolo Freire (1970, p. 24). How can we *really* make research actionable? In my case, what can a decolonial critique of reconciliation and the settler philanthropy sector in Canada do?

I do not think these questions can be easily answered, or these tensions quickly resolved. Dissonance is at the heart of my approach, just as it characterizes the texts I analyze. Still, I hope through this study to oppose lovelessness (critically studying something sometimes assumed to be an unmitigated good) and to encourage others with power, wealth and privilege (including those who work settler philanthropy) to do the same. I am trying to do what hooks calls "truth telling" (social critique), which "lays the groundwork for the openness and honesty that is the heartbeat of love" (hooks 2000, p. 53). Those of us with power and privilege (i.e. who benefit from structures of domination) are obligated to take responsibility here; exposing lovelessness is not solely the

responsibility of the oppressed (Smith, Tuck and Yang 2019, p. 16; Gaudry 2018, p. 256). "*Niya Kahmaykotayo* – I carry a heavy load," writes nehiyaw scholar Shauneen Pete (2001) to her non-Indigenous readers: "will you assume responsibility for your part, pick up an end, and let us share this burden together?" (p. 10).

Lumbee philanthropy activist Edgar Villenueva (2018) writes that "unsettling" philanthropy means acknowledging the role of philanthropy in present-day North America's history and present-day structures of enslavement and colonization, reducing the barriers to wealth distribution, building genuine relationships with Indigenous and other marginalized communities, and overturning the legal, moral and economic structures of colonial and racist domination underpinning much philanthropy in settler states. My goal with this project is, in love, to unsettle: to co-generate meaningful responses to Villenueva's challenge to philanthropy: "to really walk its talk: to embody the love of humanity" (in Martin 2018). Studying relationships between Canadian settler philanthropies and coloniality, with the aim of making my work accessible and usable in the philanthropic community, I hope to enact research for love and against lovelessness.

Table of Contents

Chapter 3 – Reconciliation as a "Canadian Imperative:" Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action *157*

Introduction **157**

3.1 – The development of the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* **161**

3.2 – Accountability and performative allyship **173**

3.3 – Unprecedented moments and national urgency: grand gesture reconciliation **181**

3.4 – Reparations and reciprocity: refusing the grand gesture **188**

Conclusions **198**

Chapter 4 – The colonial spectre *202*

Introduction **202**

4.1 – Temporal and spatial distancing **207**

4.2 – Conceptual distancing **217**

4.3 – Omission and renaming **226**

4.3.1 – Renaming as omission 231

Conclusions **241**

Chapter 5: Settlers on a Journey *245*

Introduction **245**

5.1 – Articulations and critiques of the settler learning journey **249**

5.2 – Settler consumption of Indigenous suffering **254**

5.3 – Truth-telling **263**

5.4 – Settler discomfort: closures and possibilities **268**

5.4.1 – Embracing discomfort: settler de-centring, reparations and reciprocity 274

Conclusions and summary of findings across chapters **281**

Conclusion – on philanthropy toward decolonial love *286*

Contributions and possibilities for future research **297**

Limitations of this study and possibilities for further research **298**

Concluding thoughts: on philanthropy toward decolonial love **301**

Appendix I: The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action *306*

Chapter 3 – Reconciliation as a "Canadian Imperative:" *The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action*

Introduction

On June 1, 2015, leadership from the Circle, Philanthropic Foundations Canada (PFC), Community Foundations Canada (CFC), and several of their member organizations, presented the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* ("the *Declaration"*) to Commissioner Chief Wilton Littlechild at the closing events of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) in Ottawa. The closing ceremony included a presentation of the TRC's final report after six years of hearings across the country, during which survivors and witnesses of the residential school system shared testimony about their experiences and the traumatic intergenerational impacts of residential schools on their families and communities. The ceremony also involved the presentation of the 94 Calls to Action that the Commission recommended to "facilitate reconciliation," including calls for systemic changes across sectors and industries, with recommendations for all levels of government, individual Canadians, corporations, and the health, social services, and education sectors, among other groups. The TRC stressed that all Canadians, sectors and institutions "have a critical role to play in advancing reconciliation" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015, p. 183).

None of the 94 Calls to Action were directly addressed to Canadian philanthropy or the charitable sector, even though they did address issues that some Canadian philanthropists and philanthropy organizations engage with, such as public health, criminal justice, and education. For this reason, Indigenous and non-Indigenous sector leaders co-developed the *Declaration* to communicate a response to the TRC specifically by and for Canadian philanthropy. As co-authors of the *Declaration* reflected in a 2015 *Philanthropist* article, "as key non-governmental funders of civil

society's work to improve communities, this group [of philanthropic organizations] was compelled by the significance and urgency of the challenge posed to us and to all Canadians by the Commission" (Pearson et al. 2015). Framed with a tone of urgency and hopefulness, and naming the closing TRC ceremony a "sacred" space, the *Declaration* described the "hard work of healing and reconciliation" as "an important calling to which all of us [all Canadians] are duty bound to respond" (The Circle 2015). The TRC, co-authors wrote, had offered the philanthropic community an opportunity to respond to the Canadian imperative of reconciliation by bringing its resources and unique positionality to the table.

This chapter introduces the reconciliation change narrative with a focus on the *Declaration*. My analysis is based on a critical reading of the text of the *Declaration* itself, as well as of reflective texts by the co-authors and early signatories following its release. I also draw on critical commentary about the document, and about the wider sector's response to it, authored by Indigenous leaders working in and adjacent to philanthropy. Across the archive of texts I analyze in this thesis, the 2015 presentation in Ottawa is frequently referenced as the catalyzing moment for engagement with reconciliation within the settler philanthropy sector– although some organizations and individuals were already talking about and working on reconciliation by this point, especially those involved in the development of The Circle after the formal apology of Stephen Harper in 2008 (see timeline of key events in the introductory chapter). Co-authored by a group comprised mostly of settler leaders of foundations and intermediaries, the *Declaration* was among the earliest (and most visible) collective statements on reconciliation released in the settler philanthropy sector. It became a template for the development of the reconciliation change narrative, establishing the affective tone and setting the discursive scene for settler philanthropy's engagement with reconciliation in the years that followed. The *Declaration* communicated a core message: that

reconciliation is an imperative for all Canadians, but that the settler philanthropy sector has a special role in its advancement. It set a strong tone of hopefulness, optimism and urgency.

This chapter begins with a synopsis of the history of the document's development and some of its core messaging. I highlight the importance of the political and social atmosphere in which the *Declaration* was produced, arguing that its presentation on the highly public stage of the TRC's closing session by high-powered sector leaders with access to a wide audience in the Canadian philanthropy community was key to the document's potential to influence others. Leading groups played an important role in catalyzing activity and generating awareness about Indigenous communities that hitherto had been uncommon among settler philanthropy organizations (Formsma 2013; Grant 2016). For co-authors and early signatories, the *Declaration* and the Canadian imperative message it communicated therefore presented an important opportunity for settler philanthropy actors to transform their practices and the wider philanthropy sector, and to improve relations between the settler philanthropy sector and Indigenous communities (Pearson 2016; Brascoupé Peters et al. 2015; Simon 2016).

I also demonstrate, however, that the Canadian imperative message could have dissonant functions and outcomes. The *Declaration*'s release risked reproducing durable colonial dynamics on a highly public stage, by advancing what Erin Manning (2016) describes as a "grand gesture" version of transformation – both for the sector and for Canadian society. I analyze some of the ways this happened through the Canadian imperative theme at the heart of the *Declaration.* As some Indigenous critics later indicated, the public stage on which settler philanthropists' commitment to reconciliation occurred did not necessarily lead to widespread, meaningful action. Rather, some saw it as more of a symbolic gesture, or what some Indigenous leaders in the sector described as

performative allyship – leading to (probably genuinely felt) individual and organizational commitments to reconciliation, but not necessarily followed by what Indigenous leaders have repeatedly stated transformative action should look like (Omidvar et al. 2022).

Moreover, framing sectoral commitments to reconciliation as “unprecedented” and locating the source of problems in the past (i.e. in the history of residential schools) had the effect of obscuring the lived realities of Indigenous peoples who have been working to address racism and colonial structures of violence in the Canadian philanthropy sector and beyond for decades before the TRC. This reflects how, as critical theorist David Gaertner (2020) puts it, “what settlers believe they know about reconciliation does not resonate with the history of colonialism or the stories and practices of Indigenous peoples and this land” (p. 17). The historic moment of the *Declaration*’s release positioned reconciliation as a revolutionary goal (or means) of social transformation in which settler philanthropy can and should engage. This message rests on the assumption that Indigenous-settler relations are a problem that can be “solved” and that Canada and Canadian philanthropy must retain its reputation of fairness and justice by solving them. In these ways, I suggest, the Canadian imperative theme engaged in the co-constitutive processes of colonial recognition and unknowing, which keep coloniality thriving at frequencies not always readily perceived.

In the final section, I discuss some alternative possibilities for activating the *Declaration* that Indigenous critics in later years of the archive advanced. I see these as refusals of grand gesture reconciliation. In these dissonant responses to the grand gesture, authors argued that settlers in philanthropy must quickly move beyond declarations, and embrace thoughtful, reparative and reciprocal action toward the advancement of Indigenous sovereignties. These expressions suggest

that there is always something beyond and against the grand gesture. It is not easy work with immediate and measurable results, but rather characterized by tensions, iteration and uncertainty: what Manning (2016) calls the "rocky and unsteady paths" toward something else.

3.1 – The development of the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action*

The first Indigenous person ever invited to speak at a PFC event was Shawn a-in-chut Atleo, the former Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), at PFC's 2011 Conference in Toronto (Atleo 2011a; Pearson in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017). During his plenary speech, Atleo told leaders of private foundations that they had a central role to play in a shared journey toward equal "progress and prosperity" for Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada. Atleo had given a variation on this speech at Imagine Canada's Annual Summit Meeting earlier that same year, and did again two years later at CFC's 2013 conference. In each version, he lauded members of the sector for engaging in efforts to "transform reality." He urged them to do more, to "push the tipping point to transformation," to "smash the status quo" and to "fight for our children" and "for our future." He believed that the settler philanthropy sector had resources, networks, and political leverage, as well as a shared "vision of a better future," to bring to the table.

Without once using the term reconciliation in any of the speeches, Atleo communicated some of the core messaging of the reconciliation change narrative, echoed strongly in the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* just a few years later. PFC President Hilary Pearson reflected later that Atleo's speech had been like a "spark" that encouraged people in philanthropy to explore "possibilities for partnership [with Indigenous peoples]" (Pearson in Brascoupé-Peters *et al.* 2017). This spark was then "fanned to flame," she wrote, at the 2014 PFC conference in Halifax, where Justice Murray Sinclair, Chief Commissioner of the TRC, gave the keynote speech. His speech inspired settler philanthropy leaders to begin writing the *Declaration.*

The *Declaration* was developed over several months from 2014 to 2015 by leadership from three of the organizations that are the focus of this thesis: Hilary Pearson, the President of PFC, Sara Lyons, a Vice President of CFC, Victoria Grant, a board member of the Circle and board chair of CFC, and Wanda Brascoupé, the Circle's CEO at the time. Executive directors of three settler-led member organizations of PFC, CFC, and the Circle were also part of the *Declaration's* development. They included Andrea Nemtin from the Inspirit Foundation, Bruce Lawson from the Counselling Foundation of Canada, and Lucy Santoro from the Martin Aboriginal Education Initiative. These organizations, which were already engaged in work with Indigenous communities, were among the most prevalent voices in the expression of the reconciliation change narrative in the years immediately after the *Declaration's* release. According to Bruce Lawson, it was the PFC conference in 2014 that had really moved the group to action. Sinclair's message "sort of challenged the philanthropic sector, those who were in the room…to try do something meaningful," Lawson explained (in Brascoupé-Peters et al. 2017). Pearson recalled that Murray was "articulate and moving and eloquent and wise, and I don't think that there was a person in that room in Halifax that was not enormously moved" (ibid.). The group felt inspired to produce a collective statement on behalf of their organizations and, in the case of the Circle, CFC and PFC, on behalf of their members. Lyons explained that the group believed the *Declaration* could be a "spark" for action "that had been missing [in the sector] for a long time" (ibid.).

They began to draft language that they felt could both catalyze and guide others in the settler philanthropy sector wishing to engage with reconciliation. The text of the *Declaration* came together after six weeks of co-writing. Participating organizations then presented the draft to their boards and (in the case of the intermediaries) their members for review and approval. Once the text

was finalized, the co-authors, along with some of the initial signatories, presented the *Declaration* to TRC Commissioners, residential school survivors, and other witnesses present at the closing ceremony of the TRC in Ottawa. By that time, 35 additional philanthropic organizations had signed on – mostly settler-led private foundations, community foundations, and United Ways. Those who were present at the ceremony described the presentation of the *Declaration* as a powerful and historic moment because such a public and collective call for sector-wide engagement with Indigenous peoples had hitherto not been made among philanthropists. According to co-authors, the presentation and the *Declaration* itself therefore represented something new: an "unprecedented step" for the sector in a moment of great societal import (Pearson et al., 2015).

The co-authors stressed the importance of the participation of the entire sector in reconciliation. Focusing on the history and intergenerational trauma of the residential school system, the *Declaration* stated that the TRC's release had created an "opportune moment" for Canadian philanthropy actors to honour the testimony of residential school survivors and "engage in and demonstrate leadership on reconciliation." Circle Board Chair Victoria Grant reflected that this work needed to be shared by settlers and Indigenous leaders alike, all of whom "have an opportunity to play a significant role" (Grant 2016). Co-authors wrote, "we bring our diversity and distinctiveness, our emerging vision of renewal, and our determination to ensure the philanthropic community is engaged in the work of reconciliation" (Pearson et al., 2015). The organizations leading the charge on the *Declaration* also felt, because of the wide reach of their organizations, their involvement could inspire more widespread engagement from other settler philanthropy organizations. Lyons explained that the group believed the "public profile" of aligning the *Declaration* with the final TRC event could have the effect of "widen[ing] the tent with respect to

how [other] philanthropic organizations saw themselves in this conversation" (in Brascoupé-Peters *et al.* 2017).

The perceived need for a philanthropic response to the TRC in this moment was communicated in strong tones of hopefulness, urgency, and anxiety amongst co-authors and their organizations. Nemtin discussed her sense of an urgency to ensure that the recommendations of the TRC and the testimony of residential school survivors did not "get filed in a drawer" (in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017). This possibility "created almost an anxiety in me" which in turn inspired Nemtin to get involved with the *Declaration,* to demonstrate for others in the philanthropic community how they could also fulfill their duty to do the same. Brascoupé described the *Declaration* as a "living document" and expressed her hopefulness, and the hopefulness of the entire group, that many more organizations would read and sign it. A "new generation" of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in the sector, she wrote elsewhere, had created an "environment full of possibility" with the release of the *Declaration* (in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2016). These reflections point to a belief among both Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders that the public nature of the *Declaration,* and the sectoral positionality of the leading organizations communicating both urgency and hopefulness, could move others in the sector to engage.

By signing on, philanthropic organizations commit to learning about and repairing the intergenerational damage of the residential school system, and to doing philanthropy "*with* and not *for*" Indigenous peoples (The Circle 2015, italics added). In theory, this shift of a single preposition could have material implications for philanthropic practice, positioning Indigenous peoples as partners in, rather than subjects of, settler philanthropy. Signatories also commit to three over-arching promises to "Learn and Remember," "Understand and Acknowledge," and "Participate and

Act". These promises are further broken down into seven more specific calls to action, including commitments to engage in learning by listening to the stories of residential school survivors and learning about the "history and legacy of the colonial system" in which residential schools were created. The *Declaration* also includes promises to create "dialogue" with the rest of the sector to ensure other philanthropic entities' reconciliation efforts were being done in partnership with Indigenous communities and with a view to the "multi-generational" nature of the work. Finally, signatories promised to share their resources, networks and social and political positionality, to "include and benefit Aboriginal peoples"; build relationships with Indigenous communities; and "explore new opportunities to support healing and reconciliation" and to implement the "spirit, intent, and content" of the TRC. As discussed in the next section, these calls to action were somewhat vaguely framed in the document, possibly to allow for wide interpretability.

Although the document does not explicitly commit signatories to any specific action, co-authors believed it could encourage others in the sector to commit funding, or increase existing funding, to Indigenous communities and Indigenous-led, -focused and -serving charitable organizations. These, according to research published by the Circle in 2010, 2014 and 2017, were receiving less than 1% of all philanthropic gifts and grants in Canada (The Circle 2010; The Circle 2014; The Circle 2017). Most of this 1% came from a small number of foundations that were already actively working on "Indigenous issues" – including those among the original signatories of the *Declaration* (2014, p. 15). The Circle's research on funding levels built on prior work that had explored the apparent disconnect between the sector and Indigenous communities, and tried to identify reasons for it (Ponting 1979; Nadjiwin and Blackstock 2004; The Circle 2008; The Circle 2010; The Circle 2014). Studies of philanthropic engagement with Indigenous communities in the present-day U.S. have produced similar results to the research in Canada (see e.g. Berry and Chao 2001; International Funders of Indigenous Peoples 2014; Native Americans in Philanthropy and

Candid 2019; First Nations Development Institute 2018; FIMI, International Funders of Indigenous Peoples and AWID 2016). As the 2010 Circle report concluded, despite the fact that "philanthropy has to do with giving, and every Indigenous culture has embedded within it a rich history of giving, sharing and caring," there was a "wide disconnect" between settler philanthropic actors and organizations and Indigenous communities (The Circle 2010, p. 42).

Despite what authors of the 2010 Circle report described as an "obvious need" for philanthropic engagement, funding relationships were few and far between, for many reasons (The Circle, 2010, 18). Giving and granting levels, according to Indigenous and non-Indigenous authors writing around the release of the *Declaration*, were not proportionate to the size of the Indigenous population (5% of the overall population in Canada, and the fastest-growing demographic group), or to the level of need (Bridge 2015; Rigillo 2016). Some reasons noted in the 2010 and 2014 Circle research reports included uncertainty among funders about how to approach Indigenous communities and organizations where no prior relationship existed; lack of knowledge among funders about the historical context and contemporary circumstances to which Indigenous-led organizations were responding; geographic and cognitive distances between philanthropic organizations and Indigenous communities; and mythologies and stereotypes about Indigenous peoples. Indigenous participants in the research also noted their own hesitancy to approach philanthropic funders because of their experiences with complex and tedious application and reporting requirements, and because of a fear that accepting philanthropic funding might shift decision-making power away from communities – a concern frequently raised in the wider literature critiquing institutional grant-making practices in North America (e.g. Silver 2006; Villanueva 2018; Wrobel and Massey 2021). The 2010 report concluded that "the time is ripe" for the barriers between Canadian philanthropy and Indigenous peoples to come down, and that this

was an exciting opportunity for the sector to "embark on an exciting journey" (p. 4). A "new paradigm" of philanthropy, according to the Circle research reports, was required to move forward.

The positionality of the three intermediaries involved in the *Declaration*'s release lent them potentially wide influence over the broader sector's funding response and the shape of this "new paradigm." Leaders of CFC, PFC and the Circle positioned themselves as conveners who could bring their diverse members together on priority issues and in turn potentially increase sector relations with, and philanthropic funding to, Indigenous communities. For example, Grant (2016) wrote that the "holistic approach" of community foundations "gives us a unique perspective from which to tackle priorities and leverage opportunities for impact." CFC's leadership on the *Declaration,* she implied, could lead to community foundations across the country "focusing our collective energy" on reconciliation. CFC represented all 191 community foundations in Canada at the time, which in 2015 held $4.8 billion in assets and granted $215 million (CFC 2015).[17] Although its membership includes just a small corner of the overall private foundation community, PFC also holds an influential position amongst private foundations. At the time of the *Declaration* in 2015, its membership numbered 129 organizations, which collectively held $17 billion in assets and granted $520 million (PFC 2015): roughly 50% of all assets held by public and private foundations in Canada at the time.[18] Among PFC's members that year were three of the five largest private foundations by asset size in Canada: the Azrieli Foundation, la Fondation Lucie et André Chagnon, and the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation; and five of the ten largest foundations by total grants distributed in Canada: the Azrieli Foundation, RBC Foundation, Palix Foundation, the

[17] The number now is 207 foundations, holding collectively almost $6.4 billion, as of the 2022 CFC Annual Report (CFC 2022).
[18] Now 133 members, controlling a collective $54 billion in assets, disbursing $1.4 billion in grants, according to PFC's 2022 Annual Report (PFC 2022).

Joyce Family Foundation, and the Mastercard Foundation (PFC 2017). The Circle's membership included a diversity of settler philanthropy organizations, including United Ways, private foundations and community foundations as well as many Indigenous organizations that it aimed to connect with member settler philanthropy organizations. In addition to the asset bases and granting outputs of members, their diversity (in terms of size, philanthropic priorities, politics, and geographical locations) was also significant. Exposing diverse member organizations to the reconciliation change narrative, the TRC, and residential schools through leadership on the *Declaration* could encourage greater financial engagement with Indigenous communities.

Co-authors also felt that the urgent call in the *Declaration* to create a "stronger and more inclusive" Canada might inspire other philanthropic leaders toward shifting the behaviours and policies of their organizations with an emphasis on partnership, diversity and inclusion. Grant believed the *Declaration* was "just another step, another way of educating and creating opportunities for inclusion of Indigenous people in this particular philanthropic community" (in Brascoupé-Peters et al. 2017). For leaders of the private foundations involved, including Inspirit Foundation, the Counselling Foundation, and the Martin Family Initiative, which had each already been engaging with Indigenous communities prior to 2015, this was an opportunity to lead by example to ensure such shifts eventually spread "industry wide" (Nemtin, in Brascoupe-Peters et al., 2017). Lucy Santoro from the Martin Family Initiative reflected in 2017 that "For us at the Martin Family Initiative [founded by former Liberal Canadian prime minister Paul Martin], it was almost, I should say, a no brainer" to participate in the *Declaration,* because reconciliation "was something that we were doing already in our daily lives." But the *Declaration* had provided an opportunity for the organization to "be more out there" to help "make sure that people are aware of what the issues are and why we need to get involved." As Santoro's reflections suggest, co-authors and signatories felt

hopeful about the potential for the *Declaration* to shift how others in the sector were working, encouraging them to increase internal diversity and "reach out" to partner with Indigenous communities.

This perspective was taken up by others in the sector as well, as reflected across many texts in the archive I have assembled. The lack of Indigenous representation in the settler sector became a frequent point of discussion among sector leaders in the years that followed the *Declaration*. PFC CEO Hilary Pearson wrote that "[o]rganized philanthropy in Canada is notably undiversified demographically" (Pearson 2018a; Pearson 2016a), and Jillian Witt, then the Community Engagement Consultant for *The Philanthropist,* wrote in 2017 that "most of the philanthropic sector does not reflect the lived experience and backgrounds of the communities they serve" (Witt 2017). Indigenous authors also spoke often to the lack of diversity in settler philanthropy (Formsma 2013; Archie in Bahubeshi et al. 2017; Smylie in Manning et al. 2018). Some expressed hopefulness that engagement with the *Declaration* would prove to settlers in philanthropy that they should increase organizational diversity and establish partnerships with Indigenous communities, and that everyone had something to gain from doing so.

The *Declaration* also called on signatories to "demonstrate leadership on reconciliation" and to engage the rest of the philanthropic community "in the dialogue necessary" to shift the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the sector and across Canadian society. Co-authors felt that their involvement in the *Declaration* could inspire philanthropic actors to advocate for shifts beyond the sector – in national social policy or in other institutions such as universities, health institutions, and corporations. Lyons explained that philanthropic foundations and the Circle held social power as "leaders in civil society and as trusted institutions," and for this reason, they

should seek to influence "the public and other actors" (in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017). Santoro agreed that participating organizations like the Martin Family Initiative could convene and advocate so that the *Declaration* might become a way of "us [philanthropy] bringing people together" (in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017). Co-authors felt that the document might draw the sector into a "bigger movement" in which philanthropic actors would mobilize their positionality, financial resources, political and social influence, and wider sectoral and cross-sectoral networks, to push others beyond the sector to act on the TRC. This would ensure, as Nemtin explained, that "these recommendations [of the TRC] were not ignored."

Indigenous leaders similarly expressed hopefulness that the settler philanthropy actors and organizations involved could shift public discourse. Paul Lacerte, a co-founder of the Indigenous-led Moosehide Campaign[19], urged foundation leaders at the 2016 PFC conference to help Canadians "get away from" what he described as the "old narrative" characterized by racist stereotypes about Indigenous peoples (Lacerte 2016). This narrative was based on myths that government funding was already "excessively generous" and "wasted" on Indigenous communities. He told the audience that the settler philanthropy sector, and especially foundations, have a crucial role in amplifying "a new narrative," informed by the "incredible opportunity" that was being presented by reconciliation and by a deep awareness of the "cost to us not to embrace that opportunity." The influence of the philanthropic sector in the work of reconciliation, according to authors and early signatories of the *Declaration,* went beyond increasing funding, to also activating social and political leverage to influence policy, practice and discourse at a national level.

[19] A grassroots, Indigenous-led campaign to advocate for the end of violence against Indigenous women and girls. https://moosehidecampaign.ca

The 2015 presentation of the *Declaration* and subsequent commentary of participating organizations generated some interest. By 2016, the number of signatories had increased from the original 35 to 86 (Grant 2016). A research report the Circle released in 2017 highlighted a "growing awareness among organizations in the philanthropic sector of their role as important actors in civil society, in support of, or in fostering the work of Truth and Reconciliation" (p. 20). Between 2015-2017, *The Philanthropist* published eleven articles in a special series on Indigenous Communities and Philanthropy, most of which were authored by Indigenous people who worked in the sector or adjacent to it. CFC and PFC hosted an increasing number of Indigenous speakers at their conferences and summits. The Circle hosted several well-attended webinars, each with between 100-250 registrants, and in some cases close to 1,000 views after being posted to YouTube (for reference, the average number of views for most of the webinars and conference recordings posted to YouTube that I have analyzed in this archive is about forty). PFC and the Circle produced guidance and tools to assist settler philanthropy organizations to increase their funding levels to Indigenous groups, such as guidance around how to fund First Nations (i.e. the political entities) or Indigenous-led non-qualified donees that did not hold charitable status (Brascoupé Peters 2014; Manwaring, Hunter and Brascoupé Peters 2016); and webinars focused on language and terminology, to assist in what Circle research reports had described as a "communication divide" keeping people working in settler philanthropy from engaging with Indigenous communities (Brascoupé Peters, Grant, et al. 2016).

Across blog posts, webinars, and conference sessions, sector leaders described some of the work of signatory organizations to activate their commitments to reconciliation. This included designing and participating in learning and professional development opportunities such as the Circle's Partners in Reciprocity program, a day-long reconciliation-focused retreat for leadership of private

foundations (Pearson in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017; Munshi et al. 2017); the development of new programs for funding directed specifically toward Indigenous communities and organizations (Grant 2016; Brennan and Munshi 2022; Simon et al. 2021); and development of and engagement with political advocacy campaigns (Karim 2017). Although Imagine Canada was not a signatory of the *Declaration,* it also was engaged in the conversation in similar ways. In 2017, an Imagine Canada director, Marnie Grona, speaking on a webinar hosted by the Circle, indicated that the organization was still "in the early stages" of articulating its role in reconciliation, having begun the "journey" only a year before. Grona indicated that Imagine Canada was taking time, in conversation with the Circle, to "consider and reflect" (Munshi et al. 2017).

In many of the texts I analyze in this thesis, the sector's growing awareness was explicitly connected with the *Declaration,* the publicity it received, and the urgency and hopefulness with which it was communicated. Ultimately, as Sara Lyons reflected, although the document was "just a piece of paper, a digital piece of paper," signatories and co-authors believed it was also "a thing around which we could rally," increasing the numbers of organizations and individuals who "felt they now had a mandate or a priority to be acting" (Lyons in Brascoupe-Peters et al. 2017). Indigenous leaders in the sector expressed a deep sense of hopefulness in the potential for the *Declaration* to shift relationships. Current Circle CEO Kris Archie (2021a) recalled later, "The leadership, the language, the vision for inviting the sector to take action was bold, it was necessary and it made me proud to hear about." Reading about the *Declaration* for the first time, she recalls, was very emotional for her: "I cried. I was excited for what it could mean for philanthropic [organizations] to breathe life into this beautifully written invitation for action." In the emotionally charged and highly visible moment of its presentation in 2015, the *Declaration* may have played an important part in alerting settler philanthropy actors to their potential roles in addressing Canadian

coloniality. Language positioning settlers as "leaders" of a movement, and the strong tone of hopefulness and urgency in the *Declaration,* may have been important strategies in this respect. Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders alike were hopeful that the *Declaration* would draw attention to reconciliation, leading to widespread material outcomes through actions taken by philanthropic organizations across the sector.

As I will discuss in the next sections, however, the *Declaration's* release may also have functioned as a "grand gesture" moment in which colonial structures remained undiscussed and untouched, even where settlers and settler organizations were taking well-meaning action. I address some of the later critiques of the sector's engagement with the *Declaration* despite the hope that the document had generated. These critiques focused on the risk of signatories engaging in affective performances that may not necessarily lead to the kinds of meaningful action envisioned by some Indigenous leaders and activists. They also imply that public commitments and declarations can at times preclude intellectual engagement with the systemic and durable nature of coloniality in settler philanthropy and in Canadian society more broadly. Positioning settlers as leaders and champions of a social movement without requiring them to challenge the durable structures of colonial violence that make that movement necessary in the first place risks keeping those very structures in place.

3.2 – Accountability and performative allyship

Sara Lyons' remark that the *Declaration* was "just a digital piece of paper" points to an important tension at the heart of the Canadian imperative theme, and one that I revisit throughout this thesis because it is frequently flagged by critics of reconciliation. Despite the public "splash," claims to a

Canadian imperative, and big gesture commitments to reconciliation, do not always necessarily lead to action or meaningful transformation (Manning 2016). Recognition of a problem (in this case, the perceived need to understand the history and impacts of residential schools) and public, affectively charged commitments to respond to it and in turn contribute to a "stronger and more inclusive Canada", do not necessarily result in largescale shifts, either in settler philanthropy or through it. Rather, they can risk remaining as performative gestures without concrete outcomes.

Co-authors and original signatories of the *Declaration* were almost immediately faced with the question of how to keep themselves, and other organizations, accountable to the promises they had presented in Ottawa. Pearson reflected later that there had been no hesitation for PFC, or for the leadership of many of its member organizations, to individually sign on, but their discussions also centred on the realization that by signing, "we're committing to a course of action" (in Brascoupé Peters et al., 2017). The nature of the action was not clearly defined, though, so "one concern" that PFC members voiced was "well, if we sign this, we're going to have to do something. And what does it mean? How do we do that?" (ibid.). Without reconciliatory action clearly defined, and accountability measures established, signing onto the *Declaration* might become a performative gesture unaccompanied by action on the part of signatories.

The tension between accountability and performativity remained a concern in the years that followed the release of the *Declaration.* Part of the reason for this sense of uncertainty was that the terms of the *Declaration* were somewhat vague; action was not clearly defined by the document itself. According to Circle board members Stephen Couchman, Marilyn Struthers and Justin Wiebe, the presentation in Ottawa had included a commitment on the part of signatories to act on the 94 TRC calls to action through their funding programs (Couchman *et al.* 2020). The first promise

under the "Participate and Act" category of the *Declaration* is to share "our resources to include and benefit Aboriginal peoples," which could be interpreted as a promise to commit funding; but the language does not explicitly necessitate an increase or shift in funding in any specific way. While this vagueness could be generative, leaving room for creative interpretation, it also risked leading to closures, positioning commitments to reconciliation as an ideological end, rather than a beginning of more concrete action. Even if those present in Ottawa had committed to financially contributing to reconciliation, it was difficult to know whether or not other signatories were committing their organizations to doing so as well.

Both Indigenous leaders and settler philanthropy actors expressed unease and frustration about reconciliation commitments leading to inaction in the years that followed. In a 2017 webinar on accountability hosted by the Circle, Holly McLellan, the executive director of the Youth and Philanthropy Initiative in Toronto, told listeners that there is a risk that commitments could remain in the realm of words with no action, contributing to the problems those commitments purport to address. "Accountability is really important because a lot of big talk and empty gestures have been happening for centuries…they need to be made meaningful by actions that contribute to the work at hand," she explained (in Munshi *et al.* 2017). At the 2018 PFC Conference, Roberta Jamieson, the CEO of Indspire (a major Indigenous-led charitable organization focused on Indigenous education in Canada) and a member of the Six Nations of Grand River, also called on *Declaration* signers to consider "what steps have been taken…in pursuing the commitments that have been made." She challenged audience members to "start asking yourself the hard questions…If we sign the declarations, what are we doing to follow through?" (in Avery et al. 2018). Jamieson was the only Indigenous panelist speaking at a session focused on foundation philanthropy's work, as the panel described it, "empowering women and girls." She focused much of her commentary specifically on

Indigenous women and girls. Jamieson named ongoing and durable coloniality as the source of the problems that many Indigenous women and girls face, and implied that signatories had an obligation to act. “Now is the time for truth and reconciliation,” she stated, “or as I would call it, reconciliAction.” Her comments suggest that some Indigenous leaders in the sector felt the *Declaration* could be more meaningfully turned into action by more signatories than had occurred up to that point.

Others critiqued the settler philanthropy sector for the performative nature of their commitments. Seven years after the *Declaration*’s release, Kris Archie described the sector’s initial reaction as “performative allyship,” noting that many organizations signed it and then “just walked away”(in Omidvar et al. 2022). In an article reflecting on philanthropic commitments to addressing anti-Black racism in the sector and across Canada, Dorla Tune–a grant advisor for the United Way of the Lower Mainland (in present-day British Columbia) and for the Vancouver Foundation as well as a private advisor for nonprofit capacity development–similarly wrote, “we have seen similar revolutions of national consciousness-raising on matters of life and death for equity-seeking communities before, and these conversations remain urgent for insultingly brief moments” (Tune 2020, p. 55). These critiques suggest that where a commitment to change without action does not have life or death implications for the one committing, the commitment itself risks becoming an end rather than a beginning.

The co-authors of the document discussed the struggles they experienced in articulating how accountability could be measured or tracked (Brascoupé Peters *et al.* 2017). During the question-and-answer period of a webinar focused on the history of the *Declaration*, one audience member asked whether the Circle saw itself as having a role in holding signatories accountable. Sara Lyons

responded that the purpose of the *Declaration* was not to "point fingers" or "keep tally" but rather to bring about increased awareness and draw public attention (in Brascoupé Peters *et al.* 2017). This response not only suggested that the original intentions of the *Declaration* were more about attention-raising than about pushing for action. It also pointed to a potential hesitancy around ideas of accountability; suggesting that settlers in the sector might experience expectations of accountability as accepting blame or an admission of fault. After 2018, though, the Circle's leadership was much more explicit in their public communications about holding signatories responsible. For example, at some Circle gatherings, there are sessions exploring how Indigenous leaders in the sector can challenge potential funders to concretely demonstrate their active commitment to the *Declaration,* before accepting their money or agreeing to partner with them on charitable initiatives. As discussed at greater length below, some Indigenous leaders suggested that acting on the *Declaration* must be preceded with continuous and habitual efforts to take responsibility and understand one's own complicity in the durable colonial violence of the present. Settlers must de-centre their privilege, suspend their fragility, and embrace the discomfort of exposing colonial dynamics at work in many of the established practices and institutions of Canadian settler philanthropy.

Some Indigenous critics have also noted that where action had been taken by signatory organizations, it did not necessarily advance structural change. In some cases, for example, increased funding to Indigenous causes was directed to settler-led charitable organizations that served Indigenous peoples, rather than directly to Indigenous communities and organizations or to Indigenous-led initiatives (the Circle 2017). Furthermore, settler organizations funding Indigenous communities without dismantling the inequitable power dynamics associated with institutional grant-making (discussed at length across the philanthropic studies literature for example, in

Ostrander 2007b; Edwards 2008; Kohl-Arenas 2016; Villanueva 2018; Wrobel and Massey 2021) might be engaging a "social reproduction of colonialism," in which settlers with money and power assume to know what Indigenous peoples need and want, and direct the flow of resources based on their assumptions (Goodchild 2019).

In other cases, critics across this archive have suggested that the focus of signatories remained on publishing statements of allyship (such as land acknowledgements) or centring settlers' learning and professional development journeys in ways that often shifted the burden of labour onto Indigenous "partners" (e.g. Bahubeshi et al. 2018). Attempts to increase diversity in organizations, or to engage with more Indigenous communities, without undertaking decolonial shifts in organizational policies and practices, could lead to the "tokenization" of Indigenous and racialized staff, colonial extractions of their time and knowledge, and ultimately burnout (e.g. Allen 2020; Manning and Morrisseau 2021).[20] These critiques suggested that signing the *Declaration* could function as a performative gesture predicated on colonial recognitions of a problem (the history and impacts of residential schools, including the resulting inequalities in Indigenous-settler relations), which would not necessarily lead to substantive or meaningful change in philanthropic practices. Telling settlers in philanthropy that they can be leaders in reconciliation, or even that they have an obligation to do so, does not necessarily obligate them to act in ways that address inequitable colonial relations of power that Indigenous critics have identified in settler philanthropic practices.

Thus, dominant articulations of the settler philanthropy sector's roles and positions in the reconciliation dynamic since the *Declaration* could have dissonant outcomes in practice. Early on, Indigenous and settler authors expressed hopefulness that the "immense" financial resources, and

---

[20] I will discuss some of the issues of colonial extractivism in the reconciliation learning journey and in DEI efforts in next two chapters.

social and political leverage held by philanthropic institutions could be powerfully mobilized in the name of reconciliation (Atleo 2011b; Atleo 2013; Rigillo 2016; Stauch and Erickson 2016). Yet some critiques suggested that affective moments like the public presentation of the *Declaration* in 2015 may not of themselves be "where the transformative power lies" as philosopher Erin Manning puts it (2016, p. 223). Engagement in "grand gesture" commitments has the potential to reproduce the unknowing/recognition dynamic. Where settler recognitions of a problem led to deeply felt and very public commitment-making framed as a Canadian imperative, it also risked becoming a closure. It could do so by triggering performances of solidarity or allyship amongst settler philanthropy actors, rather than opening toward transformative possibilities of meaningful decolonial action. Meanwhile, equating accountability to "finger-pointing" might have functioned as a form of colonial unknowing, absolving settlers of their complicity in the perpetuation of colonial durbabilities in the present, and of their responsibility to address them. Through such performances, then, the colonial violence that the Canadian imperative theme of the reconciliation change narrative acknowledges is relegated to the past and limited to the violence of residential schools – a key critique of reconciliation discourse voiced elsewhere by Indigenous scholars and activists. As Mohawk historian Audra Simpson (2016b), drawing on Glen Coulthard, argues, to write colonial violence in such temporally and conceptually restrictive frames allows for other "techniques of dispossession," deeply entrenched in the Canadian politics and society of the present, to continue unremarked in the politics and discourse of reconciliation (p. 439). As such, public declarations and commitments to change, and the simultaneous affective performances of settlers, leave the status quo in and beyond philanthropy untouched.

The critiques discussed above, then, demonstrate the potentially dissonant outcomes of the *Declaration*'s release and uptake. At times, Indigenous leaders have highlighted the important work that some settler organizations have done to meaningfully activate their commitments to

reconciliation. Archie told attendees of a Circle webinar in 2021 that there were "all kinds of ways in which settler philanthropy is showing up alongside Indigenous partners and doing amazing work." The most successful examples, she continued, were those where "Indigenous partners are actually put in a position of power and authority for decision-making about when, where and how funds are used." For example, in 2021 Janine Manning, a member of the Neyaashiinigmiing Anishnaabe Nation, and the first Indigenous woman to become a board president of a family foundation in Canada (the Laidlaw Foundation), described the Laidlaw Foundation's the Indigenous Advisory Council, which it established after signing the *Declaration*. The Council aims to shift the frame from "donor dominance" to "grantee empowerment" (Manning and Morrisseau 2021). The Foundation's Indigenous Youth granting program was shaped and informed by the council: "They created the program. They created the application. They deliberate" over applications (ibid.). The Foundation does not place the administrative burden of managing the granting program onto the Indigenous members of the Council but rather manages paperwork and communications itself. The Indigenous Peoples Resilience Fund (IPRF), funded by Community Foundations Canada, is a similar example. The purpose of the IPRF is to provide prompt, barrier-free money to Indigenous governments, community groups and grassroots organizations without charitable status, as well as registered Indigenous charities, facing deficits as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The application process is short and straightforward, and can be completed verbally, and decisions are made by an Indigenous Advisory Council (Simon *et al.* 2021). It is clear that in some cases signatories have taken action to increase funding and take decolonial and Indigenous-led approaches to the work.

At other times, the *Declaration*'s release could reify colonial power dynamics and result in inertia resulting from uncertainty and fragility, according to some Indigenous critics. Itoah Scott-Ens

(2017) wrote in *The Philanthropist* that after 2015, conversations with settler funders who had signed the *Declaration* revealed to her that even when they were "keen to support reconciliation", some settlers' fears of doing it the "wrong way" had held them back from taking action at all. The Circle's research reports described above pointed to organizational, professional, social and cultural barriers that could impede action. For example, some staff and leadership from settler philanthropy organizations often felt "hampered by a lack of cultural competency" and differences in "ideals, mores and traditions" could lead to communication impasses (The Circle 2014 p. 20; The Circle 2017, p. 24). Others noted that the "complexity of the issues" at stake led to hesitation among settler organizations. In some cases, staff of funding organizations wishing to "do" reconciliation felt hindered by the more conservative politics of the "old guard" governing the grant-making decisions (The Circle 2014). For various reasons, signing was not equivalent to acting. Thus, as Lindsey Dupré (2019)– a Métis scholar and nonprofit leader who founded the Mamawi Project[21]– explained that "symbolic gestures" and statements that communicate "good intentions" cannot be mistaken for "justice and systemic change."

3.3 – Unprecedented moments and national urgency: grand gesture reconciliation

Another way that commitments like the *Declaration* could be part of a grand gesture was through the discursive and affective framing of reconciliation as an urgent imperative for the settler philanthropy sector, and as a distinctive moment in Canadian history. At the final TRC hearing in Ottawa, leaders in the philanthropy sector described the commitments of the *Declaration* as "unprecedented." This framing was central to the change narrative in the years that followed, positioning settler philanthropy as a key player in a historic moment in which Canadians suddenly awakened to a calling to which they were "duty bound" to respond. Describing settler

[21] A social media collective focused on providing a platform for Métis storytelling, knowledge and conversations, especially authored by Métis youth. https://themamawiproject.medium.com

philanthropy's response to the TRC on the public stage as new and unprecedented was probably a reflection of what the individuals who wrote the *Declaration* genuinely felt about it. It may also have been part of why the narrative drew others in the sector to the table. At the same time, though, it had the potential to overshadow less performative and less visible decolonial work that had already been happening for a long time, that was potentially more challenging than what was on offer on the national stage of grand gesture reconciliation.

What may have felt like a new and unprecedented moment to settlers in the sector was not pointing to anything new to Indigenous and racialized people who worked in philanthropy or engaged with it. Rather, the perceived urgency that had been activated by the TRC was a response to things with which Indigenous peoples in and adjacent to the sector were intimately familiar. Settler philanthropy's lack of funding to and engagement with Indigenous communities and peoples, for example, had been under discussion long before the TRC's conclusion. A 1979 federally funded commission researched why private foundations in Canada, with their financial weight and social power, for the most part did not engage with Indigenous issues which, according to the report were "substantial" and deeply under-supported (Ponting 1979). Twenty-five years later, another expansive research report by Indigenous child welfare scholars Cindy Blackstock and Samantha Nadjiwan found that Indigenous children have "almost no access" to the billions of dollars of revenue (in government contracts) supporting the Canadian voluntary sector after neoliberal economic restructuring policies had devolved the responsibility of social services delivery to nonprofit organizations in the previous decades (Nadjiwin and Blackstock 2004). Similarly, a publication that Imagine Canada released in 2005 focused on why Indigenous people and communities in the Northwest Territories, where Indigenous populations are comparably high, were not represented in volunteer positions in the "mainstream" voluntary sector (Little 2005).

Research by the Circle in 2010 and 2014 had suggested that the circumstances had not substantively changed by that time. As the organization published in the 2010 report, “in spite of the obvious need,” philanthropy’s engagement with Indigenous peoples and communities was still an “unrealized opportunity” (p. 18).

Indigenous child welfare activist and scholar Cindy Blackstock had written elsewhere of her experience in the 1980s and 1990s working in Indigenous social work: a space parallel to, yet sometimes actively avoided by, the voluntary and philanthropic sector. “I witnessed the significant benefits brought to children and youth by the voluntary sector,” she wrote, “and then when I traveled about 8 blocks away to work on reserve, the voluntary sector was not only absent, it often appeared to find reasons for not crossing a reserve boundary at all” (Blackstock 2005, p. 132). Purported Canadian values of diversity, equality and inclusivity were not being reflected in voluntary sector activity, Blackstock concluded. These apparent exclusions and avoidances of Indigenous peoples, she implied, coincided with colonial unknowing “about our historical and contemporary truth” (ibid.). In other words, refusing to know the realities of ongoing colonialism led to inaction and avoidance. Blackstock and Nadjiwin (2004) similarly concluded that racism at personal and institutional levels was a fundamental problem in the sector that held it back from engaging with Indigenous peoples. The lack of relationship between the voluntary sector and Indigenous communities stemmed, their report concluded, from a sense of “national guilt, from not wanting to know about the abuses of Aboriginal peoples by Canadian governments and peoples, and from a desire not to upset entrenched national values of equality, multi-culturalism, inclusion, and freedom” (p. 74). Blackstock’s perplexity at the disconnect between the Canadian voluntary sector and Indigenous communities suggests that this disconnect was tied up with colonial

unknowing – a desire to not know about historic and ongoing colonial violences that challenge mythologies of Canadian national identity (and of the sector's role in reflecting it).

Other Indigenous women in the sector have shared similar observations (Grant 2016; Scott-Ens 2017; Goodchild 2019). Jocelyn Formsma (2013), an Indigenous leader who spent most of her career in the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Movement[22] working with Indigenous youth, reflected on her experiences in *The Philanthropist.* She wrote that early in her career, philanthropic funders were not interested in funding programs for Indigenous youth. She recalled constantly searching for funding opportunities, but learning that "the work that we were doing just did not qualify." In a 2017 Circle webinar, Archie told settlers working in the sector that institutional philanthropy in Canada "absolutely does not reflect the lived experience of the majority of the people they're seeking to serve" (in Bahubeshi *et al.* 2017; also Buchholz et al. 2020). Being an Indigenous woman in the sector, she reflected, sometimes felt "very isolating" since there were so few other Indigenous people. This issue was "one of those shadow sides of the nonprofit sector" that tended to trigger settler discomfort when brought up, but was something "that we definitely need to be aware of and find more comfort in talking about" (ibid.). As these reflections suggest, a lack of engagement, and the "colonial systems" that were being exposed in the "unprecedented moment" of the *Declaration*'s release were ongoing, lived realities of Indigenous peoples. Affective performances of urgency and hope on a public stage, discourses about "unprecedented occasions" and "opportune moments," to some extent overshadowed the work of exposing systemic racism and durable coloniality that had been ongoing, especially among Indigenous women, for many decades.

[22] A national collective of Indigenous-led and -operated nonprofit community organizations that provide various types of services and programming to Inuit, Métis and First Nations people, especially those living in urban areas. There are 125 Friendship Centres across Canada as of 2021. See: https://nafc.ca/about-the-nafc/our-history?lang=en.

Another key issue is that claims about "Canadian imperatives" may function as a way of upholding mythologies of settler Canadian goodness through what critical theorist Adam Saifer describes as philanthropic nation branding. This he describes as a process whereby philanthropic actors in Canada mobilize discourses of reconciliation, diversity, equity and inclusion, to restore the Canadian national identity to its "brand" of fairness, diversity and multiculturalism, and to situate settler philanthropy actors as central upholders of that brand. Saifer argues that nation-branding "directly conflicts with the country's ongoing history as a white settler-colonial nation-state" (Saifer 2021, p. 561). In this case, by situating the source of colonial harm in the past and focusing strictly on the residential school system as the central issue at stake, the language of the *Declaration* in some ways obscures the "presentness" of colonialism, or as Ann Laura Stoler (2016) puts it, the ways in which coloniality is "ineffably threaded through the fabric of contemporary life" (p. 5). Past tense is built into the *Declaration,* which describes "the tragedy that *was* the Indian Residential School System experience", the "history and legacy of the colonial system that *imposed* the Indian Residential School system that *dispossessed* and *inflicted* harm upon Aboriginal peoples and their cultures" (The Circle 2015, italics added). The past tense and passive voice in these passages imply that residential schools were imposed by a "system" rather than by people, governments, and institutions – including settler philanthropists and humanitarian organizations who were involved in the establishment and management of residential schools. Nation-branding thus engages in temporal distancing. It is a process that centres settlers' and settler philanthropy's roles in transforming Canadian society for the future, and restoring the Canadian nation-brand by addressing the guilt of the past, without drawing attention to their present complicity in the issues at stake in the first place (Saifer 2021, p. 561). I discuss the entanglements

of temporal distancing like this–especially the emphasis on the past-ness of coloniality in much reconciliation discourse–and philanthropic nation-branding at greater length in the next chapter.

The *Declaration* also urges signatories to enact settler philanthropy to build a “much stronger, more inclusive Canada” and a “fairer and more just country.” Such language may have the effect of triggering deeply felt commitments to act on colonial inequities in the present. But it relies on the assumption that Canada was fair and just already, and that it simply needs to become more so – that a lack of fairness or justice or inclusivity do not reflect the “true” Canadian spirit. This is often tied up with a sense that inclusivity and multiculturalism are inherently Canadian characteristics, and that a central role of the philanthropy sector is to reflect, protect and promote those characteristics. Referring to similar discursive processes in universities performing anti-racism, Sara Ahmed (2006) describes such examples of colonial recognition as “non-performativity.” In this dynamic, “the shameful white subject expresses shame about its racism, and in expressing its shame, it ‘shows’ that it is not racist…The very claim to feel bad (about this or that) also involves a self-perception of ‘being good’” (p. 4). The outcome is that the focus of the discourse becomes the ethical and moral development of the settler or settler institution as they reckon with their new awareness of racism and coloniality, and work to re-establish the “true” identity of the Canadian nation-state and the sector. That the society or sector perceived to be in need of growth is built on “labyrinthine structures of racism, Indigenous dehumanization, and white supremacy" is ultimately obscured (Gaertner, 2020, p. 244).

There was significance to the chief elected official of the largest national body representing First Nations governments in Canada employing the Canadian imperative theme in his speeches in 2011, 2012 and 2013 to convince settler philanthropy leaders that they had a pivotal role to play in

"smashing the status quo." Shawn a-in-Chut Atleo's calls to action engaged in similar patterns of colonial recognition and unknowing. In recognizing the "serious challenges" faced by Indigenous peoples that resulted from residential schools, the source of these inequities (and those who benefit most from the inequities – including those in his audience), are effectively removed from the picture. In the Canadian imperative theme advanced by the *Declaration* and in subsequent reflections on reconciliation, settlers in philanthropy are positioned as key players in restoring and reflecting Canadian identity and improving conditions to make Canada "stronger, fairer, and more inclusive". As such, this theme of the change narrative can enable colonial durabilities in sometimes insidious ways.

These issues are especially notable and complex in this context because critical anti-colonial activists have pointed to some of the ways that the AFN itself (as well as the imposed colonial band governance system it represents) is a product and reflection of the colonial status quo. They argue that the collective can have the effect of subsuming diverse Indigenous sovereignties and legal orders under a federally (colonially) recognized system. In so doing, it severely restricts the self-determination of individual Indigenous communities – especially those that do not fall under the AFN's membership (see, e.g., Tomiak 2016). There is also some irony to Atleo's remarks about smashing the status quo; he stepped down from his position in the AFN in 2014, after his administration was criticized by some Indigenous activists for supporting federally designed Indigenous education policies that disempowered local Indigenous leadership and forms of education, as well as resource extraction policies that some critics felt nurtured, rather than smashed, colonial status quos (CBC News 2014; Kinew 2014; Watts and King 2018). In the end, the Canadian imperative theme, the *Declaration*'s presentation, and its uptake embody the key point of dissonance that I see at work in the reconciliation change narrative as expressed across this

archive of texts. Depending on the delivery and practical execution, its messaging can reify colonial status quos even while committing to advancing change in grand gestures. Leaning on public and emotionally charged commitments to change can lead to the restoration of settler normalcy by obscuring colonial durabilities constantly being reinscribed under the surface.

3.4 – Reparations and reciprocity: refusing the grand gesture

Since the release of the *Declaration,* some Indigenous critics have countered grand gesture framing and outcomes, imagining dissonant alternatives for (and sometimes against) reconciliation. These suggest that there are other potential outcomes that the generative language of the *Declaration* could lead to, focusing on reframing philanthropic relations to centre reparations, reciprocity, and Indigenous self-determination. These alternative possibilities draw wider conversations about trust-based philanthropy and radical philanthropy (discussed in Part 3 of Chapter 1 of this thesis) into conversations about decoloniality and Indigenous sovereignties. In so doing, they offer generative possibilities that can, as Manning puts it, "push through the process" and refuse the pre-conceived structures of grand gesture reconciliation.

As I discuss at greater length in the next two chapters, continuous and habitual efforts to decentre settler primacy are often framed as a critical first step of imagining reconciliation otherwise. This is an explicit refusal of the recognition/unknowing dynamic at work in the Canadian imperative formation because, as theorists of decoloniality argue, it requires "a significant re-shaping of settler consciousness" through intentional acts of unsettling (Davis et al., 2017, p. 399). In the context of philanthropy, unsettling or de-centring is imagined as a shift in settler perspectives. Rather than positioning colonial violence as a thing of the past (or as unwanted aberrances in a presumed post-colonial present) with present-day legacies to which philanthropy must respond, Indigenous critics

urge settlers in philanthropy to think of themselves as implicated in the durable structures of coloniality in the present (Bahubeshi et al. 2018; Wiebe 2018). Ultimately, Couchman et al. (2020) write that "truly taking action on reconciliation" means complementing commitments with ongoing efforts to name "power and privilege imbalances," and work "tirelessly to eradicate white supremacy" (p. 154). Settler decentring refuses to leave colonial structures untouched or unacknowledged. Tim Fox, the Vice President of Indigenous Relations and Equity Strategy at the Calgary Foundation (as well as member of the governing circle of the Circle), told listeners in a 2022 webinar that "It's not just about leaning on the *Philanthropic Declaration"* (in Vavek et al. 2022). Rather, it is critical to try to "change the system" by exposing and addressing deeply held and "harmful beliefs" that pervade the sector. Philanthropic practices and relations could not improve, he suggested, without exposing and addressing deeply ingrained structures of coloniality and white supremacy at work in philanthropic organizations. This in turn can lead to sustainable and creative possibilities for settler philanthropy to support Indigenous sovereignties through reparative and reciprocal relations.

Next, some authors emphasize that while increasing overall funding levels is necessary, the nature of funding relationships is also an important concern. There is a danger, Anishinaabe (moose clan) systems change scholar Melanie Goodchild (2019) suggested, that when increasing funding to Indigenous communities in the name of reconciliation, philanthropy organizations can reproduce colonial power dynamics if they are not aware of them. This can happen in well-meaning philanthropic efforts, for example, that impose programming, ideas, and requirements that are culturally inappropriate or not meaningful to the communities they target (Exner-Pirot 2015; Glass 2018). For this reason, Indigenous authors emphasize shifting the focus from fitting Indigenous

peoples into existing funding practices, to reimagining philanthropic relations altogether through a decolonial and reparative lens (Wiebe 2018; Redvers 2017; Dirksen et al. 2020).

The next key shift, according to many authors, involves the movement of long-term, abundant funding from settler funders to Indigenous-led solutions and initiatives – especially for organizations in small, rural communities with little administrative capacity (e.g. Ulrichs 2020; Simon et al. 2021; Lorinc 2020; Goodchild 2019; Archie 2021b; Omidvar et al. 2022). This perspective aligns with wider literature on improving philanthropy through trust-based and participatory approaches that emphasize generous, unrestricted funding with fewer application and reporting requirements – discussed in Part 3 of Chapter 1 (e.g. Herro and Obeng-Odoom 2019; Wrobel and Massey 2020; Hunnik et al. 2020). Abundant unrestricted funding must be part of a larger effort to shift institutional philanthropic relations altogether. As Wrobel and Massey (2021) imagine, it must be characterized by a "letting go" of power on the part of funders. Indigenous critics across the archive take these models further by drawing them into explicit conversations about dismantling colonial structures and advancing Indigenous sovereignty. In this dynamic, trust-based philanthropy centres commitments to long-term, unrestricted funding of Indigenous leadership, and trust in Indigenous-designed solutions (Brennan and Munshi 2022).

Acknowledging the colonial roots of the issues, and of the accumulation of wealth and power that fuel much institutional philanthropy in Canada, in turn can lead to reparative funding efforts. This is key, Fox writes, to the work of interrupting coloniality and ensuring Indigenous peoples themselves, in all their diversity, are the ones deciding what it means to thrive. This approach is also critical to getting away from what some Indigenous leaders describe as the "transactional nature" of much traditional grant-making. Tim Fox notes that the idea that "'Oh, we have this

wealth, we have this money here, [and] we are trying to help solve these problems,'" does not "sit well with Indigenous communities." This is because settler-led solutions "have largely failed to alleviate the social issues produced by settler practice" (Couchman et al. 2020 p. 151). Similarly, Inspirit CEO Roberta Jamieson (2020) wrote that among settler philanthropists working with Indigenous communities, engaged and thoughtful commitment to amplifying local forms of wisdom and sovereignty must replace paternalistic, deficit-focused, and transactional assumptions. The refusal of a dynamic that assumes Indigenous peoples are "poor and needy" and that settler philanthropy has the power the help them was a starting point for transformational practice (p. 164). To avoid replicating and maintaining the status quo, then, Indigenous writers suggested the priority must be placed on supporting Indigenous self-determination. Reparative philanthropy requires "creative and generative commitment[s] to centre Indigenous values and people, first and foremost" (Kelly and Woods 2021, p. 153). This approach moves the focus away from Canadian imperatives and philanthropic nation-branding as discussed above, toward radical alternatives that refuse the colonial status quo.

To this end, some authors thus emphasize the need for funders to distinguish amongst settler-led organizations that serve Indigenous beneficiaries and Indigenous-led organizations (e.g. Smylie in Manning et al. 2018; Simon et al. 2020; Vavek et al. 2022). In 2022 the Circle released a "definitional matrix" that distinguishes amongst Indigenous-benefitting, Indigenous-informed, Indigenous-partnered, and Indigenous-led organizations (The Circle 2022). The goal, according to the Circle, was to help philanthropic funders to make "stronger granting and partnership decisions." The document references a "growing understanding" that directly funding Indigenous-led work and movements is the best way to enable Indigenous success and advance Indigenous sovereignty (see also Couchman et al. 2020). Abundantly funding Indigenous-led work in these ways would

constitute a demonstration of a philanthropist's or organization's trust in the experience and capability of Indigenous organizations and communities to identify and address social problems themselves (Vavek et al. 2022).

Funding Indigenous-led organizations, communities and solutions, is key to reparative practice that avoids performativity. Relinquishing power over how and where philanthropic dollars are spent, and making space for Indigenous peoples to make the decisions, and to generate the solutions they want and need, is an important way that critics across the archive refuse what I call the "grand gesture" expressions of reconciliation. An example of this kind of dynamic at work in a philanthropic setting is the Right Relations Collaborative.[23] This is an Indigenous-led collective giving platform premised on placing Indigenous peoples in the decision-making positions in a philanthropic relationship, flipping the "transactional" dynamics of much institutional philanthropy on their head. The "Aunties Council" (the Collaborative's leadership board) as well as external Indigenous community leaders "vet" potential funders who can apply to participate in the Collaborative, including by contributing to a pooled fund that provides unrestricted operating support to Indigenous organizations and initiatives represented by the collaborative. As of 2023, the Collaborative hosts a pooled fund of $1.2 million per year that will last for three years, and is being disbursed to community-based, Indigenous-led organizations (Right Relations Collaborative 2023). Co-creators of the Collaborative write that they actively are trying to "work through the barriers inherent to capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy and emerge on the other side in a shared space that centers collaboration, support and abundance" (p. 5). They argue that this kind of work is long term and ongoing and it "requires us to have open hearts" (p. 13).

[23] See https://rightrelationscollaborative.ca.

By embracing decolonial, trust-based relationships, some authors argue, settler philanthropy organizations can move beyond the conciliatory rhetoric of reconciliation that centres settlers and aim rather toward radical relations of reciprocity and the amplification of Indigenous sovereignties (Rowe and Roussin 2020; Brennan and Munshi 2022; Jamieson 2020). Discussions of reciprocity in this archive reflect some perspectives in the wider literature on Indigenous systems of giving and sharing. Reciprocity, as this body of literature suggests, has more than strictly economic functions in Indigenous societies, "bind[ing] collectives together", maintaining kinship relations and social networks across generations and geographies, and shaping relations of mutual responsibility not only with human kin, but also with the land and water (Kuokkanen 2011 p. 217; Kuokkanen 2004, p. 82). As it is expressed across this archive, reciprocity is imagined as a possibility against and beyond grand gesture performances of reconciliation, looking instead "toward envisioning and shaping meaningful, comprehensive, and sustainable systems of contemporary indigenous self-governance" (Kuokkanen 2011, p. 217). Shifting toward reciprocity requires the development and maintenance of "enduring relationship built out of the persistent necessity of being in relation to the other," as David Gaertner puts it (2020, p. 149).

Indigenous writers in this archive argue that reciprocity is predicated on thoughtful, slow and intentional relationship building with Indigenous communities, organizations, and leaders, instead of transactional forms of philanthropy that, they argue, replicate colonial power dynamics. *Declaration* co-author Victoria Grant wrote in 2016 that settler philanthropy had a role to play in "reviving reciprocity" not only by funding Indigenous organizations and communities, but also by contributing time and networks, building relations and listening – with the awareness that Indigenous peoples and communities have much knowledge, expertise, and experience to bring to the table.

Jeska Slater of the Vancouver Foundation wrote in 2021 that the community foundation had revised its Indigenous Priorities Strategy in this vein, aiming to embed Indigenous priorities throughout the organization, and prioritizing unrestricted grants to Black-led and Indigenous-led organizations (Slater 2021). The application form for such grants was significantly simplified, Slater explained, and the foundation actively began to collect feedback from applicants and grantees, as well as demographic data, to understand where the greatest funding gaps existed for Indigenous-led and Black-led organizations in the region and thus inform future granting decisions. The foundation also developed an Indigenous Community Panel with local Elders and community leaders to shape funding decisions from the perspectives of local Indigenous communities. Slater emphasized that positions on the Panel were amply compensated. Sharing advice with others in the settler philanthropy sphere wishing to work with Indigenous communities in reciprocal and reparative relationships, Slater emphasized the importance of settlers in philanthropy becoming cognizant of the emotional cost for Indigenous Peoples of being asked to engage with "colonial institutions" such as foundations. She noted that settler philanthropy organizations needed to ensure relationship building with Indigenous community leaders was not extractive but built with "the time and resources to do it meaningfully and authentically." She also highlighted the importance of amplifying diverse Indigenous ways of knowing and solutions. She urged settlers in the settler philanthropy sector to "walk alongside, not over, Indigenous partners by making space for their connection to the land, their teachings and their laws to create solutions that will benefit all Canadians" (Slater 2021). These are some of the ways, CFC leadership reflected in 2021, that some community foundations aimed to "shift the power" to ensure "those who best know" are at "every table where important decisions are made" (CFC 2021).

Indigenous leaders emphasize that this kind of long-term and "authentic" relationship-building should be challenging and uncomfortable for settlers in philanthropy. The dismantlement of organizational structures that impede the flow of resources and power to Indigenous communities, and the development of long-term and sustainable relations of reciprocity, is not easy work. As such, it differs from grand gesture reconciliation dynamics because it emphasizes the importance of long-term relations of mutual obligation, rather than centring settlers as key protagonists with critical roles in rescuing the Canadian "nation-brand." Settler power, positionality and networks can indeed be mobilized to advocate for decolonial change as *Declaration* authors hoped, but doing so, according to these writers, requires ongoing commitments to refuse white settler supremacy and coloniality in all its forms, including the organizational processes and power structures that, as they argue, "perpetuate exploitation" in and through the sector (Contreras Correal *et al.* 2021). In turn, engagement in a new kind of relationality with Indigenous Peoples and communities, as well as with other racialized leaders and organizations becomes possible (Jung, Archie, Senior, *et al.* 2020; Jung, Archie, Lutaaya, *et al.* 2020). This kind of work takes time and thoughtfulness, and it is not always easily measurable, quantifiable or even visible, within the sector.

Sometimes, settlers in philanthropy are asked to mobilize their power and privilege in the spirit of reparations and reciprocity, and then to get out of the way, instead of taking up space. As Rudayna Bahubeshi put it, often the work of reparations requires "lower[ing] the volume on some voices or practices" in the sector, going beyond making space to actually stepping aside altogether (Bahubeshi in Archie et al. 2017). At most Circle events, for example, there is usually an Indigenous-Peoples-Only Day scheduled the day before settlers are invited to participate in proceedings. Indigenous peoples are invited to "gather together – to laugh, share stories, and be honest about what the philanthropic landscape is like for them" and to make space for "learning, strategizing and collective care." Here, settlers are asked to respect the spaces where they are not

invited – to step aside, rather than making their own relationships to Indigenous peoples the central focus of any event. This is a refusal of dominant strains of reconciliation that assume settlers must always be in the front seat, so to speak.

At other times, the "rocky and unsteady paths" can lead to even more radical possibilities. A memory from my days in the grant-making world comes to mind here. At some point after I left the organization I used to work for, I was out for a drink with a former colleague – a program officer there. We were discussing how things had changed since I left, and he told me that he had set a target for himself to approve at least one application per year from an Indigenous organization. But, he told me with some frustration and dismay, he had had some trouble. He had reached out to the executive director of a large, Indigenous-led organization to explain that he had the budget to make a major grant for a program of the organization's choosing, if they would submit an application. His "cold call" reflected an interesting shift of philanthropic power dynamics for two reasons. First, the group my former colleague worked for typically only granted in response to applications received, rather than reaching out to potential grantees (i.e. they did not usually do cold calls). Second, he was declined. After presumably discussing the offer with the board of governors and other leaders, the executive director called my friend back to tell him that the organizational practices and political emphases of the organization he worked for did not align with the intentions and priorities of her organization.

This message was a clear refusal of the politics of performativity that underlie some articulations of reconciliation in the sector. The leader of the organization's refusal sent a message: Indigenous organizations do not exist to "fit in" with settler priorities, and a funder's desire to fulfill a diversity/inclusion quota is not a good enough reason for Indigenous organizations to engage with

some settler funders (indeed, it might even be a reason they choose not to engage at all). Her response signaled another possibility, one that Gaertner might describe as "incommensurable" with reconciliation and with some of the messaging of the *Declaration*: a world in which institutional settler philanthropy, even the best-intentioned, is neither needed nor desired. Where at times Indigenous critics emphasized the need for abundant and unrestricted funding in relations of reciprocity, at times others argue that as a production of neoliberal capitalist policy and practice, institutional philanthropy does not fit at all within radical reimaginings of a world beyond the neoliberal and the colonial present (e.g. Villanueva 2018; Wiebe 2018; Couchman et al. 2020). Melanie Goodchild (2019) envisions a future in which her organization is not dependent on "powerful, rich, white people," but rather thrives in a future of "mutual support" and reciprocity with Indigenous-led funds and funders. Her imagined future, in which Indigenous sovereignty is the driving factor, does not involve reference to relationships with settler philanthropy at all. What these examples suggest is that in some articulations, settler philanthropy is neither the solution nor the point, and this perspective is incommensurable with the Canadian imperative and the grand gesture messaging critiqued earlier in this chapter. In this case, decolonial futures depend on an absolute dissonance with reconciliation – a dissonance which is not, and need not be, resolved. In this articulation, settlers and settler philanthropy are not positioned as "champions" for smashing the status quo, but rather urged to step aside and make space for a different kind of future: imagining a world where institutional settler philanthropy no longer exists (Wiebe 2018; Couchman et al. 2020). Rather than focusing on improving settler relationships with Indigenous peoples, these incommensurable possibilities function as what Edmonds (2016) calls "unruly ruptures" that call into question public consensus around inclusivity and reconciliation, and around institutional settler philanthropy.

Conclusions

The *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* is often referenced in the texts I analyze as a galvanizing moment for the settler philanthropy sector. The document, and its presentation in 2015, framed reconciliation as a Canadian imperative: an "important calling" for all Canadians, and a special task for Canadian philanthropy, which had a unique role to play in its advancement. Co-authors and signatories described the release of the *Declaration* as an "unprecedented" moment because of its potential to inspire participation on a sectoral level. Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders alike expressed immense hope for the document's capacity to trigger increased settler engagement with Indigenous communities, by encouraging others in the sector to get involved, and mobilizing their social power to affect policy on a national level. This potential stemmed in part from the social and sectoral influence of the co-authors of the *Declaration,* and in part because of the public and affectively charged nature of the presentation in Ottawa, which coincided with the conclusion of the TRC.

Yet, I have also argued in this chapter that the Canadian imperative theme may have underpinned a "grand gesture" version of change for the sector, embodying performances of reconciliation that were already at play at the state level. As some Indigenous critics later pointed out, signing the *Declaration* could be performative rather than activating, not necessarily leading to the kinds of action they felt would be most meaningful. Furthermore, by positioning the settler philanthropy sector as a pivotal player in a moment of great social importance, the narrative worked to centre and stabilize Canadian settler identities while turning attention away from settler complicity in the very issues signatories committed to address. In this way, it could elevate and uphold – and indeed conceal – the colonial durabilities at work in the settler philanthropy sector and in neoliberal Canada through co-constitutive processes of colonial recognition and unknowing. Eventually, the

urgency and hopefulness woven through early reflections on the *Declaration* shifted to cynicism and frustration. In some cases, Indigenous individuals working in or adjacent to the sector abandoned reconciliation as a meaningful concept altogether (Munshi and Levi 2021, p. 2; Omidvar et al., 2022).

This suggests that the articulation of settler positionality in the reconciliation change narrative can have dissonant outcomes. As indicated by the shifting perspectives of Indigenous sector leaders on reconciliation, the *Declaration's* uptake could and did go in many directions. Without action, the *Declaration* could remain as performative allyship. Without systemic shifts in the distribution of power and the nature of philanthropic relationships, reconciliatory action could risk re-centring settler supremacy without requiring any of "the difficult labour that goes into dismantling racism and white privilege" as Gaertner writes (2020, p. 144). Indigenous leaders in the sector invited settlers in philanthropy to more radical and disruptive approaches that explicitly name colonizing structures, processes and systems of white supremacy as they exist and persist in the sector. They suggested possibilities beyond fitting Indigenous peoples *into* settler philanthropy as it stands, instead focusing on reframing relationships altogether to transform the sector "as a whole" (Pasta 2020). Critics urged settler philanthropy to abundantly fund and demonstrate political solidarity with Indigenous-led movements and initiatives; "lower the volume" on settler assumptions about what Indigenous peoples need; and shift decision-making power directly to Indigenous communities, organizations and leaders. They brought trust-based and participatory models of philanthropy into a frame of reparations and reciprocity toward the advancement of Indigenous sovereignties. These possibilities could be an important way to "critically and compassionately reformulate" reconciliation away from the limiting functions of the grand gesture (Gaertner, 2020, p. 174).

Activating the *Declaration* in these ways is not always easy work. This is in part because individuals working in settler philanthropy organizations are often constrained by organizational, professional and social parameters that limit their ability to engage in the slow and thoughtful relationship-building that Indigenous leaders call for. Furthermore, otherwise possibilities are often characterized by tensions. While some Indigenous leaders urged immediate movement away from the grand gesture, they also emphasized the need for slow, thoughtful shifts in practice and relations. While critiques of dominant practices indicated that the overall impact of centring Indigenous sovereignties would likely be good (if challenging), they also emphasized that the "path forward is emergent and the outcomes are less certain" (Couchman et al. 2020, p. 152). While Indigenous leaders in the sector repeatedly told settler philanthropy actors (especially those who had signed the *Declaration)* that they must act with urgency to address white supremacy and coloniality (e.g. Bahubeshi et al. 2017; Bahubeshi et. al 2018), they also noted that the work must be characterized by patience, thoughtfulness and intentionality (Glass 2018; Dirksen et al. 2020). Furthermore, dissonant alternatives to the grand gesture articulation of reconciliation are not templates or "one-size-fits all" measures. Indigenous sovereignties are plural, shifting and exceptionally diverse. So, mobilizing settler philanthropies to support Indigenous sovereignties requires critical attentiveness to the highly local and sometimes contradictory contexts, concerns and priorities of various Indigenous communities. The work was described in some texts as a "continually evolving" process, and an iterative and emergent approach, rather than a box-ticking exercise (Elson 2018; Lorinc 2020). Immediate results of these emergent paths might not always be visible or easily measurable in the sector.

Alternative possibilities emerged after the *Declaration* not in a dialectical or linear progression from "bad" versions of reconciliation to "better" ones, but through ongoing discussions, trial-and-error, and continuous reflection and reorientation. Even as settler positionality was being inscribed in texts across the archive in "grand gesture" terms, it was also being critiqued and reimagined. Critiques and alternatives presented "rocky and unsteady paths" toward a "something else" for activating the *Declaration* in a way that is perhaps more challenging, and more generative, than the "Canadian imperative" formation allows.

The next Findings chapters will explore other ways that the recognition/unknowing dynamic surfaced in later expressions of the reconciliation change narrative, as well as alternatives that refused these colonial dynamics. I demonstrate some of the other discursive-affective resonances of the *Declaration* across texts in the archive I have assembled, especially as they appear in colonial hauntings, and in settler commitments to journey and to learn. These discursive-affective features have had important material implications in the practices and decisions of settler philanthropic organizations.

Chapter 4 – The colonial spectre

Introduction

While most of this thesis focuses on what is said in the archive of texts that I have assembled (and how, why, where, by whom and when things are said), I devote this chapter to a discussion of things that are often left unsaid in the reconciliation change narrative. This chapter explores discursive processes of distancing, omission and renaming, which I have identified as patterns across many of the texts in this archive. Through these processes, the settler subject and settlerness, and coloniality and racism, are written as "over there": existing away from and outside of the contemporary settler philanthropy sector specifically, and Canadian society more broadly. Sometimes, coloniality and racism are also positioned as vestiges of a tragic past, or else unwelcome aberrances in a presumed post-colonial and post-racial Canadian present. As Stoler (2016) argues, such discursive acts in settler public memory are part of the "ongoing malleable process" that make coloniality durable, and its durabilities invisible (p. 14).

A brief anecdote about a personal experience in the settler philanthropy world presents a helpful illustration of these discursive processes (especially distancing) at work. I was selected to interview for a scholarship distributed annually by a small, volunteer-administered philanthropic fund resourced collectively through fundraising efforts primarily targeted toward Canadian settlers. The adjudication committee was entirely comprised of white settler Canadians. As the first layer of the application process had involved summarizing my PhD research project, the interview panel was already familiar with the subject of my thesis and my proposed argument when I entered the interview space. I was asked to prepare a brief (three to five minute) summary of my thesis for the start of the interview, and then be ready to respond to questions for the remaining 20-25 minutes. A

draft list of potential questions had helpfully been sent to all interview candidates several weeks in advance of the event.

After I completed my brief presentation, one of the three committee members asked the first question, which she prefaced with a lengthy statement. She explained to me that she did not believe I could conduct a study on colonialism and philanthropy if the time period on which I focus "begins after the 1980s." She asked then whether my focus was philanthropy practiced by governments or private individuals and non-government organizations. When I responded that my focus is an ecosystem of many types of private philanthropists and organizations that do not generally include government, she asserted her belief that private philanthropy plays a very important role in Canadian society, and that reconciliation is a critical process happening in Canada and being pursued in the philanthropy sector. I could tell from her preface that my critique of reconciliation had generated some discomfort.

Later in the interview another interviewer asked me why I used the term settler when discussing philanthropy and present-day issues in Canada. "Is it a historical term? And if this is not a historical study, why do you use it? Is it the same as 'non-Indigenous?'" she asked, visibly frustrated. We spent several minutes debating my political choice to use the term. I do not think my answers satisfied her concerns. Until the very end of the interview, when the panelists asked about my timeline, logistics and my financial situation, no version of any question that had been supplied prior to the interview (even in diluted form) was ever asked. I do not recall responding clearly or articulately to any of the questions that were raised instead – I was so jarred by the interaction that I doubt I answered any of the questions in meaningful or helpful ways. It did not go well, and I was not surprised a month later when I learned that I did not receive the scholarship.

I felt intense anxiety during this experience and was both surprised and frustrated at a sudden sense of immobilization that had obstructed my response to this clear instance of discursive violence in the form of colonial unknowing. My anxiety ultimately led me to silence (a privilege of being a white settler) during the questioning, and to some important personal learnings and self-reflection I drew from this experience afterward (more benefits of being a white settler). What made it something worth writing about here was how I experienced it as a lived illustration of the discursive practice of omission and distancing discussed in this chapter.

The panelist's perspective that I could not reasonably study colonialism in a project that begins, temporally, in the late 20th century (at the time I was still planning to focus on several change narratives beginning in the 1980s), was an expression of deeply held settler anxieties that can emerge when settlers are confronted with the present-ness and proximity of colonial violence and white supremacy. Such confrontations are what Bergland (2000), Gordon (2008), and others who draw on their theoretical perspectives in settler colonial studies (e.g. Baloy 2016; Ghaddar 2016; Fortier 2022), describe as hauntings – reminders of the durable structures of domination and abuse from which settlers benefit in the present, and to which they contribute. J.J. Ghaddar (2016) draws Avery Gordon's discussions of haunting into a colonial framework eloquently: "Discarnate yet real, horrible yet irresistible," hauntings remind us that "past and present violence and dispossession cannot be ignored, even when inconvenient or disturbing" (p. 25). Hauntings generate anxiety in the confronted settler because in the moment of their occurrence settlers are forced to consider the real presence of coloniality, and their own complicity in it, as well as the resulting possibility of having to decentre their own normalcy or question their own positions of power. As Gordon (2008) writes, "if you don't banish [the spectre], or kill it, or reduce it to

something you can already manage, when it appears to you, the ghost will inaugurate the necessity of doing something about it" (p. 206). Settler anxiety about this possibility often in turn leads to a discursive practice that allocates "the abuses of settler colonization to the dustbin of history" – a common but effective form of colonial unknowing (Coulthard 2014). The panel's resistance to the use of the term settler was a form of temporal distancing – a way to banish the colonial spectre that my PhD research had conjured in the present. This distancing allowed the settler of today to become something or someone "over there," a spectre of the past, which only enters the present as a political idea or label to be debated among settlers and ultimately refused.

My own anxiety leading to silence meant I did not respond meaningfully to the panelists' remarks, and ultimately left their colonial acts of distancing and omission unchecked and unremarked in that moment. Even while I was trying to articulate a project that critiques this very tendency toward silence, my own silence contributed to an atmosphere of colonial unknowing. My whiteness and settlerness place me in a position of privilege here: although the panelists' perspectives caused me some distress and may have cost me the scholarship, I did not experience their words as violence against me, personally. By leaving that violence unchecked, though, I potentially contributed to the reproduction of a space where such violence can be enacted against Indigenous peoples and other members of equity-seeking communities – whether in the interview room or elsewhere.

This chapter aims to demonstrate that discursive practices of omission, distancing and reframing like this one, which are often triggered by white settler anxiety in the face of colonial hauntings, have important material functions when employed in the philanthropy sphere, just like they did in that interview. As Indigenous authors and speakers in this archive of texts argue, where settlers in philanthropy distance themselves from coloniality and white supremacy, colonial relations of

domination in the practices of settler philanthropy remain untouched. I analyze here a diverse range of texts across the full temporal range of the archive, especially recordings of conference sessions and webinars from Philanthropic Foundations Canada (PFC) and the Circle, as well as post-session reflections. I draw my analysis of these texts into conversation with theories of haunting, recognition and unknowing, which I fleshed out in Chapter 1.

The chapter is divided into several sections. In 4.1, I discuss some examples of spatial and temporal distancing. I explore how the settler subject is reinscribed as a figure from a distant past or another place, and colonialism as a former reality that exists now only in legacies or vestiges of a shadowy and shameful history. Settlers in philanthropy are in turn imagined as having a central role in warding off these ghostly figures; and reversing or ameliorating those things that haunt the present. In 4.2, I discuss examples of conceptual distancing, a discursive technique whereby coloniality and racism are acknowledged as present realities in Canada, but settler philanthropy actors and institutions are removed from the frame of reference as a beneficiary or perpetuator of those structures of violence. In 4.3, I focus on texts in which I have identified omission – a related discursive strategy whereby racism, coloniality and settlerness are left out of the reconciliation change narrative, and out of intersecting conversations about inequality, diversity and inclusion, altogether. At times omission also takes the form of renaming: the use of neutral and indirect language that has the effect of shifting audience attention from racism and coloniality within the settler philanthropy sector and Canadian society toward more palatable concepts like tensions and opportunities (or lack thereof). Throughout these sections, I also discuss alternative possibilities voiced by Indigenous critics and some settler allies across the archive. They argue that opportunities for transformative, anti-colonial practice in philanthropy – whether taking the form of reparations, reciprocity, or trust-based philanthropy – must be preceded with explicit and consistent

acts of naming coloniality and decentring settler dominance. The examples I analyze here point to some of the dissonant expressions and outcomes of the reconciliation change narrative.

4.1 – Temporal and spatial distancing

The most common form of discursive distancing I have identified across this archive is temporal: the relegation of coloniality to a distant past, which must be acknowledged but then moved beyond, in order to focus on healing Canada and creating a better future. For example, in a 2017 webinar hosted by the Circle, settler and Indigenous leaders reflected on the creation of the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* and the importance of reconciliation to settler philanthropy (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017). I discussed the *Declaration* and this webinar (along with other texts that preceded and followed it) at length in Chapter 3. Here I am interested in some of the ways those involved in the discussion engaged in temporal distancing. PFC CEO Hilary Pearson advised the 240 online attendees from across the sector that those who do not know about the history of colonialism can learn about it through literature: "there are many wonderful pieces of literature about the experience of Indigenous peoples, in the period of colonization, essentially, that I think are very moving and beautifully expressed." Pearson encouraged listeners to "put yourself into the position of people who have experienced historically this terrible traumatic sort of colonization experience." Putting oneself into that position, she implied, could help settlers in the sector to empathize, and thus could motivate philanthropic work toward reconciliation. Later that year, Pearson reflected in a blog post, "We have had in our history many incidents of hate and expressions of prejudice, as we have begun to recognize in facing the history of colonialism and treatment of Indigenous peoples" (Pearson 2017). In these examples, the use of verb tense, and the identification of colonization as a historical phenomenon that has come to an end, function as temporal distancing. In other examples, the use of tense and historical language also sometimes

coincides with haunting. Colonialism may be perceived to have ended in the past, but settlers are haunted by its continued existence in the form of traces, legacies and impacts. In the same 2017 webinar Andrea Nemtin (a co-author of the *Declaration*) stated that she became involved in the work of reconciliation after hearing about the TRC: "I was very moved by the injustice of what had happened, and the continued effects of that injustice." In the *Declaration* text itself, colonial harm is acknowledged, but it appears in legacies and impacts: described as "cumulative impact of unresolved trauma passed from generation to generation." Colonization in these examples is framed as a historical period, and Indigenous people's traumatic experiences with colonial violence are understood as historical. Even in that historical setting, hate and prejudice and the bad "treatment of Indigenous peoples" are framed as "incidents" – not products of durable structures or systems.

As I argued in Chapter 3, the *Declaration* and the discussions that followed from it may have played an important role in bringing settlers in philanthropy into a dialogue in which they may not have previously engaged. At the time, the number of settler institutions engaging in philanthropy with Indigenous peoples and communities was a tiny minority, and the release of the *Declaration* presented an opportunity for this number to grow. To that end, it is possible that Pearson, Nemtin and the other philanthropy leaders speaking in the webinar may have been trying to give a "soft" introduction to the concepts of coloniality, reconciliation, and Indigenous-settler relations for their colleagues in the sector to avoid the possibility of alienating them through language that might produce settler anxiety. But this kind of avoidance, and the use of historicizing language have some problematic functions. Temporal distancing is critical to leaving coloniality's present-ness unsaid. As other critics of reconciliation have argued, a focus on the history of residential schools, or on "instances" of past violence with impacts in the present, problematically locates the source of

present-day trauma and "continued effects" in residential schools, rather than in the ongoing structures of violence and coloniality on which the neoliberal Canadian nation-state, and in turn the institutional philanthropic sector, are founded and depend (Simpson 2016a; Ghaddar 2016). Colonial violence is written off as something that is mostly gone, but that still appears in the form of vestiges. Furthermore, talk of legacies, tragedies and unresolved trauma do point to the intergenerational impacts of past actions, policies and systems – but also eschews discussion of present-day actions, policies and systems that have all the same effects today.

Michelle Daigle (2019) explains this kind of distancing is a key characteristic of much reconciliation discourse, which "manufactures the illusion that Canada has entered a renewed era with Indigenous peoples that is amicable, cooperative, and mutually beneficial" (p. 707). Racism and coloniality then are conceptualized as legacies of a "tragic past" that are not reflective of the spirit of this "renewed era." The risks, as Stoler (2016) puts it, is that the narrative in this way "sever[s] colonial pasts from their contemporary translations." Coloniality becomes spectralized: framed as something that has ended, but that still haunts the present. Settler philanthropy actors are in turn positioned as having an important role in banishing this spectre: addressing the "legacies" and "impacts" of historical colonialism in order to uphold and protect Canada's presumed more progressive identity in a "renewed era" of reconciled relations (see Saifer 2019 and Saifer 2021). In a lengthy blog post for PFC reflecting on the potential roles of philanthropic grantmakers in Canada in partnering with Indigenous communities and causes, philanthropy researcher Nicole Rigillo (2016) wrote that "Canadian foundations are well-poised to fund innovative community-based solutions" to the intense challenges some Indigenous communities face. She wrote of these challenges in terms of legacies: "The legacies of internal colonialism in Canada have left a schism between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities that can be seen in persistent differences

in poverty rates, health outcomes, and educational attainment rates." While the schisms Rigillo referenced are real, describing them as "legacies" of historical colonialism had the effect of obscuring the tangible presence of structural coloniality in the Canadian now that reproduces the "persistent differences." Settler philanthropic institutions are in turn positioned as having a key role in "fixing" the problem of the "legacies of internal colonialism." This is a good example of how colonial recognitions and unknowing work together in this change narrative. Focusing on the past and future, and largely omitting the present-ness of coloniality from the discussion, has the effect of obscuring the persistent and lived reality of colonial power dynamics that Indigenous critics identify in contemporary Canadian social life and more specifically in settler philanthropy.

Additionally, an unspoken function of temporal distancing is that it normalizes the "amicable" Canadian nation state, settler philanthropic institutions, and settler/Indigenous conciliation, as necessary conditions of a "better" future. A "shared future" in a "stronger, more inclusive Canada" where relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples are reconciled is a stated goal of reconciliation discourse that is usually assumed to be commonly held. What goes unspoken is an assumption that Indigenous peoples wish to be reconciled with settlers in a future based on and in a colonial state that is not acknowledged as colonial, and thus does not itself have to change. This is an important example of colonial unknowing predicated on settler commonsense.
As Damien Lee (2023) argues, this version of the Canadian state (indeed the colonial nation-state as a whole) is not something to which many Indigenous leaders are interested in reconciling. The shared future in this configuration is not explicitly envisioned as one in which ongoing structures and relations of colonial violence – at work in the state, in institutions, and on a daily basis in interpersonal interactions – are exposed and dismantled. The conversation then revolves around mobilizing settler philanthropy institutions toward this commonsense vision. The issues to be

addressed are framed as something that exist outside of settler philanthropic institutions and practices in the present. In this discursive configuration, settlers in philanthropy are not required to reflect on their roles in the upkeep of colonial structures of violence, or the benefits they derive from them. They are not asked to think through the ways that colonial structures and relations persist within institutional practices (some of which are discussed in the previous chapters such as grant-making practices that uphold inequitable power relations). As Saifer and Ahmad (2023) argue, this kind of distancing entrenches a perspective that settler philanthropy institutions are well positioned to address the very inequities and violence out of which they emerge.

Spatial distancing is another common pattern in the expression of the reconciliation change narrative across this archive of texts. Spatial distancing allows for the recognition that racism and coloniality exist in the present, but that they happen "over there" e.g. in the United States, or elsewhere in the world. For example, Pearson's reflections in a 2016 blog post discussed inequality and racist prejudice as something that primarily exist in the United States: "There is much talk about inequality in the United States," she wrote, and "To a lesser extent, this is also an issue in Canada" (Pearson 2016b). In a later blog post she wrote, "we witness daily the tensions that come from discrimination based on race or ethnicity as we watch developments in the United States. Given the tensions that arise among people of different cultures and backgrounds, shouldn't philanthropy in Canada be taking the long view and planning for what may come?" (Pearson 2017). By referring to racism as "tensions" and framing these as a problem strictly existing in the U.S. (something only that Canada might face in the future) the discourse excludes the tangible violence Canadian settlers and settler states enact daily on Indigenous peoples and lands.

Where racist violence does occur in Canada, it is written as an aberrance to Canadian national identity: "even here," Pearson wrote, "in our communities, we are hearing of more reported verbal

attacks on Canadians by other Canadians based on differences in religion, race, dress and belief" (ibid.). The "even here" in this statement plays an important role, implying that racist and colonial violence typically only happen elsewhere, and when they happen in Canada they are an anomaly, which does not fit into the overarching narrative of what Saifer (2020) calls Canada's nation-brand. For this reason, Pearson continued, such instances of violence that happen "even here" must give leaders in foundation philanthropy "pause to think about what more any one of us can do to counter the noises of hate…Canadian foundations are already acting to counter racism, inequality and divisiveness." While the "even here" normalizes Canada's mythology of goodness (especially in comparison with the U.S. and other places where, according to the narrative, racist violence is more typical), the statement about foundation action implies that settler philanthropy institutions exist outside of instances and structures of colonial and racist violence. As such, they are positioned as potential leaders in the work to "counter" these "noises of hate" when they creep north across the border.

Another interesting example of spatial distancing occurred in a session on reconciliation at PFC's 2016 Biennial Conference (Joseph et al. 2016). Here, Khalil Shariff (CEO of the Aga Khan Foundation Canada) and Hereditary Chief Robert Joseph of the Gwawa'enuk Nation and founder/President of Indigenous Corporate Training, Inc.[24], spoke with settler panel chair and provincial politician Melanie Mark in an opening plenary titled "Inequality, Pluralism & Reconciliation." Post-conference reflections by audience members situate this specific panel as an important moment in Canadian philanthropic history: one of the first times that sector leaders and

[24] A business that provides training to companies and organizations wishing to work meaningfully and effectively with Indigenous peoples, for example, offering courses and resources about colonialism or about Indigenous cultures, intended to dismantle racist stereotypes that often preclude settler institutional engagement with Indigenous communities.

organizations in a collective space were asked to think and listen critically about race, inequality, and reconciliation (e.g. Pearson 2016c; Witt 2017).

When asked to provide advice to the foundation community on how to act on "questions of inequality and reconciliation," Shariff's response followed a discursive pattern of spatial distancing. He stated:

> I suppose my advice would be really around the conceptual mindset that we adopt. I think any human context is changing, right? It's always dynamic. And there are always forces at play. I think for philanthropic foundations, for social entrepreneurs, one of the fundamental questions is to be able to understand the forces at work in any situation and then to be able to identify the promising forces at play and the pernicious forces at play, because every society has both of those. Take any issue you're working on today, you will find forces of inclusion, for instance, [and] forces of exclusion. The challenge becomes when the pernicious forces at play overwhelm the promising ones. And frankly, we're seeing that in many parts of the world today. And I don't think Canada can be complacent, despite *Economist* cover stories, right? I don't think we can be complacent about it.

Shariff engaged here in what I see as a common discursive practice of spatial distancing in the reconciliation change narrative, referring to "pernicious forces" outweighing "promising ones" in many parts of the world, but not so much in Canada – which he described as a "pluralist society." He suggested that Canada and Canadian philanthropists cannot become complacent and ignore the possibility that something distant and "over there" could endanger the "promising forces" of pluralism "over here." Shariff's remarks hinted at a sense of precarity, and thus anxiety. The pernicious forces to which he points are a threat to Canada's identity as "pluralistic" – an identity that Shariff later indicated is characterized by fragility.

His comments suggested that the sense of precarity comes from an awareness that "pernicious forces" are always a threat to Canada. But the spatial distancing here may have been a response to

another kind of haunting, which reminds the audience not only that pluralism and inclusivity are precarious and fragile, but that Canada maybe is not as inclusive and pluralistic as Canadians like to imagine. In the Canadian context, hauntings can "give the lie," as affect theorist Ann Cvetkovich writes, to the idea that Canadians are "kinder, gentler, nicer, or more polite" than Americans, and that they are somehow less (or not) implicated in the ongoing, transfigured life of racism and coloniality as Americans are (in Berlant et al. 2022, p. 370). The spatial distancing may have been triggered by Chief Joseph's remarks that immediately preceded Shariff's answer. At first, Joseph began with a version of temporal distancing, indicating that "we're not the same Canadians we were fifty years ago," and that settler-Indigenous interactions have improved over time. But then, he warned the audience with a rhetorical question: "Have we learned enough? Have we overcome of some of those -isms, so that we could prevent hurting each other?" Although Chief Joseph noted his sense and experience that things seemed to have improved, he also urged settlers to consider that there is more work to be done: "the future, whatever it is, involves all of us acknowledging our part in society." Shariff's subsequent remarks in turn positioned present-day inequality, colonialism and racism – the "isms" that Joseph was asking about – as "over there," away from and outside of Canada, but always lurking. The settler foundation community, haunted by this lurking presence, was then encouraged to strengthen Canadian pluralism, support inclusion and engage in reconciliation in order to prevent the pernicious forces from coming "over here." Racialized colonial violence and inequality as a living and lived reality – and as a founding, structural characteristic of Canadian settler society and of settler philanthropy – are left unsaid. In this way, settler philanthropy is absolved of responsibility to check on how structures of colonial violence may persist in organizational practices and at times in the funding relationships that settler foundations engage in.

Joseph's and Shariff's conversation, which according to later reflections from audience members, "set the tone" for the remainder of the conference, presented an interesting example of some of the dissonance at the heart the reconciliation change narrative. Especially in the earlier years of reconciliation discourse, many speakers in this archive engaged in subtle forms of distancing. Chief Joseph's remarks to the audience embodied these tensions. At one point in the talk, he told the audience that the priority was for the leaders in the room and in the sector more widely to work to "embrace each other, to nurture each other, to create understanding with each other." Doing so, he suggested, would first require an understanding of the ways colonialism and racism distance people from one another. The possibility of creating nurturing and reciprocal relationships in "all of our difference," he suggested, hinged first on breaking down those divides. Where racism is allowed to flourish, the result is "so much more brokenness and despair and even violence." After rhetorically asking whether racism and inequality had really been fully exorcised in the Canadian present, Joseph told foundations leaders in the room that the reconciliation "moment" had called them to a "significant shift in the funding approach of philanthropic foundations." The recording does not go past this call to action to indicate how exactly he would have defined this shift, but his reflections, and Shariff's, carry weight and demonstrate some of the dissonant outcomes of haunting in the reconciliation change narrative.

Hauntings are "relentless," as Ghaddar (2016) writes; settlers in philanthropy are haunted by the thought that racism and coloniality are not just something "over there," or something that happens in isolated and unwanted incidents, but are both structural and durable in Canada today. Such hauntings can lead to closures in the form of spatial distancing, through which settlers may be called to action but are not necessarily required to reflect on their own place in the living and durable structures of coloniality. Rather, they are asked to imagine themselves or their

organizations as powerful outside forces who can keep the "pernicious forces" that exist somewhere else from creeping into Canada. Vague, distant and threatening, the colonial spectre is characterized in this narrative as something outside of settler philanthropy and something to which settlers in philanthropy must respond while real, concrete colonial power dynamics at play in settler philanthropy practices and institutions, and Canadian social life are left obscured. Vimalassery *et al.*'s colonial unknowing occurs through things left unsaid: settler individuals, settler philanthropy organizations, and the settler philanthropy ecosystem are absolved of complicity and responsibility in the colonial present because the colonial present is not acknowledged. Although settlers talk about transformation, the colonial status quo remains untouched and unspoken. In these ways, as Daniel Heath Justice (2018) explains, colonial recognition and unknowing together lead to an implicit denial of complicity and in turn, "not coincidentally, absolve the settler population" (p. 4). Evading discussions of settlers' complicity in ongoing colonial violence functions to excuse and exempt settlers in philanthropy and their organizations from more difficult and radical work.

Further, distancing can result in the reification of mythologies of Canadian national identity as commonsense. As Adam Saifer writes in his critique of national mythologies at work in the institutional settler philanthropy sector, "The discursive truths of the exceptional Canada," which I see to be constantly at work in dominant expressions of the reconciliation change narrative, "justify and maintain violent systems of oppression directed toward historically marginalized populations" (2019, p. 99) – and settler philanthropy at times play key roles in those processes. The commonsense-ness of a Canadian settler society in the present is stabilized through a focus on warding off the spectres of the past, or of elsewhere, to work toward a future in which settlers and Indigenous peoples are "reconciled," but on settler terms. Making both settlerness and coloniality a

spectre in the Canadian present – leaving things unsaid – maintains colonial power relations within the settler philanthropy sphere firmly in place.

4.2 – Conceptual distancing

One other form of distancing that I see occurring across this archive is conceptual. Typically in this formation, the audience is encouraged to reflect on the existence of mostly unnamed and unwanted negative forces that exist outside of themselves and their organizations, and to avoid complacency in order to evade the undesirable situations these forces present. Not only are coloniality, racism and inequality omitted from such narratives; their discursive alternatives are inscribed as a "force" that somehow exists and operates outside of specific human action, and indeed outside of the settler philanthropy sphere. Conceptual distancing occurs often by discussing colonialism as something that is nebulous, a system or force that exists somewhere else and without a human source, rather than as something personal, persistent, and human-made – something people live, breathe, reproduce and experience through everyday life and in organizational operations and productions. Like inscriptions of colonialism as a historical legacy that haunts, discourses about colonialism as an unnamed force allow for settlers in philanthropy to conceptualize racism, inequality, coloniality, as things that are of interest but that exist outside of their sector, rather than realities and structures that are built into it, operating constantly through and in it. Coloniality's durable presence is in this formation thus hidden in plain sight.

Use of the passive voice is one common way I see conceptual distancing occurring across the archive I have assembled. Producers of texts across this archive often arrange statements about coloniality in a way that positions it as something that happened (or sometimes happens) to someone else; but the cause of what happened is often markedly absent. As summarized in the previous chapter, the preface to *the Declaration* described Indigenous peoples who shared their

testimony during the TRC hearings as having been "previously silenced…had not been heard, listened to, or believed." Their testimony according to the *Declaration* was critical to healing in "the lives of those affected across generations." This language framed residential schools, which Indigenous scholars have discussed as essential spaces of colonial violence in Canada, as an experience of the survivors whose voices have historically been ignored (The Circle 2015). But neither the architects and perpetrators of residential schools in Canada, nor the philanthropists who supported their existence, nor those who benefitted and continue to benefit from the forcible removal of Indigenous children from their homes, were included in the picture. The identities of those who have not listened to or believed the survivors' stories were also not indicated. Residential schools and systems of colonization were things that "happened to" other people, but their producers, perpetrators, beneficiaries are not identified.

This kind of conceptual distancing, likely a subconscious act by authors, has important discursive functions and is common across articulations of the reconciliation change narrative expressed in this archive of texts. What goes unsaid via the passive voice is an unspoken assumption that coloniality, racism, violence, oppression, etc. are forces and systems without human sources. They become disentangled and dissociated from historical and ongoing human decisions, discourses, actions, and policies in the settler state generally, and by extension in the settler philanthropy world. The settler in this configuration is haunted both by the holdovers and legacies of systems from the past (from which they are temporally distanced), as well as by the harmful forces and trauma "experienced by" survivors and their descendants in the present (from which they are conceptually distanced). Readers and signatories are asked to reflect on, be aware of, and even at times challenge these nebulous forces presented to them. But they are not implicated as actors with clear roles and stakes in the production of those forces, which are human generated. In this way,

while the passive voice renders coloniality and racism unspoken or else vague and external, so too in turn does it preclude discussion of specific actions that signatories and other settler philanthropists/organizations ought to do in order to enact their commitment upon signing.

Another, more subtle, example of conceptual distancing occurred during the inaugural episode of a podcast hosted by *The Philanthropist*, broadcast in June 2022. Here, Ontario senator Ratna Omidvar, a key figure in lobbying for changes to Canadian charity polices–especially those policies that enable systemic barriers to marginalized charitable organizations and communities–chaired the webinar discussion with panelists Kris Archie and Edgar Villanueva, author of *Decolonizing Wealth* and co-founder of Liberated Capital. The podcast focused on "a big question that looms over the philanthropic sector," namely: "what reparative change in the sector should look like." The panelists talked about "how organizations can take part in real wealth redistribution, shift power directly back to communities, and move 'reconciliation rhetoric' forward into these actions of reciprocity." The overarching question guiding the conversation was, "if accumulated wealth comes from years of oppression, exploitation, and colonization, then is philanthropy simply an expression of atonement at best or a cover-up at worst?" The framing of this question reflected a significant discursive shift from the earlier conversations discussed above. The question explicitly refused the dominant framing of reconciliation by centring the present-ness of colonization, and positioning coloniality as a fundamental reason for Canadian philanthropy's existence and a reality to which Canadian philanthropists and philanthropic organizations must respond.

At one point in the podcast, though, Omidvar asked of Archie, "settler colonialism is very much part of our everyday life; can you tell me how settler colonialism gets in the way of settler

philanthropy, and obstructs the kind of work and impact that you've been talking about?" The question, framed as it was, was a subtle and likely unintentional shift from the overarching focus of the podcast dialogue. At its outset it described coloniality as inseparable from everyday life in Canada, and in the second part of the question coloniality was described as "getting in the way of" meaningful reparative philanthropic action – obstructing the kinds of justice-oriented work with which Archie and Villanueva are concerned. Yet simultaneously, the question subtly decoupled the settler philanthropy sector from the presentness and pervasiveness of coloniality. "Getting in the way of" certain kinds of philanthropic work may unintentionally imply that, though it is not without its unwanted effects, coloniality in fact exists "outside of" settler philanthropy and, external to it, affects the workings of settler philanthropy. In this configuration settler philanthropists and philanthropic organizations are urged to be aware of contemporary forces/systems of coloniality and oppression, in order to respond to and ward them off – but they are subtly positioned as standing outside of those forces and systems.

Archie's response to the question was telling. She began by explaining why, several years ago, The Circle largely abandoned the "rhetoric of reconciliation" and instead adopted language of reparations and reciprocity. She described a program the Circle hosts that embodies the differences amongst these concepts. Partners in Reciprocity (PiR) is, as she described it, a "thoughtfully designed peer learning program dedicated to supporting philanthropic teams in the reorientation toward equity and justice." Participants primarily include settlers in small teams from settler philanthropy organizations, who commit to a year-long program consisting of monthly peer learning sessions with pre-readings and personal reflection. Archie explained that the work focuses on coming to terms with how individual participants and the philanthropy organizations they represent "uphold white supremacy and other harms of systemic oppressions" in their daily work

and operations. The aim is to think and plan strategically around how to "shift power, practice and policy" when participants return to their organizations, and thus to engage meaningfully in equity- and justice-focused work. Archie described one reflective activity during PiR sessions in which participants are asked to list the top three mindsets or practices that they see upholding white supremacy, colonial power dynamics, and systemic oppressions in their own workplaces and in the sector. She described several examples that settler participants frequently name, including organizational overreliance on written documents, or the drive to become "experts" on issues before acting on them – resulting in a tendency for philanthropic resources to be expended on organizational research and learning rather than on supporting Indigenous-led initiatives. The PiR sessions are an opportunity, she concluded, for settlers to reflect on the ways in which they see themselves contributing to colonial harms, racism and white supremacy in their organizations and wider field of philanthropy in Canada.

Her response exemplified some of the reflections of Indigenous critics of reconciliation in this archive– that Indigenous peoples experience and identify racism, coloniality and oppression not as things that exist outside of Canadian philanthropy and acting upon it from the outside, but as ongoing realities in their everyday interactions with settlers in the sector and outside of it (Formsma 2013; Nadia Joe in Lawson et al. 2016; Dupré 2018). They understand coloniality and racism as products of human decisions, speech and action, built into the daily work of settlers who work in the philanthropy ecosystem and indeed into to the very ecosystem of Canadian philanthropy itself. The response thus situates coloniality not as a nebulous force, a thing of the past, or a thing "over there." Rather, it is something inside of and indeed fundamental to the settler philanthropy sector, as they have experienced it in their professional and personal lives. This then is an implicit refusal of the rhetorical act of conceptual distancing that is prevalent across many of

the texts I have analyzed. Conceptual distancing recognizes coloniality in the present and positions settlers and settler philanthropy organizations as key actors in providing solutions, but without necessarily demanding from them the radical work of naming and dismantling ongoing practices of domination, subtle and overt, in their institutions and daily work. This form of colonial unknowing thus becomes key to what Tuck and Yang (2012) call “settler moves to innocence”: characterized by the use of language that absolves the settler of “past evils” and allows them to voice their disdain for the local and unwanted “incidents” and forces from which they themselves are discursively separated.

Alternatively, in some articulations of the reconciliation change narrative, Indigenous authors across this archive introduce a strain of dissonance that counters spatial, temporal, and conceptual distancing. The past is not past, they argue, but ongoing. A “reconciled” future where colonial structures remain in place and concealed, is not one that is either possible or desirable. Compare the above examples to commentary of critics several years later, who suggest that Canadian institutional philanthropy does not exist outside of racism and coloniality, but is deeply and structurally implicated in them. Board members of the Circle wrote in 2020 that “Philanthropy is seen by many Indigenous communities as a return of value – in a somewhat diminished form – of what was previously taken” (Couchman et al. 2020, p. 138). This is because as discussed in Chapter 1, any wealth and power accumulation in Canada “depends on the impoverishment of Indigenous peoples and domination of their lands” (Yellowhead Institute 2021, p. 5). Thus, philanthropic actors working in all areas of social life – whether working in the areas of health, inequality, poverty, arts, music, animal welfare, climate change and environment, or political advocacy – can (and should) adopt philosophies and practices that expose and refuse colonial

domination, and that challenge it in wider society (Villanueva 2018; Jamieson 2020; Vavek *et al.* 2022; Bahubeshi 2017).

Across this archive of texts, some critical authors urge individuals in settler philanthropy to shift their perspectives to see themselves and their organizations as beneficiaries of colonial violence and white supremacy – which exist in Canada now as much as anywhere else. In a series of live graphic recordings of sessions at the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit in June 2020, co-hosted by the Circle, a diverse group of leaders of colour in the sector, Indigenous sector leaders and activists explained the deep intersections between anti-Black racism and coloniality in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector, and discussed critical ways to expose and dismantle them (Tune and Contreras Correal 2020; Buchholz, Dean-Coffey, *et al.* 2020; Jung, Archie, Senior, *et al.* 2020; Buchholz, Bolduc, *et al.* 2020). Similarly, Laidlaw Foundation Board Chair Janine Manning wrote in *The Philanthropist*, "philanthropy is deeply entrenched in colonialism… [foundations] wouldn't have gotten their start without access to free or cheap land, from which Indigenous people were displaced" (2021). She called on those settler philanthropy organizations interested in reconciliation to ensure they do not "remove themselves from any equation" when considering the "harms that have come to Indigenous people." These remarks articulated a central premise of this thesis: that the settler philanthropy ecosystem is structurally imbricated in the larger field of durable colonial relations, institutions, policies and frameworks that together form and uphold the Canadian state. Manning urged settlers in philanthropy to boldly face this truth, this haunting. These examples suggest that the more radical possibilities for thinking reconciliation "otherwise" must start there. Doing so is a refusal of the comforting effects of discursive distancing, presenting "unruly ruptures" to the colonial unknowing entrenched in

dominant articulations of reconciliation, with their "linear push to forget and move forward" as Penelope Edmonds writes (2016, p. 11).

One example of the potential material implications of boldly facing hauntings was articulated by Tim Fox, a Niitsitaapi sector leader, and the Vice President of Indigenous Relations and Equity at the Calgary Foundation (a community foundation for the present-day city of Calgary). The organization since 2017 has been working to shift its relations with Indigenous communities by beginning with the challenging process of facing its own colonial hauntings boldly, at all levels of the organization. Fox has described the Foundation's reconciliation journey as one focused on naming and then overturning white supremacy and coloniality in everyday organizational practices, engaging meaningfully and abundantly with Indigenous peoples, initiatives, and organizations, and building structures and policies of reciprocity that advance long-term relations. In one article, he noted that the Foundation has been working since it signed the *Declaration* to "incorporate context and deep-rooted understanding" of coloniality and white supremacy amongst all its staff, leadership and governance; not just those individuals who work directly with Indigenous communities (MacDonald and Fox 2021).

This work has in turn informed organizational efforts to put "the decision-making power back into the hands of the communities we serve" by establishing an Indigenous review panel for Indigenous-focused grant applications, and by increasing the proportion of Indigenous reviewers for all other reviews for other types of grant applications. The Calgary Foundation embraced oral storytelling in its granting processes, accepting applications and reporting in the form of phone conversations, and video and audio recordings, rather than written documents. This option is available to all grantees and applicants (Sato and Dayal 2020). Fox noted that the organization's

journey "toward reconciliation and racial equity" has not been straightforward. The work, he explained, has been challenging and emergent, long-term and shaped by trial-and-error, rather than by any pre-determined deadline or outcome (MacDonald and Fox 2021). Like Fox, other critical authors in this archive imagine trust-based, reparative, and decolonial frameworks not so much as structured templates with clear instruction manuals that can be perfectly applied to every situation but rather as continuous and iterative shifts in practice, thought and relationships (Contreras Correal *et al.* 2020b).

The challenging work of facing hauntings, of "daylighting realities that exist in the shadows" of the sector, as speakers at one session of the Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit put it (Contreras Correal *et al.* 2020a), can lead to decolonial and reparative practices like those explored in the final sections of Chapter 1, such as those envisioned by Edgar Villanueva (2018) and Wrobel and Massey (2021). As such authors argue, the "concrete structural reform" that reparative and decolonial philanthropic practices aim to effect are predicated on shifts in power dynamics which begin with leaders in philanthropy "embrac[ing] previously unthinkable levels of intellectual humility" (Wrobel and Massey 2021, p. xxii, p. 69). Drawing such alternative possibilities for philanthropy explicitly into discussions of decoloniality, Indigenous critics in this archive refuse colonial structures of domination and move beyond the performative and conciliatory rhetoric of the reconciliation change narrative toward reparative and decolonial models for philanthropy. These alternatives push to destabilize settler normalcy through explicit acts of settler de-centring, through decolonial and reparative philosophies and practices, and by harnessing trust-based and participatory practices toward the advancement of reciprocal relationships, Indigenous self-determination and decolonial futures.

4.3 – Omission and renaming

In addition to temporal, spatial and conceptual distancing, I also have identified a pattern of omission and renaming across much of the text in the archive. Omission is a discursive technique whereby racism, coloniality and settlerness are left out of the reconciliation change narrative – and out of adjacent conversations about equality, diversity and inclusion – altogether. Renaming is a related discursive process whereby coloniality and racism in the present are reframed in a way that draws attention away from their presence. Some examples I have drawn from across the archive of texts follow.

The work of omission frequently occurs in this archive in discussions of diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI), which are positioned as critical to the pursuit of reconciliation. A lack of Indigenous representation in the sector is a frequent point of discussion in this archive, especially in the early years. In 2018, PFC commissioned a study surveying its member foundations on their policies and practices with respect to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) (PFC 2019a). Released in January 2019, the survey results (from 37 respondents, mostly chief executive officers and executive directors or board chairs from private foundations varying in size, geography, and structure) indicated first, that most foundations were governed and led primarily by white men and women who did not identify with the diversity markers provided in the survey, and second, that in 2018 most foundations did not have formal DEI-related policies. Later that same year, the organization released a practice guide for foundations. The guide introduced the case for implementing DEI in private foundations by indicating that Canadian society, and the communities settler philanthropy organizations serve, are "becoming increasingly diverse" (PFC 2019b). The publication noted that philanthropy has an important role in ensuring "those who have been historically excluded – women, people of color, people with disabilities, and the LGBTQ

community – are at the decision-making table and reflected in our portfolios" thus signaling to readers that inequality and exclusion intersect with race, gender, ability and sexuality (p. 2).

Throughout the text, though, racism, sexism, colonialism, and whiteness and settlerness are never explicitly named. Philanthropy organizations are described as primarily populated by "mostly majority-group members" (p. 6). Readers of these texts are thus left to assume what it means to be part of the "majority group" and what "notably undiversified" means, when settlerness and whiteness in all their intersectionality are explicitly left out of the frame of reference. That settlers (that is – primarily white, able-bodied, cisgender, heterosexual settlers) control most of the decisions, resources, positions of leadership, and power in many settler philanthropy spaces goes unsaid. As a result of this omission, settler consumers of these texts are not explicitly required to reflect on their own power, positionality and privilege, which derive from their settlerness, as potential parts of the problem identified. Omissions of settlerness from the discussion thus has the effect of centring and normalizing settler colonial power relations within settler philanthropy organizations and beyond. Leaving racism, colonialism and settlerness unsaid, settler power and positionality remain uncompromised, even if settler philanthropy is encouraged to increase inclusion and diversity.

Compare the above texts with the critiques of some authors across this archive who have warned that where organizational efforts at diversity and inclusion do not involve explicit discussions of systemic racism, white supremacy and coloniality, it can lead to the reproduction of violence. First, critics note that inclusivity and diversity efforts in the form of community partnerships and staff representation can lead to institutional extractions of Indigenous and racialized people's time, energy, knowledge and work. Lindsay Dupré wrote and spoke frequently of this experience,

explaining that Indigenous people in the sector often experience inclusivity as exploitation (see, e.g. Dupré in Bahubeshi et al. 2018; Dupré 2018; Dupré 2019). Extraction disguised as inclusivity, she argued, ultimately just serves to support "the image of different organizations" (Dupré 2018). Similarly, Nneka Allen, who identifies as an Afro-Indigenous charity consultant and who has worked for decades in various roles in the sector, described the steep "emotional tax" of being the "first" or the "only" person of colour in the room in a 2020 blog post for Imagine Canada.[25] The paradox of working in a sector committed to "to provid[ing] relief, creat[ing] opportunities, giv[ing] access, and ultimately lov[ing] humanity," she wrote, is that she has often suffered "exclusion and marginalization" within her work (Allen 2020). In "homogenous" spaces working to increase diversity, she wrote, the burdens offloaded onto racialized leaders often lead them to flee the sector altogether (see also Gebremikael 2021; Kim 2020).

Sometimes DEI can translate to the devolution of responsibility for the organization's reconciliation or DEI journey on Indigenous partners, staff and volunteers. Janine Manning stated that many organizations in the sector were "very keen on jumping on the diversity journey," but that the work should not begin or end with hiring. "It's exhausting," she explained, when in addition to core work, "we're [Indigenous people are] also expected to be equity, diversity, and inclusion experts" and also to speak on behalf of all Indigenous peoples (Manning and Morrisseau 2021). Similarly, in a 2017 webinar hosted by the Circle, Tanvi Bhatia, who identifies as a migrant settler and community organizer living in the unceded territories of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations (present-day Vancouver) and has worked in social justice and migrant rights organizations for over a decade, described some diversity hiring as "trivializing" and tokenizing. It could, she and her co-speakers warned the audience, lead settler philanthropy organizations to

[25] Allen is also an editor of *Collecting Courage,* a collection of essays and reflections that articulate the experiences of People of Colour in nonprofit, fundraising and philanthropy in Canada. (See Allen et. al. 2021).

assume that the recruited person should "speak for the whole community" and not be able to share other forms of expertise beyond that associated with whatever "diverse" aspect of their identity the organization wanted them for (Bhatia in Bahubeshi et al. 2017). Such critiques suggest that while settler philanthropy organizations may benefit from pursuing inclusivity (because it increases their impact and viability), organizational extractivism ultimately can maintain durable colonial and racist dynamics.

Some critics also note that inclusion and diversity ideals common to the reconciliation change narrative can function as a distraction from transforming dominant structures, policies and practices at work in much of the settler philanthropy sector. In the same 2017 webinar, Rudayna Bahubeshi, then the Communications Manager at the Inspirit Foundation, emphasized the need for structural shifts "beyond representation" (Bahubeshi et al. 2017). In a 2018 conference session, she told foundation leaders that there was a need "for some pretty radical changes" to address "our urgent problems," which "aren't going to be solved by representation and diversity in our organizations while the other ways of working stay mostly the same" (in Bahubeshi et al. 2018). Roberta Jamieson similarly wrote in 2020 that reconciliation and inclusion needed to go beyond representation to meaningful and deep change. "When our people talk about reconciliation, we are talking about structural and systemic change. We are not talking about wanting a seat at your table. We want to build an entirely new table," she wrote (Jamieson 2020, p. 163). Simply increasing inclusion in organizations or within "the broader society" without exposing and shifting structures was experienced by some Indigenous peoples, she charged, was a form of assimilation.

These critiques point to omission in reconciliation discourse and practice as a means of "stabiliz[ing] white supremacy by transforming its mode of articulation," as critical theorist Sunera

Thobani puts it (2007, p. 146). Colonial unknowing and colonial recognition are deeply entangled in the discursive work of omission. Institutional commitments to increase inclusivity can be means to rescue settler normalcy through representational optics, without meaningfully addressing systemic issues of power and coloniality. Thus, omission produces an important point of dissonance in the reconciliation change narrative: by keeping settler power and privilege out of the conversation, colonial recognitions of a lack of diversity can rescue settler identities and stability in the sector. Saifer and Ahmad (2023) argue that the "recent enthusiasm" for diversity, equity, and inclusion policies" in settler philanthropic institutions emphasize "representational politics" over systemic change (organizationally, sectorally, societally) which in turn affirm the institutional importance of philanthropic organizations "as a force for social change" (pp. 3-6). As such, the key stakeholder and beneficiary of colonial recognition in the reconciliation change narrative becomes the settler Canadian working in and for the sector who, through their inclusive work, can demonstrate their organization's and sector's legitimacy.

Indigenous authors repeatedly explain therefore that inclusivity efforts must be paired with intentional efforts on the parts of settlers to "do their own homework" – engaging in necessary learning without taxing their colleagues or the communities with whom they engage. They also ask settlers to explicitly attend to and address the ways white supremacy and coloniality persist through the distribution of professional power in organizations (Slater 2021; Manning and Morrisseau 2021). For example, Manning (2021) noted that older white men who work in the sector often have "more time, freedom and mobility" to build professional networks, to engage in professional development opportunities, or to otherwise advance their careers, than do Indigenous single mothers, family carers and community-engaged people. For many Indigenous women in the sector (including herself), she explained, the opportunities to advance into leadership positions are

unavailable because settler philanthropic institutions usually do not value the unpaid labour of caretaking and fulfilling community obligations. Meanwhile, organizations burden Indigenous and racialized employees with the expectation that they will guide settler colleagues through the organizational journey of reconciliation and diversity, but do not value or remunerate that labour.

Increasing representation without intentional and long-term structural shifts, according to this critique, leaves colonial power dynamics in place and ultimately leads to the application of the "same old" solutions to issues that are far more deeply rooted than representational politics can address. DEI efforts for reconciliation can thus engage in the co-constitutive dynamics of recognition and unknowing. While these policies and efforts recognize a lack of diversity in the settler philanthropy world, they also engage in the processes of colonial unknowing by keeping the durable structures that produced that lack of diversity in place and unremarked. By "adding Indigenous and stirring," critiques argue, inclusion and diversity thus risk becoming means of rescuing settler normalcy rather than advancing political and cultural shifts, in sector practice and wider society. Thus, while Indigenous authors express concern about a lack of inclusion and diversity in the sector, they also argue that philanthropy must disrupt mainstream DEI rhetoric and practices. Critics of the politics of inclusion argue that DEI efforts must coincide with the challenging work of naming and de-centring settler dominance and extractivism. Couchman et al. (2020) note that "disruption" of such cultural norms in institutional practice "allows new possibilities for relationship" to develop (p. 141).

4.3.1 – Renaming as omission

At times, racism and colonial violence are also omitted from the reconciliation change narrative through the discursive act of renaming: the use of neutral and indirect language that has the effect

of shifting audience attention from racism, coloniality, and ongoing violence within settler philanthropy and Canadian society, toward more palatable concepts like tensions and unequal opportunities. This is a similar process to conceptual distancing. For example, where inequality enters reconciliation discussions, race, racism and colonialism are often omitted from the narrative. Authors and speakers often frame inequality rather in terms of missed or lacking opportunities.

In the closing plenary session at PFC's 2016 biennial conference in 2016, "Changing the Frame: Inequality and the Creation of Opportunity," panel moderator Janet Austen, then the CEO of the Vancouver YWCA, introduced the topic by explicitly acknowledging "factors like ancestry, class, gender, race and ethnicity, [and] access to education" to be critical to the discussion of inequality in Canada (Austen *et al.* 2016). Immediately after her introduction, the first speaker, Kevin McCort, President and CEO of the Vancouver Foundation, shifted the discursive frame of analysis by removing those "factors" from the conversation about inequality – first by discussing inequality as something experienced primarily in the developing world, that Canadian philanthropy has a responsibility to "go out" to eliminate (a suggestion that generated enthusiastic applause from audience members), and then by referring to inequality in terms of lacking opportunities and unequal access to wealth. He explained, "We've heard about the residential school system, which was designed for particular outcomes, and we need to think about the systems that we're in today" and urged the audience to "recognize you're in systems that generate inequality of outcomes, inequality of opportunity." He pointed to the need for increasing inclusion, diversifying the voices of those making decisions about philanthropic activities to include "those that are being disadvantaged by a system" where "opportunities" are not available in equal measure to all.

Speaking vaguely of opportunities, systems, and a lack of diversity in these ways has the effect of removing racism, settlerness and whiteness from the conceptual frame. The settler audience is not asked to reflect on their settlerness – the ways in which their own positions of power and privilege are integral parts of the very "systems that generate inequality of outcomes." Inequality is disentangled from historical and contemporary processes of racialized coloniality that are alive and well in the settler philanthropy ecosystem and more broadly in Canadian society. As scholars of racial capitalism and colonialism have argued, framing inequality in terms of opportunity has the effect of de-racializing inequality in the colonial state. This framing extracts the fundamentally colonial and racist origins, underpinnings and outcomes of inequality from the discussion (e.g. Coulthard and Epstein 2015; Koshy et al. 2022; Yellowhead Institute 2021). "In Canada, silence is violence," speakers at the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit in June 2020 told philanthropy leaders (Jung, Archie, Senior, *et al.* 2020). This discursive practice of renaming keeps racism and colonial power firmly in place by making it harder to see.

McCort's co-panelist Kavita Ramdas from the Ford Foundation followed McCort's comments with a challenge to audience members to refuse these kinds of silences. She indicated that "we [in the settler philanthropy world] understand inequality from the position of great privilege…And our system as it currently exists, even the structures of our philanthropic organizations, tend to default to what we are used to. And so, who we surround ourselves with, who are the program officers, who are the decision-makers on our boards? They do not tend to be the people from the communities that we are trying to serve" (in Austen et al. 2016). Later, she indicated that this lack of representation is built into the foundations of the settler philanthropy sector, stating that "philanthropy…has emerged out of some level of inequality" and that "until we're able to actually look at ourselves and say, 'no, we're actually just perpetuating a system of privilege within our own

institutions,' and until we change that around, we will be in a very poor position to actually try to be doing this to other people [elsewhere in the world]." Ramdas' indirect challenge to McCort and to the audience suggested that inequality is not a system that exists outside of the settler philanthropy sector – but that it is fundamentally tied up with racialized identities and settler privilege, just as philanthropy itself is.

Her response aligns with the arguments of authors on trust-based and radical philanthropies discussed in Chapter 1, who suggest that philanthropic responses to poverty, inequality and other social issues require radical attention to the "history and political–economic context of the region, the role of the colonisers in shaping it and its ongoing implications" (Herro and Obeng-Odoom 2019, p. 885). Some Indigenous authors across the archive I assembled make similar arguments. In an interview between Justin Wiebe, who is a Métis program officer at the MasterCard Foundation[26], and Edgar Villanueva in 2018, Villanueva urged philanthropy leaders to historicize and racialize all the issues their organizations seek to address. In this way, he and Wiebe implied that racism and coloniality are neither things of the past nor things over there, but present and structural realities in Canada and across North America. Villanueva explained that "taking the time to understand how [dominant colonial and racist] systems" are at the heart of many socioeconomic disparities is key to more effective philanthropic decision-making. He argued therefore that inclusivity and the pursuit of "equal opportunities" are not adequate responses, since they do not account for these more challenging questions. On the contrary, he stated, reparations and equity

[26] Specifically, he is the lead on MasterCard Foundation's EleV Program, which focuses on funding Indigenous-led programs in Canada that aim to improve education and employment outcomes for Indigenous youth. The program is unique among others at the MasterCard Foundation because it explicitly embraces trust-based practices and deep relationship building with Indigenous communities in an effort to shift funder-grantee relations and organizational practices. See Campbell and Wiebe (2021) and Brennan and Kwofie (2021).

must be the focus. His reflections suggested to settlers in philanthropy that boldly facing colonial hauntings can lead to these more challenging, and more generative, possibilities.

For these reasons, Indigenous critics argue that attention to the intersections of racism, coloniality and inequality requires listening "for the wisdom of Indigenous peoples" with lived experience. Reparations and equity-focused work on the part of settler organizations requires a commitment to supporting Indigenous efforts of self-determination when addressing these things. To avoid replicating and maintaining the status quo, then, the priority must be placed on supporting Indigenous self-determination, "strengthening Indigenous-led organizations and funding the solutions developed close to the ground and in Indigenous communities" (Couchman et al. 2020, p. 151-152). Indigenous writers emphasize that settler philanthropy organizations need to demonstrate respect and trust in the ability of Indigenous communities and organizations to address issues and lead in solutions themselves. The approach of funding Indigenous-designed and -led solutions must also shift the frame of reference away from deficit-focused or problem-based work to strength-based programming rooted in the wisdom and lived experiences of Indigenous peoples (Manning et al. 2018).

One other example of omissions and reframing from this archive of texts is worth discussing here. A well-attended plenary panel at PFC's 2018 Conference in Toronto, which I will discuss at greater length in the next chapter, included both settler and Indigenous leaders from the sector as speakers: Jon McPhedran Waitzer, Rudayna Bahubeshi, Lindsay Dupré and Hilary Pearson. I want to highlight it here as an important example of the ways in which racialized and Indigenous peoples in this archive openly invite hauntings, bringing to the fore "the living effects, seething and lingering, of what seems over and done with, the endings that are not over" (Gordon, 2008, p. 195). The

speakers in this panel did so by urging settlers to critically think about the present-ness of coloniality and racism, as they exist in the structures and systems regulating and supporting settler philanthropy, in settler organizations' daily practices, and in funding decisions. The session also demonstrated some of the subtle ways in which settlers at times respond to such hauntings with colonial unknowing, and the anxiety that they can produce.

The panelists invited settlers in the audience to face the haunting of their complicity in the colonial present. They urged settler philanthropy leaders to acknowledge that the source of most of the philanthropic wealth they controlled is the "massive historical theft" of Indigenous lands and resources, exploitations of Black and migrant people's labour, and economic and social policies that usually favour elite white men's interests over everyone else's (Bahubeshi et al. 2018). Colonial and racist economic inequalities (historical and ongoing), chair Jon McPhedran Waitzer told foundation leaders, are often framed as a justification for foundation philanthropy's existence, but they are also what makes its existence possible in the first place. Co-panelists urged the audience therefore to consider their complicity, and in turn shift the focus of their philanthropic efforts from expressions of generosity to the pursuit of justice.

Shortly after this initial haunting that the co-panelists invited, PFC CEO Hilary Pearson reframed the conversation. By highlighting the connections between philanthropy and inequality, she indicated, her co-panelists had identified an important paradox, one that should "be critiqued." However, she continued:

> One could also reframe it [i.e. the work of philanthropy] as from opportunity to opportunity. People who have created foundations have had opportunity; they may themselves have come from nothing. And they have been able to get something, they've had an opportunity to pull together resources for themselves and they have chosen–and I don't want to lose track of this in philanthropy–they have chosen to be generous,

> they have chosen to give it back in some way. And they have chosen in many cases to do it, because they want to create opportunity for others. So, 'from opportunity to opportunity': I think that's a framing of philanthropy that is as fair in its way, as 'from inequality to inequality', and perhaps more hopeful.

The focus here on those who have created foundations (and those who run them) as having received "opportunities" despite having themselves "come from nothing" reifies a common discursive practice in Canada that draws attention away from the racialized and colonial foundations of the "opportunities" to which Pearson refers. In this formulation, settlers who pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps and now can generously share their opportunities, so to speak, are implicitly compared to those who, presumably, have not. Yet what this framing leaves out is that the "opportunities" settlers in philanthropy enjoy have never been available equitably to racialized, Indigenous and other equity-seeking communities. Opportunities are in a way framed as something that "come to" some, but not to others. But the structures of white supremacy and coloniality that create those opportunities and their winners and losers in the first place are left out of the conversation.

The focus on opportunities shifted then to a focus on the generosity of those in the sector who had "chosen to give it [their resources and access to opportunity] back in some way." This reframing, Pearson stated, is just "as fair" as her co-panelists' critiques of institutional philanthropy that pointed to racialized and colonial inequalities, but, she concludes, perhaps more "hopeful." Pearson's concluding comments in the session went on to reframe the urgency with which Bahubeshi, Dupré and McPhedran Waitzer had presented their ideas. Their remarks – characterized by a sense of frustrated candour – were described as a reflection of youthful "impatience" which Pearson suggested the older generations in the room had "likely grown out of." She explained that it was justifiable for youth to be angry and impatient because "there's still such a huge set of things

that philanthropy has to do and has to address. It doesn't seem to ever get better." She continued, "But it does, actually: it does get better," and philanthropic interventions have been an important part of what make things "get better". What is required, Pearson suggested, is patience and a rearrangement of the focus from inequality to hope.

This reframing may have been Pearson's well-meaning attempt to assuage the discomfort of audience members (many of whom were leaders, governing members and founders of private foundations, which were particularly under scrutiny during the session) in the face of a truly "horrible yet irresistible" haunting produced by the other panelists' remarks. It may then have been a discursive strategy on the part of Pearson to preclude the possibility of alienating audience members from engaging with the topic at hand. But it also missed the point. McPhedran Waitzer, Bahubeshi and Dupré were not questioning whether philanthropists are generous. Rather, they were urging audience members to consider, as sociologist Susan Ostrander puts it, "the socially created organizational frameworks within which donors (and recipients) operate," including those that underpin their ability to act generously in the ways they do (2007b, p. 382). Taking a sociological and decolonial, rather than a moral, position to understandings of philanthropy allows us to see it as a social institution emerging from and within larger colonial infrastructures, where fraught and inequitable relations of power are constantly at play.

Bahubeshi responded to Pearson's reframing with an attempt to address by returning later to the term "impatience" and asking audience members to think rather in terms of urgency. "I think it's important to recognize," she said in response to Pearson's remarks, "it's more about urgency…there are some ways in which we've come far. Absolutely. And there are ways in which some issues are getting worse…this work is long and hard. And then also it is absolutely urgent."

Like Bahubeshi, other Indigenous and racialized authors across this archive of texts discuss the need for both patience and urgency, but in different ways than Pearson's version of the narrative of philanthropy allows. They frequently call for urgent action that takes the form of ample, long-term, flexible funding, as well as slow and genuine relationship-building with Indigenous communities, and patience on the part of funders looking for evidence of impact (e.g. Jamieson 2020; Archie 2021b). This interesting interaction pointed to the ways that omission and renaming in the reconciliation change narrative often leave racism, colonialism and settlerness unsaid – rendering them invisible in conversations about inequality, opportunities, and exclusion. The obfuscation maintains and conceals a disconnect between well-intentioned settlers in philanthropy and racialized coloniality, neutralizing and de-racializing settler philanthropy and the social issues it seeks to address. In these ways, the reconciliation change narrative may serve the function of obscuring and reifying systems and structures of violence.

My point here is not that I believe PFC organizationally or Pearson personally to be especially worthy of critique or that I consider them to be singular examples of "bad" versions of reconciliation (although I have referred to their publications frequently in this chapter). However, I do think that Pearson's professional positionality and leverage as the CEO of this organization – the main umbrella organization for private foundations in Canada – cannot be ignored. Pearson was a vocal leader in early conversations around reconciliation, a co-author and initial signatory of *The Declaration*, and she is frequently recorded speaking about reconciliation, DEI, inequality and other adjacent issues in PFC's resources. She and other PFC members discuss frequently in the archive how their exposure to reconciliation made them want to do philanthropy better, engaging with Indigenous peoples more respectfully and meaningfully. Her organization's role in drawing

sectoral attention to reconciliation and Indigenous-settler relations had powerful implications, as discussed at greater length in the previous chapter.

As a white settler in a position of power (the CEO of the organization hosting the conference), though, Pearson's reframing of the message of younger, racialized and less senior (in terms of positionality in the sector) co-panelists carried weight. The audience was likely primarily made up of people from the same or similar social location as Pearson: white, high-powered leaders of private foundations. Where Pearson's and PFC's communications embraced unknowing (in this example, in the form of omission/renaming), there was a danger that the message delivered was one that assuaged settler anxiety and discomfort in a moment of haunting that could have been generative, because it called into question settler privilege. Emphases on patience and hope, though likely unintentionally, functioned as a soft refusal of more challenging ideas about inequality, justice and violence presented earlier in the session. This then became a subtle example of the "deferral of responsibility" in the reconciliation paradigm that Smith, Tuck and Yang (2019) criticize, whereby settlers expect "digestible" versions of truth-telling that do not make them feel uncomfortable about their positionality and privilege.

Omissions and renaming, then, can result in refusals of more uncomfortable possibilities beyond including Indigenous peoples within settler philanthropy's structures and organizations as they stand. Here, again, is the dissonant work of the reconciliation change narrative. Through omission and renaming, as Winona LaDuke and Deborah Cowen (2020) put it, colonial durabilities remain both durable and concealed "despite, or even through [i.e. because of], talk of reconciliation" (p. 244). Exorcizing the haunting produced by a truth-telling, the discursive practices of omission and renaming allow colonial and racist structures and ways of thinking to "aggressively defend against

transformation" (Pedwell 2021, p. 74). Even while settlers in philanthropy are faced with hauntings of the present-ness of coloniality and white supremacy, their response to the anxiety such hauntings trigger can preclude radical possibilities with and beyond settler philanthropy and reconciliation. Yet there are alternative options, as Indigenous critics discussed above suggest. Explicit naming – boldly facing the hauntings – can lead to reparative practices and philanthropic relationships that de-centre settler normalcy and centre Indigenous sovereignties.

Conclusions

An October 2023 podcast aired by *The Philanthropist* brought together four Indigenous individuals working in or adjacent to the philanthropy sector to discuss the Circle's 2023 All My Relations Gathering (AMR) in June that year (McLellan *et al.* 2023). Like previous offerings of AMR, the gathering had invited Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders from the sector to focus on "reciprocity, accountability, curiosity, and abundance," with an aim to reframe power dynamics between Indigenous-led organizations and settler-led funders and "pave the way for transformation and collective change." At one point during the podcast, Justin Wiebe shared his reflections on the importance of a radical awareness of the structural nature of colonial power dynamics in the settler philanthropy world. This applies to Indigenous individuals working in positions of power as well, he said:

> I say this often to folks in philanthropy, and especially when I meet someone who's new coming into the philanthropic world. In no other place will someone laugh at your jokes as much – you know what I mean? Or like answer your emails, and when you start working for a funder, you have to be really conscious of that, because it can really go to your head, I think, that you're somehow more important, or your perspective is more valuable or something like that.

He continued by emphasizing that his participation at events by the Circle in recent years had helped him keep those dynamics in check. At the Circle, "I can be called…out…on how I've

maybe adopted too many settler philanthropic approaches, or how I've forgotten that I'm holding the lunch bag." His remarks pointed to the importance for individuals working in the sector, especially those who are committed to justice-oriented practice, or to trust-based, reparations-based, or reciprocal models of philanthropy, to hold themselves accountable, and be open and sensitive to others holding them to account. He described AMR as "a bit of a self-check," pushing him to constantly ask himself: "am I still in the right direction here? Have I lost my way?" Such reflections, he concluded, provide an opportunity to "reorient" and do better.

Wiebe's discussion eloquently pointed to the structural nature of colonial relations of power at work in settler philanthropy organizations – which can affect/infect anybody working in positions of power and therefore require constant, radical self-awareness and a willingness to receive critique. His discussion also implied how hauntings, appearing when those around us ask us to explicitly name the present-ness of coloniality and our complicity in it, can have dissonant outcomes. In my analysis, hauntings punctuate, question, and make visible the durabilities of colonial structures and systems both in the settler philanthropy world and more broadly, even as colonial unknowing can work to obscure them. As suggested by my interaction with adjudicators for the scholarship I described at the beginning of this chapter, hauntings can be deeply unsettling, and lead to closures and refusals. Throughout this chapter, I have demonstrated that through omission, renaming and distancing, critical things can remain unsaid in the reconciliation change narrative. At other times, as Wiebe's remarks above suggested, hauntings can force the possibility for something else, something that does not nurture or reify colonial status quos but rather leads to alternative ways of doing philanthropy.

The possibility that racialized coloniality "yield[s] new damages and renewed disparities" in the Canadian present, and in settlers' own practices in the settler philanthropy sector, generates anxiety (Stoler 2013, p. 7). In turn, through distancing, omission and renaming, the settler is rewritten as a spectre of the past, racism and coloniality as something "over there" that haunts the present in the form of impacts, legacies and negative forces that are never far enough away – and therefore as something of which settler philanthropy must be aware and against which it must work. The colonial spectre haunts an imagined future toward which settler philanthropy actors in dominant strains of the reconciliation change narrative are encouraged to work. The narrative positions the settler philanthropy sector as central in addressing impacts and legacies and warding off unwanted forces in order to build "a fairer and more just country" and a "stronger and more inclusive Canada," to use the language of *The Declaration*. Yet while embracing a change narrative that is fundamentally about transformation, engagement in distancing, omission and renaming absolves settlers in philanthropy from the responsibility to really think critically about what transformation means.

This tendency to disappear and spectralize ongoing colonial and racist violence in the practices and discourses of settler philanthropy, and in Canada generally, has important outcomes. When settlers in philanthropy are haunted by an awareness of the "present-ness" of coloniality and white supremacy in Canada and in settler philanthropy, especially when they begin to engage with Indigenous leaders and communities in their reconciliation work, such hauntings can lead to closures. While at times hauntings can lead to transformed ways of doing in the settler philanthropy world, settlers often distance themselves from the spectres that haunt through discursive and affective expressions absolving settler Canadians of guilt ("racism is real, colonialism is real – but

not here, not anymore, and not us!”). This is the key point of dissonance that I see at the heart of the reconciliation change narrative as expressed in this diverse archive of texts.

However, some Indigenous authors across the archive of texts I have assembled also argue that facing hauntings boldly – in all their “horrible yet irresistible” shapes – can be a critical step toward challenging colonial dynamics in philanthropic practice. Reparations and reciprocity, these authors argue, must be preceded with active and continual efforts to expose the present-ness of colonial relations of violence and domination. This includes the ways in which such relations underpin and maintain institutional settler philanthropy’s very existence, and persist in its practices and policies. Such critiques offer a dissonant alternative to dominant strains of reconciliation. They are critical refusals of colonial unknowing, focused on the generative possibilities explicitly decentring whiteness, embracing discomfort, refusing silence and making use of discomfort in the face of colonial spectres.

In the next chapter, I analyze a central motif in the reconciliation dynamic that I have identified in this archive of texts: that of the settler’s learning journey toward advancing reconciliation. I explore different versions of the settler learning journey as articulated across the archive, highlighting their deep emotional inflections and potential material outcomes in the settler philanthropy sector. I also discuss possibilities of “truth telling” and de-centring, which are advanced as decolonial and feminist critiques of grand gesture reconciliation in some critical texts across this archive.

Chapter 5 – Settlers on a journey

Introduction

This chapter focuses on a common motif I have identified across the texts I analyze: that of the settler (or settler organization, or the settler philanthropy sector more broadly) embarking on a journey of learning and self-transformation in the name of reconciliation. As I will discuss below, the reconciliation journey is imagined to hinge on settlers learning about the history and current landscape of settler-Indigenous relations, listening to Indigenous peoples' voices and experiences, and including Indigenous peoples more actively in philanthropic activities and policies. Echoing the language of the TRC and the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* (*the Declaration)* reconciliation itself is often referenced across texts in this archive as a journey – or as a destination on a long journey. The settler's journey of personal learning is positioned as a critical first step along the way. The motif figures centrally and frequently across the texts I analyze and is relevant in this thesis because of the discursive and affective processes that coalesce in its expression.

I focus my analysis here both on the discursive content and on the emotional and tonal qualities of the journeying settler motif. The learning journey motif is emotionally charged, positioned as being both about learning cognitively (i.e. if you listen to what people say it will change the way you think) and about feeling or internalizing those learnings (i.e. if you listen to what people say, it will change your heart). Learning journeys are often described in the texts I analyze as generating feelings of vulnerability, remorse, despair, compassion and hope in settler learners – triggered often when settlers learn about colonial violence and Indigenous suffering for the first time. Some describe their experiences with reconciliation as moving (e.g. Pearson in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017), and sometimes life-changing (e.g. Dayal in Munshi et al. 2017). Some describe feeling

lucky to be learning, and "protective" of their learnings when faced with push-back from colleagues (Grona in Munshi et al. 2017), while others feel inspired to encourage their wider social and professional circle to engage in their own learning journeys. Andrea Nemtin, former CEO of the Inspirit Foundation and one of the co-developers of the *Declaration*, stated in a 2017 webinar that "engaging people on an emotional front works…very well" and that "you can always go in with the facts right off the top," but engaging feelings generates "an openness to actually understand further and then do something." These remarks suggest that *feeling* the learning journey is just as important as the learning itself for triggering reconciliatory action. In this chapter, I unpack such affective inflections as they appear across this archive, positioned by some authors as central to the work of "transforming the sector" (in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017).

In the sections that follow I distinguish between two types of learning journeys: one centred on "learning about" as articulated in the *Declaration,* and the other centred on critical truth-telling leading to settler de-centring. In the first section of this chapter, I explore articulations and critiques of settler journeys of learning and personal transformation. In this iteration, settlers commit to "learning about the history and legacy of the colonial system" and about Indigenous peoples and cultures and "the cumulative impact of unresolved trauma passed from generation to generation" (*Declaration* 2015). In the second and third sections I unpack some of the affective and emotional inflections of this motif, analyzing two distinctive versions of the journey – one focused on settlers consuming narratives of Indigenous suffering to become "better" settlers, and the other focused on de-centring settlers through critique and truth-telling, especially as it pertains to the settler philanthropy sector. In the truth-telling iteration, Indigenous critics of reconciliation urge settler learners to embrace truth-telling and critical feedback as "a gift" that "helps us grow" (Bahubeshi et al. 2018). I explore here some of the dissonance and tensions that emerge between these two

versions of the settler learning journey, highlighting especially their deep emotional inflections and potential material outcomes in the settler philanthropy sector.

I find in my analysis that, while explicitly focused on generating transformation, learning journeys as they are articulated in this archive can sometimes result in the reproduction and obfuscation of colonial durabilities. Engaging individually in the learning journey is figured in this narrative as a key first step for settlers in philanthropy to learn how to share power over decision-making, engage more with Indigenous leaders and communities, inspire others in the sector to do the same, and collaboratively generate informed solutions in the name of reconciliation. Although settlers' feelings of empathy, compassion, or discomfort– stirred by their learning journeys–may act as important triggers, though, they do not necessarily or immediately lead to transformation in settler philanthropic practice. As Pedwell (2021) writes, "while affect may act as a trigger which drives forward embodied change, or which signals when existing habits have become disrupted, it cannot participate in enduring processes of transformation without some degree of habituation" (p. 12). In other words, genuine and durable transformation may not therefore occur at the moment of a settler learning experience, however emotional, powerful or genuine it might be.

This emotionally charged motif also presents a good example of the mutually imbricated nature, and functions, of colonial recognition and unknowing in the reconciliation change narrative. Affective responses to recognitions along the settler's learning journey at times function to assuage settler anxieties and guilt, by triggering remorse and compassion in response to the consumption of Indigenous suffering. This may in turn stabilize settler identities and settler philanthropy's place in the social world by centring settler remorse and performances of self-reflexivity. At other times, becoming aware of and acknowledging coloniality through listening and learning can trigger settler

discomfort and, in turn, defensiveness and fragility, resulting in refusals and closures that reify settler dominance. Thus the learning journey may be part of the "an ongoing malleable process[es]" of colonial recognitions and unknowing that allow settler Canadians and settler philanthropy to distance themselves from present-day translations of structural colonial violence (Stoler 2016, p. 14).

I conclude the chapter by unpacking the potential of settler discomfort to generate possibilities outside of or beyond the typical unknowing/recognition dynamic in the reconciliation change narrative journey. Though settler discomfort does at times trigger closures resulting in colonial unknowing, I argue that it can also present an opening toward settler decentring, reciprocity and incommensurability. Critics of dominant reconciliation narratives do not completely throw away the settler learning journey, but rather reposition it in a potentially more generative iteration focused on self-directed learning and receptiveness to critical feedback and truth-telling. The critiques frequently voiced by Indigenous women and women of colour leaders across the archive suggest the journey should not end at the first moment of settler awakening, but should be an ongoing work of exposing and addressing both systemic and everyday colonial durabilities in personal and professional life, and across the settler philanthropy ecosystem. The central argument I make in this chapter, then, is that settlers' affective experiences resulting from learning and truth-telling can have dissonant outcomes: at times leading to closures and the re-stabilization of settler normalcy. But I also demonstrate how they can sometimes open the way toward exposing and decentring white supremacy and colonial durabilities in the settler Canadian philanthropic sector, generating possibilities toward reciprocity and the ample support of Indigenous sovereignties.

5.1 – Articulations and critiques of the settler learning journey

The motif of the settler learning journey is embedded in the *Declaration.* Signatories commit to "learning about the history and legacy of the colonial system that imposed the Indian Residential School System, that dispossessed and inflicted harm upon Aboriginal peoples and their cultures, so that we can understand how to work toward the reconciliation that is needed now and into the future" and to educating themselves on "the cumulative impact of unresolved trauma passed from generation to generation." When describing the process leading up to the production of the *Declaration,* Bruce Lawson, a co-author of the *Declaration* and co-developer of the Aboriginal Grantmaker Network (the organization that was the predecessor to the Circle) shared details of his own learning journey. Although his organization, the Counselling Foundation, had been engaging with Indigenous communities for many years, he stated, when he had arrived there in 2009, "I sort of was starting from a place of not knowing very much." He attended a conference session about Indigenous issues and philanthropy in Canada where "I felt like the odd person out" and "didn't understand the room I was in" (in Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017). That experience, he said, "sparked a learning journey" that in turn resulted in him "working more closely with Indigenous peoples over time, and then going off to the Truth and Reconciliation National event in Edmonton." This experience generated further discussions that led him and several other settler philanthropy leaders to author the *Declaration*, as discussed at length in Chapter 3.

Lawson thus positioned his own journey of learning, which he recalled as both an intellectual and deeply felt experience, as central to launching others across the sector into the journey of reconciliation. Discussions of the settler learning journey like this suggest that personal transformation is central to generating more reconciliatory practice at the communal,

organizational and sectoral level. Reflecting on sessions at the 2016 PFC conference, which was the first time PFC members met after the public release of the *Declaration*, CEO Hilary Pearson concurred that personal learning journeys were critical to sectoral and societal shifts. "We have much to learn about Indigenous communities, cultures, history and worldviews," she wrote, "much that is valuable for all Canadians to know…Listening and learning together is the first step to reconciliation. It is possible but will involve hard work." The "we" here refers to individuals (especially settlers) in the settler philanthropy ecosystem. Such discussions about learning continued at PFC events for several years. Allan Northcott, the president of the Max Bell Foundation (a private foundation in Calgary), an advisory council member at Imagine Canada and a board member of PFC, asked audience members at the 2017 PFC Symposium to "step outside the world of philanthropy for a moment and listen to stories that will be told in voices that we may not have heard or we may not have heard very often, but are nevertheless very much a part of the Canadian experience" (in Nemtin et al. 2017). Northcott's articulation of the journey is relevant because it connects learning and listening to better understanding Canada, and implicitly, to being a better Canadian. As such, the learning journey may work at times to stabilize settler Canadian identities, engaging in what Saifer (2019; 2020) calls philanthropic nation-branding, as discussed in greater detail below. It also subsumes Indigenous experiences uncritically within narratives of Canadian national experience.

Writers and speakers across these texts present several practical steps that settlers and settler organizations can take to engage in this journey, including reading, training, professional development, networking and relationship building. The Circle's 2010 report had noted that non-Indigenous donors and staff needed cultural competency training, which, the report stated, would be critical for increasing settler understanding "about the realities of Indigenous people's lives" and

in turn the things settler philanthropy institutions could do to support Indigenous people (p. 31). Journeys of listening and learning, these articulations suggest, could help settler philanthropy actors enact reconciliation not just at a personal level but on a wider social scale. For example, in a 2017 webinar on increasing sustained settler engagement with reconciliation, Marnie Grona, a staff member at Imagine Canada, emphasized "immersive opportunities" (e.g. land-based learning opportunities or the Kairos blanket exercise[27]) at conferences and professional development events as an important strategy (Munshi *et al.* 2017). She recommended that settlers also "connect with the Indigenous groups and reconciliation leaders in the community and in social media." Grona was speaking specifically about Imagine Canada's reconciliation journey, and indicated that through discussions with the Circle and with other Indigenous leaders in the sector, Imagine Canada leadership determined that organization-wide learning was necessary for the organization to "consider and reflect what our role is" in the reconciliation moment. Imagine Canada established a task force to help begin the organizational learning journey, and to make recommendations to the board that could direct Imagine Canada's reconciliation activities (as well as the learning journeys of its member organizations), and in turn affect the wider sector going forward.

Other articulations of the settler learning journey suggest that learning hinges not just on settlers listening passively, but on dialogue and conversation, even if that conversation is challenging and uncomfortable. Assembly of First Nations (AFN) Grand Chief Shawn Atleo, who addressed settler philanthropy audiences at Imagine Canada, CFC and PFC events from 2011-2013, told listeners at the Imagine Canada Summit in 2011, "I believe strongly that this is our time, our time to press

[27] This is an interactive educational program often practiced in workshops at professional development events, developed by KAIROS, a Canadian faith-based charitable organization in consultation with Indigenous Elders and knowledge holders in 1996. The intention of the exercise is to teach participants about the history of colonization and forced displacement experienced by Indigenous peoples in Canada. KAIROS blanket exercises became common features of cultural sensitivity and reconciliation training events in settler organizations across industries after the TRC was finalized in 2015. See: https://www.kairosblanketexercise.org.

forward, to push harder, to engage openly and honestly, and [to] have those challenging conversations and ignite the change that's needed today" (Atleo 2011b). A 2015 article in *The Philanthropist* referred to the role that "meaningful dialogue" plays in the "journey toward transforming Canada's future" (Belanger 2015). Texts across the archive identify an urgent need for deep listening and ongoing dialogue. In this vein, Justin Wiebe (2018) wrote, "[f]unders don't always know best, community usually does. We need to do a whole lot better listening and responding to what community asks of us." The journey motif in this way at times encompasses dialogue and sharing, encouraging settlers to engage openly in conversation and build relationships with Indigenous peoples.

While both settlers and Indigenous authors across the archive position learning journeys as central to the change they envision for settler philanthropy and Canadian society, I have also identified some important critiques. For example, some Indigenous individuals who work in the sector critique the focus on listening and learning as extractive, and as resulting in deferrals of more challenging action. They suggest that the emphasis on "dialogue" and "honest conversation" with Indigenous peoples often becomes a devolution of settlers' responsibility to do the work themselves. Lindsay Dupré discussed this dynamic in a 2018 article for *The Philanthropist*: "We are regularly being asked to share our knowledge and experiences with non-Indigenous people," she writes, "But while these opportunities can be positive and have the potential to enhance our leadership when done carefully, they can also be violent and distract us from the important work that needs to be done within our communities" (Dupré 2018). Kris Archie similarly posted in 2021 that some Indigenous people in the sector felt disillusioned with reconciliation because "many Settlers believed that this labour of Reconciliation belonged to Indigenous peoples. That Indigenous peoples were meant to be present for their questions, curiosities, for their

entertainment" (2021a). These comments suggest that critics of reconciliation felt shifting the sector toward justice and equity requires a long and self-reflective (and often difficult) process of learning about colonization, racism and white supremacy. But the work of doing so should not fall on the shoulders of Indigenous peoples, thus mirroring the "deferral of responsibility" identified by Smith, Tuck and Yang (2019) in post-secondary institutions, in which settlers insist that Indigenous people guide and teach in a way that is "coherent and …palatable to white settler[s]" and that serves settler needs (p. 15).

Some Indigenous writers and speakers in this archive also critiqued the learning journey because it could function as a closure: stopping at settler reflection without necessarily leading to transformative action. In a 2022 webinar hosted by CFC, Tim Fox encouraged listeners to move beyond learning journeys and mobilize their knowledge – putting reconciliation into action (Vavek *et al.* 2022). Relatedly, in a June 2022 webinar, Archie discussed how a perceived need to increase settler knowledge and expertise gets in the way of actually "showing up" to do the work of funding and empowering Indigenous communities. Philanthropic funders often invest in highly paid consultants, blanket exercises, research and development, conferences, webinars and other professional development opportunities before investing in Indigenous communities and organizations (Omidvar et al. 2022). This distracts the settler philanthropy organization and sector, according to Archie, from the urgent and critical work required in the present: "You don't need to know everything about the salmon way of life to support me in it," she argued; "you just need to know and trust that I do, and that my community does." Archie's critique suggests that one function of the learning journey motif is to centre the settler's learning while also absolving them from immediate, reparative action afterward, which might involve giving up power, wealth, position or privilege and doing philanthropy in ways they were not previously prone to do. The

settler's self-reflection and internal learning journey (and thus settlers themselves) risks taking centre stage, while practical action takes the back burner. In turn, the settler learning journey in some ways represents a refusal of personal or collective responsibility to engage in the heavy lifting of reconciliation.

5.2 – Settler consumption of Indigenous suffering

The settler learning journey in this archive is often triggered when a settler "sees" Indigenous suffering for the first time, whether by reading about it, or witnessing residential school survivor testimonies, or receiving a "shocking revelation" through the news or on social media. For example, in a 2013 *Philanthropist* article, Pyotor Hogson, the Anishinaabe founder of a nonprofit consultancy that advocates for Indigenous youth, discussed the story of eleven-year-old Wes Prankard, whom Hodgson described as a settler ally to Indigenous children (Prankard and Hodgson 2013). According to this story, Prankard first was mobilized to action when his father returned from a humanitarian trip to Attawapiskat First Nation in Northern Ontario and showed him pictures "of over-crowded, mould-covered homes as well as a series of trailers, originally intended for emergency housing, that have become the permanent residence for many families." Wes could not understand "how this could occur in Canada" and soon was catalyzed to embark on a journey of activism and fundraising, first resolving to raise money to build playgrounds for children in remote communities like Attawapiskat and then to encourage other settlers to get involved in the work too. This example is indicative of many others across this archive that suggest that the shock of witnessing Indigenous people's suffering is essential to mobilizing settler action.

This story also frames settlers' emotional experiences of shock and compassion as central to advancing meaningful change in the name of reconciliation. Bruce Lawson's description of

witnessing the testimony of residential school survivors at the TRC hearings in Edmonton places that experience as the catalyst for his own learning journey. “I couldn’t help but be struck and knocked over by the incredible testimony of survivors... It was just haunting to hear their stories,” he stated (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2017). In the same webinar, Lucie Santoro, a leader at the Martin Family Initiative recounted that while participating in the hearings, she felt “such despair and like, ‘how did we get here?’ You keep questioning yourself: ‘how did we really get here?’” Nemtin similarly remarked that when witnessing the testimony of survivors she was “deeply touched.” She explained, “once you hear those stories it’s very hard to unhear them. They actually can lodge themselves in your body.” These speakers, key figures in the early articulations of the reconciliation change narrative whose involvement in the production and release of the *Declaration* also shaped wider patterns across the archive, described settlers’ interactions with Indigenous suffering as deeply embodied, and deeply emotional. They also indicated that these experiences were critical to inspiring action. Each speaker indicated how their embodied experiences of shock and despair propelled them into their own learning journeys. Lawson’s use of the word “haunting” is salient here, suggesting that in some cases when settlers become aware of the “seething and lingering” ghosts of coloniality that Gordon tells us are always there – as discussed at greater length in Chapter 4 – such hauntings may trigger strong affective responses (Gordon 2008, p. 195). In this case, activating settler remorse and compassion, hauntings may at times “inaugurate the necessity of doing something about [them]” (ibid. p. 206). In other words, deeply felt and embodied hauntings, “lodging themselves” in a person’s mind and body, can push people to move.

Reading these texts in conversation with critical decolonial and Indigenous theory and feminist affect theory, I unpack in this section some of the subtle issues with the learning dynamic centred on the consumption of Indigenous suffering to activate settler compassion and remorse. In my

critique presented here my goal is not to deny the importance of settlers being exposed to painful and traumatic colonial realities that Indigenous peoples choose to share for many reasons. Peter Hodgson described Wes Prankard's work, triggered by his exposure to images of Indigenous children's suffering in the north, as important and well-received by children and parents in the Attawapiskat community (Hodgson 2013). And, as discussed in Chapter 3 on the *Declaration,* after witnessing the pain and trauma shared in the TRC hearings, settler leaders in the philanthropy sector may indeed have catalyzed important action amongst other organizations and settlers in the philanthropy; the *Declaration* still holds generative potential for the sector. Furthermore, I want to be careful not to dismiss the desire of Indigenous authors and speakers in this archive to share their sufferings with settler audiences. At the opening session of the 2013 CFC Conference, Rob Cardinal, a Siksika man and a leader of IndigeSTEAM – an organization that provides culturally relevant programming to encourage Indigenous youth to pursue studies and careers in STEM – described his own experiences with suffering in an emotionally charged speech to CFC members (Cardinal 2013). He shared about his experiences with substance dependency, being unhoused, and suffering depression and suicidality during his youth. He also tied his own suffering directly to coloniality, saying it was all a product of the "ravages of intergenerational trauma that had reached out to me through generations of despair in Aboriginal communities…it could have taken my life several times." Later in the speech, he explained that his community's support, as well as nonprofit services – "a vast network of smart and caring people" – helped him start a different life where he now feels that he is "in extra innings." My point here is not to dismiss the sharing of such experiences and perspectives; it is clear that some authors and speakers across this archive, like Cardinal, consider sharing the suffering they have experienced to be deeply important, potentially in order to activate listeners to do something.

What I want to point to here is that when these moments of sharing become a canvas or a stage on which settlers begin their emotional and intellectual learning journeys, and engage in affective performances, this dynamic can risk positioning settlers as consumers of Indigenous suffering, with the ultimate outcome of settler centring and the stabilization of settler normalcy (Daigle 2019, p. 703; Kizuk 2020, p. 172). Critical decolonial and Indigenous studies theorists, critical race theorists, and feminist affect theorists, have done extensive work to understand the complex functions of remorse, empathy, compassion and the politics of pain (Ahmed 2006; Berlant 2004; Berlant 2010; Ahmed 2014; Pedwell 2014; Kizuk 2020). As affect theorist Lauren Berlant (2020) writes, compassion or remorse are not "*at root* ethically false, destructive or sadistic" (p. 7), but it is important to consider how they derive "from social training, emerge[s] at historical moments" and exist in a complex relation to oppression and harm, thus at times producing dissonant outcomes. A common assumption about the potential of empathy, compassion or remorse, as Pedwell (2021) summarizes, is that when people are intellectually and emotionally exposed to the sufferings of others, from which they have been previously shielded or socially removed, "they [might] be compelled to fundamentally alter their ways of seeing and being in the world" (p. 32). Yet Pedwell, like other theorists, questions whether shocking and visceral experiences that trigger compassion really do represent a "radical break" that leads to "sustained…transformation at a deep embodied, material, and structural level." (p. 32). Relatedly, settlers' experiences of being "knocked over," shocked, or "deeply touched" by Indigenous testimony, in subtle ways can refigure the durability and "everyday" nature of colonial violence as something new and surprising for settlers. The experience of shock is "profoundly uneven" (Pedwell 2021, p. 32). The things that usually work to shock settlers and trigger their remorse or compassion are things that Indigenous peoples know and live daily, in both major and minor, structural and personal, shocking and habitual ways. Some theorists suggest rather that the shock experience and resulting feelings of compassion can be

momentary or fleeting – a response that does not lead to sustained action or eventually leading to compassion fatigue.

Others have demonstrated how good, compassionate intentions often lead to what Lauren Berlant (2004) calls "ordinary terror" (p. 6) and the reification of violent state control. Indeed, as Berlant explains, compassion can be part of the affective processes of "shoring up" the very privilege that allows a person to be in the position to feel compassion in the first place. They argue the neoliberal economic restructuring processes in places like Canada, the U.S. and the U.K. have shifted responsibility for the amelioration of suffering away from the state and toward individuals (and to the philanthropy and nonprofit sectors), insisting that those suffering, or in pain, or less fortunate can be helped through others' "compassion." In this formulation, they write, "we cultivate compassion for those lacking the foundations for belonging *where we live*" (p. 3-4). Thus, state narratives of compassion premised on recognizing others' pain obscure the structural violence and inequalities that create and reproduce that very pain – and generate the conditions that allow for those who do not feel the pain to experience compassion and empathy and even act philanthropically to alleviate others' pain.

The politics of compassion Berlant discusses echo into settler experiences of compassion in the context of coloniality and reconciliation. Often, settlers are moved to compassion by their visceral exposure to Indigenous people's suffering, but also at times are moved to feel remorse and shame. Belief in the affective power of such feelings of remorse and shame to transform practice is evident across the archive I have assembled. Many of the texts suggest that former Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper's public expression of remorse and formal apology for residential schools in 2008 had launched Canada into "a period of reconciliation." Yet Kizuk writes that the consumption/remorse dynamic "prioritizes a 'hearing' of testimony that is settler-self-referential.

'How do I feel when I hear this? What does it say about me, the perpetrator, to be a listener?'" (p. 167). Upon consuming the image or story of Indigenous suffering, settlers feel compelled to engage in performances of remorse and compassion, to activate the discourse of apology, and make commitments to becoming "better" Canadians by joining on the journey of listening and learning. The responsibility to change is tied to the desire "to fix the image of the settler" but not in ways that challenge the structural relations of violence by which settlers got the image they feel remorseful about in the first place (Kizuk, 2020, p. 166). And indeed, across my archive, witnessing truth and engaging in "uncomfortable conversations" is often positioned as a means to increase the effectiveness or prove the legitimacy of the existence of a settler philanthropy sector (Lawson et al. 2016; Pearson 2018b). The settler learning journey thus becomes the end goal, and Indigenous people's experiences and suffering become the guideposts along the way.

Furthermore, as some critical scholars of reconciliation write, compassion and remorse can function as a closure that ultimately stabilizes the settler status quo rather than creating a generative opening toward radical decolonial futures. The performance of remorse in the larger political framework of reconciliation in Canada and elsewhere, as Gaertner notes, depends on a "discourse of apology, which centres perpetrator voices" (2021, p. 42) and necessitates Indigenous forgiveness. The underlying assumption is that the remorse/forgiveness dynamic will lead to the end of the problems that necessitated an apology. Settler remorse and the "sorry" that follows are positioned as enough – and thus, as closures. Yet, settler remorse and apology is often limited to a past that is long gone or (in some cases) denied altogether. Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson (2016b) questions, "how do you apologize for something that you deny ever happened [or that keeps happening]?" The political function of this discursive and affective theme is that coloniality is positioned in the public imagination as an event that is over there or in the past, that Canadians are done with and can move

on from. As Gaertner writes, “there is no future without forgiveness. Or rather, there is no settler future without Indigenous surrender” (p. 39). “’Sorry’ has a way of distracting from the material facts of pain, anguish, and dispossession while centring settler guilt”; and it becomes the first step toward closures that protect and stabilize settler futurity. This is a dynamic that holds Indigenous suffering as a consumable good while absolving settlers and the settler state of responsibility for the everyday, habitual and deeply engrained colonial violence that is the core of Canadian society and, as I have suggested throughout this thesis, in much settler philanthropic activity. The settler state asking for forgiveness “with no land back, no justice and no peace” is to Audra Simpson “absurd” and insulting “in spite of its conciliatory intent” (2016b). An imagined “reconciled” future based on settler apology and Indigenous forgiveness is ultimately a future in which coloniality, in all its durability, is both entrenched and disguised. Thus, Gaertner concludes, settler remorse can be weaponized, and the durabilities of coloniality remain undiscussed and untouched (Gaertner, p. 47).

The affective performances of remorse, shame, compassion and self-reflexivity are central, then, to the mutually imbricated processes of colonial unknowing and recognition that I see constantly at work in the reconciliation change narrative. The settler can be positioned as embarking upon a journey of learning as a newly self-aware, vulnerable and compassionate outside observer who is not necessarily implicated in the problems they suddenly recognize. Settler experiences and expressions of compassion and remorse can thus re-establish settler stability and centre settler experiences of learning and self-reflexivity. As such, as Kizuk (2020) puts it, “my wounds as a settler” take centre stage while I actually remain ignorant of the “wounds of others” (even while seemingly recognizing them), and of my own complicity in the infliction of those wounds. “Except insofar as it relates to myself,” and to my ability to explore and demonstrate my own reflexivity, I

can continue to not know (p. 171). Remorse and compassion, as moments of colonial recognition and unknowing, may become acts of settler stabilization and of rescuing settler normalcy: a means of justifying the existence of settler philanthropic institutions as they stand, and cultivating a mythology of Canadian self-reflexivity and compassion.

"Learning about" can at times position the settler and the settler philanthropy sector outside of the suffering that is being shared or witnessed. Settlers are distanced from colonial violence as they consume Indigenous suffering, rather than seeing themselves as beneficiaries and perpetuators of the realities that produce those sufferings. Thus, settler complicity is allowed, as feminist affect theorist Sara Ahmed (2014) writes, "to disappear from this history" through expressions of shame; the suffering or pain about which the settler subject feels ashamed gets lost in the narrative (p. 36). The politicization and commodification of pain in turn can have the outcome of turning it into something "that simply 'is' rather than something that has happened in time and space" – as a direct result of human decisions and actions that still happen and from which settlers continue to benefit (p. 34). In the same 2017 webinar with Bruce Lawson and Andrea Nemtin quoted above, Pearson suggests that if settlers read Indigenous-authored accounts of suffering and pain they might be able to "step into the shoes" of those who suffer because such written accounts often "are very moving [and] beautifully expressed" and function to "really put you there" in the position "of people who have experienced historically this terrible traumatic sort of colonization experience." Yet the assumption that witnessing others' suffering will help settlers in the sector to better understand and inspire them to action is limited here by distancing – situating coloniality in the past, a discursive process I analyzed in Chapter 4. This version of settler learning thus risks positioning Indigenous suffering as a consumable. The result is that coloniality and trauma remain left firmly in the past,

with settler philanthropy positioned as a force outside of colonialism, which has suddenly wakened to its responsibility and capacity to "act on" it.

This, again, is the central form of dissonance that I see in the reconciliation change narrative across this archive of texts. While settler awareness of Indigenous experiences (including of suffering) is, according to Indigenous critics, important for enabling action toward justice, when that newfound awareness is not tied to a sense of responsibility for the personal and structural durabilities of settler white supremacy and colonial violence, the learning may actually function as unknowing. It can centre settlers, thus stabilizing colonial durabilities by allowing the settler on the journey to defer personal responsibility for the suffering they witness. At times recognition, "confronting past and ongoing colonial violence toward Indigenous peoples," challenges the myth of Canada as an inclusive and reconcile-able society. This experience in turn triggers discomfort – which may be an opening toward transformation, but may also be "easily appropriated back into narratives of Canadian goodness" (Kizuk 2020, p. 165). Settler recognitions of Indigenous suffering become part of the narratives of settler self-reflexivity. The problems being suddenly recognized are not necessarily recognized as present in the here and now and as products of the durable colonial violences from which settlers, settler philanthropy and the settler state benefits. The affective experiences at the heart of this motif may (even though unintentionally) therefore serve functions that reproduce colonial durabilities. In these ways, it becomes a critical part of what LaDuke and Cowen (2020) call the "infrastructure of feeling" that underscore settler white supremacy and durable coloniality.

5.3 – Truth-telling

I also see other possibilities for settler learning across this archive. I focus this section on settler discomfort that can be triggered through an alternative form of learning that I will call truth-telling, and its potential to ignite "processes through which [embodied change] might produce more durable effects" (Pedwell, 2021, p. 34). Truth-telling tends to centre more on presenting critiques of settler philanthropy organizations and the sector as beneficiaries, byproducts, and producers of historical and ongoing colonial violence. It focuses on myth-busting and what authors often call "uncomfortable truths" about settler philanthropy's relationship with coloniality and white supremacy. As Edgar Villanueva told Justin Wiebe in a 2018 interview published in *The Philanthropist*, "A lot of folks are thinking about reconciliation, but we need *truth* and reconciliation. I often find that very intelligent people don't know the true history of this place…Philanthropy has played a role in perpetuating harmful systems." In the truth-telling paradigm, settlers in philanthropy are urged not to just observe and "learn about" colonial harm and Indigenous suffering, but also to wake up to their own complicity, both past and present. In some ways, the truth-telling paradigm thus actively challenges the colonial recognition/unknowing dynamic discussed above, functioning quite differently than the "learning about" version of the learning journey. I argue here that the truth-telling dynamic can still sometimes have complicated and dissonant outcomes. Sometimes it results in settler discomfort that leads to closures, but it may also produce more generative possibilities in the exposure and interruption of colonial durabilities. Truth-telling (though not without its own limitations and cautions, as discussed further below), intersects closely with efforts to de-centre settlers and engage in reciprocal and decolonial possibilities in the practice of settler philanthropy.

One part of the truth-telling effort, according to some texts, is to break down and interrupt racist myths that inhibit reconciliatory practice in settler philanthropy. The Circle's 2010 report, subtitled "A Foundation for Understanding," for example, was an early document urging settler donors and settler philanthropy organizations to address persistent myths about Indigenous peoples. Authors wrote that in the settler philanthropy world, "there's a lack of familiarity, a lack of understanding the circumstances of First Nation people. There are cultural chasms. There are a host of assumptions, the main one being that First Nations are adequately taken care of by the Canadian state. It is racism and cultural misunderstanding" (p. 31). Such misunderstandings, assumptions and cultural chasms, many of the authors in this archive later agreed, inhibit the sector's engagement with Indigenous peoples. As Imagine Canada leader Marnie Grona told listeners in 2017, settler philanthropy leaders must "continue to look at and address biases within the organization and among staff that are barriers." Truth-telling by myth- and bias-busting, according to these discussions, is central to inspiring more direct and abundant engagement with Indigenous communities – toward the advancement of reparation, reciprocity and Indigenous self-determination.

The truth-telling paradigm does not only have to do with myth-busting stereotypes about Indigenous peoples, but also myth-busting about the practices and purposes of settler philanthropy itself. Institutional settler philanthropy, critics argue, must come to terms with its complicity in ongoing colonial and racist violence. A story Wanda Brascoupé recounts in a 2016 *Philanthropist* article encapsulated this perspective succinctly:

> at a recent Circle gathering, a foundation representative explained that the organization he represented had a significant endowment that had been well invested, and that now the foundation was hoping to donate in order to assist Indigenous people in Canada. The response by one of the Indigenous participants was simple and poignant: 'You're welcome.'

She continued, “most endowments in philanthropic organizations in Canada were created through the economic boom in resource extraction, agricultural production, settlement and transportation…on what we now know as disputed land in Canada and internationally” (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2016). Circle board members Couchman, Struthers and Wiebe also reflected a few years later on this moment, describing it as “a jarring moment for many in the room who had come to learn how to support Indigenous communities better and who held familiar assumptions of gratitude for gift-giving” (p.138). The narrative centred the “truth-telling” perspective that Indigenous critics of reconciliation had been voicing from the start, pointing to the violent colonial and racist foundation of wealth and power accumulation on which Canadian economies – and the settler philanthropy sector – depend. Similarly, Roberta Jamieson (2020) wrote that “some philanthropists need to acknowledge that their own organizations were blemished from the very beginning” (p. 163). She suggested that settler philanthropic organizations should do research of their own to find out if and how their endowment “came off the backs of Indigenous communities’” (p. 164).

The truth-telling paradigm, then, is concerned with myth-busting about the benevolence or inherent goodness of the settler nation-state more broadly and settler philanthropy sector specifically. Nneka Allen critiqued the “rose-tinted glasses” through which some working in the charitable and philanthropic sector in Canada envision the value of their work. In a 2020 guest post for Imagine Canada’s *360 Blog*, she critiqued the myths and assumptions that characterize much settler philanthropic activity: “The caring, the benevolent, the lovers of humankind: these are charities and nonprofits. Here to make the world a better place. Missions positioned as righteous and superior. Visions large and lofty. With a saviour complex sadly in high gear, they feel heroic, even honourable in their work.” These mythologies within the sector are products of the wider

mythologies of Canadian identity as nice, generous, diverse, and welcoming (e.g. Thobani 2007; Saifer 2020b). Couchman et al. (2020) described Canada as "a nation that likes to see itself as an advocate of justice, diversity, and peace" (p. 132) and Allen wrote that "Canadians widely believe their country to be a peaceful, multicultural country without racism." But, she continued, racism, inequality and oppression are "woven into the fabric of Canadian institutions and normalized in everyday practices" and, she wrote, "the nonprofit sector is no exception." The nation's rose-tinted glasses are really just colonial unknowing at work in the public consciousness. Allen's comments are reflective of the perspectives of other Indigenous critics who contend that colonial violence inheres social structures and institutions at a macro-level, but also permeates everyday relations and entanglements of power on a micro-level, including in the settler philanthropy sector.

Truth-telling aims to shed light on deeply rooted and habitual (and therefore durable) elements of coloniality that do not always look like coloniality on the surface. Inequitable relations of power between white settlers and Indigenous peoples in the settler philanthropy ecosystem – whether in giving/granting relationships, in staff/leadership relationships, in collegial relationships, or elsewhere – produce and are reproduced through the hidden colonial durabilities woven into habitual practice and everyday life. As Itoah Scott-Enns (2017), a Tłı̨chǫ sector leader who at the time was the executive director of the Arctic Funders Collaborative[28] and a faculty member for the International Funders for Indigenous Peoples' Learning Institute[29], wrote, "no matter what feel-good version we tell ourselves…Indigenous grantees are ever aware of who makes the decisions

[28] A grantmaking collaborative hosted by MakeWay (formerly Tides Canada) that promotes "more informed and effective grantmaking to support healthy Arctic communities and ecosystems" and leverages philanthropic support to "advance land and water stewardship, capacity building for Indigenous peoples, community and cultural well-being." See: https://www.arcticfunders.com.
[29] A global network of funders that are dedicated to funding Indigenous Peoples and communities "to promote thought leadership and strategic collaboration between the funding community and Indigenous Peoples. See: https://internationalfunders.org.

for the resources they desperately need, and it is not them." In a 2022 webinar for CFC, Tim Fox suggested therefore that unseen and unremarked power dynamics shaped by colonial durabilities mean that even where settler philanthropy organizations push for inclusion and diversity efforts, reconciliation or other "big gesture" transformations, "we're not doing as good as we think." He stated that the "mental model" of settler generosity and wealth distribution that "permeates" the sector obscures settlers' capacity to imagine alternatives that involve "reach[ing] these communities that are often missed."

What distinguishes the above discussions from the "learning from" type of journey analyzed in the previous section is that they position settlers, settler organizations and the settler philanthropy sector as directly implicated in the violent colonial durabilities that produce Indigenous suffering. As such the truth-telling dynamic implies a responsibility for settlers in philanthropy to meaningfully address colonial durabilities through ongoing, habitual truth-telling and "intentional" practice. Rudayna Bahubeshi and Kris Archie discussed the important implications of this type of learning for addressing racism and interrupting colonial violence in a 2017 Circle-hosted webinar (Bahubeshi et al. 2017). Bahubeshi noted that her parents did not receive any education about "the violence perpetrated on these lands toward Indigenous people" when they arrived in Canada before she was born. "There's a troubling way," she said, in which "fleeing a colonized country to unknowingly come into another [colonized country] really perpetuates the violent ways in which this country [Canada] has tried to erase Indigenous peoples." In this way, she suggested, newcomers to Canada become implicated in the violence through ignorance: "how are we actually participating in that [violence] by not knowing the histories on these lands?" she concluded. Unknowing, Bahubeshi's comments suggested, is a sustainer of colonial durabilities even amongst those in the sector trying to do good. A central reason for engaging in the learning and listening

journey via truth-telling, then, is so that settlers in philanthropy can in turn actively refuse to reproduce colonial violence through their interventions.

Dismantling myths about the inherent benevolence and inclusivity of settler philanthropy through continuous efforts to expose and root out white settler supremacy in their philanthropic and professional spaces opens the way toward new possibilities for reparative practice, such as direct and abundant giving to Indigenous-led organizations, communities and grassroots initiatives. In a 2021 publication released by the Circle, Munshi and Levi concluded that a "deeper sense of understanding, respect, and relationship creates an ability to sense power dynamics, challenge systems of oppression, and create reciprocal partnerships." (p. 8). Their remarks suggest that the truth-telling dynamic can result in possibilities outside of the unknowing/recognition at the heart of much reconciliation work – being a starting point for settler de-centring, Indigenous empowerment and reciprocity in settler philanthropic relations. Thus, these authors argue, truth-telling can drive action and shift inequitable dynamics of power in philanthropy and wider society, generate more sustainable and meaningful relationships with Indigenous communities.

5.4 – Settler discomfort: closures and possibilities

In this section I explore settler discomfort as an affective outcome of truth-telling that can have important functions in the settler philanthropy world. Some Indigenous-authored critiques of institutional settler philanthropy and reconciliation encourage settlers to "sit with" the discomfort they experience after an encounter with truth-telling (haunting) or after facing critiques like those discussed above. This, they suggest, can have the impact of decentring white settler supremacy on a habitual and personal level and potentially in the systems, practices and discourses that inform and underpin much settler philanthropy. In a 2020 interview, Tim Fox lauded settler colleague Sara

Lyons (a settler and Vice President of Strategic Initiatives at CFC) for embracing discomfort and engaging in truth-telling herself: “when you’re standing in front of a group of your peers in this settler-created philanthropic space and when you’re confident in saying ‘you know what, I am a settler and this makes me uncomfortable but we have to lean into this,’ you’re breaking down those barriers” (in Dirksen et. al. 2020, p. 22). The barriers, he said, include the fear of “truth and what it means for change.” Embracing the discomfort triggered by truth-telling, he suggested, can lead to more radical decolonial and reparative practices dismantling colonial status quos in the settler philanthropy sector.

Sometimes, discomfort can produce the same closures as those discussed in previous sections of this chapter. Another memory from my old job stands out. One of my colleagues had attended the 2018 PFC Conference in Toronto, and at an all-staff meeting a few months later, presented a summary of the conference to all the staff at our organization. She told us that the most interesting session she attended was an intergenerational plenary panel which included both settler and Indigenous speakers, Jon McPhedran Waitzer, Rudayna Bahubeshi, Lindsay Dupré and Hilary Pearson. I also discussed this panel with reference to omission and reframing in the previous chapter. During this session, speakers engaged in critical truth-telling: what Lindsay Dupré described as “tea spilling.” Chair McPhedran Waitzer probably generated some discomfort when they urged foundation leaders to acknowledge that the source of philanthropic organizations’ wealth was tied to “massive historical thefts” of Indigenous lands and resources, exploitation of Black and migrant communities, and economic and social policies that historically have favoured elite’s – usually elite white men’s – interests over everyone else’s. Although colonial and racist economic injustices, they concluded, are often framed as a justification for foundation philanthropy’s existence, they are also what makes its existence possible in the first place.

McPhedran Waitzer's co-panelist, Bahubeshi, stated that through racist and unequal state policies, Indigenous peoples and other racialized and equity-seeking peoples have been not "left behind" but, rather, strategically pushed out. Speakers urged PFC members to do more to support Indigenous and racialized youth as "the leaders of today," and to engage in further truth-telling about the settler philanthropy sector. They suggested that doing so would inspire more "radical" changes in the sector than had been taking place in the name of reconciliation and diversity/inclusion, ultimately redirecting settler philanthropists from a narrative of individual generosity to one of collective responsibility to address injustice and inequality. The recording of the session was animated by speakers' visible frustration with institutional philanthropy, and McPhedran Waitzer asked the audience to embrace the discomfort their frustration might generate, describing critical feedback as a "gift" and calling on audience members to "take on some of that burden of education [i.e. truth-telling]" especially if it "triggers fragility" or makes them "feel attacked."

After explaining the content of that session at our all-staff meeting, my colleague shared the reaction of one audience member (which is not captured by the online recording I have analyzed here). During the question-and-answer period, the individual told the panelists that because foundation philanthropy is funded by private wealth, it is a private affair, and no one else therefore really has the right to "demand" that private philanthropy do one thing or another. His comments implied that personal generosity and the individual right to make giving decisions, rather than a collective responsibility to advance equity or reparations (as the youth panelists had argued), was the driving force (or the imperative) for private philanthropy in Canada. His refusal was a closure, potentially triggered by the discomfort generated by the panelists' sharings. My colleague concluded her story with the audience member's response, stating: "and that was that." That was

the end of the story for her, and the end of the presentation. In a way, her conclusion was a kind of closure, too. "And that was that" was an affirmation of the refusal that the audience member had given voice to. By my former colleague's telling it seems this plenary resulted, amongst some of the audience members, in explicit colonial unknowing triggered by white settler fragility.

Hilary Pearson's reflections on the plenary afterward suggested the conversation did indeed produce some discomfort: it was, she wrote, "challenging, as it had to be" because "for most foundations, especially family-run, this may seem difficult or uncomfortable territory" (Pearson 2018b). Bahubeshi also remarked during the question-and-answer period that one of the audience members described the experience as one of "cultivated discomfort." Writing in 2016, Pearson had reflected that these kinds of conversations were not common in the sector a decade before. "Rarely has organized philanthropy offered opportunities for people to acknowledge and discuss their own biases," she wrote (Pearson 2016a). But in the present moment focused on reconciliation, Pearson noted, philanthropists and philanthropy organizations were being forced to reflect on those topics in order to be "truly effective" in their work.

Pearson's conclusion that the opportunity to be uncomfortable could lead to "truly effective" philanthropic action is of interest to me because I see settler discomfort as having potential to both preclude and mobilize action. As some feminist affect theorists have suggested, being told truths that make one uncomfortable does not necessarily lead directly to personal or social transformation – especially for those in social locations of privilege or dominance, like the audience member whose response my former colleague had recounted (Pedwell 2021). As Pedwell (2021) suggests, one of the challenges of addressing persistent forms of racism (and, I would argue, durable colonial violence) through critique or truth-telling is that racism and coloniality "actively resist efforts to

bring them to conscious awareness" and "aggressively defend against transformation." This is because the possibility of transformation "risks bringing shameful values to conscious attention, but also because it is perceived to entail a loss of advantage or control" (p. 74). Furthermore, as Avery Gordon writes in her theorization of hauntings, one's notification of involvement also can "inaugurate the necessity of doing something about it" – a necessity that is incompatible with settler normalcy and stabilization.

While the explicit closure I witnessed at the staff meeting at my old job is an obvious example of a closure triggered by truth-telling, I actually find that less obvious refusals are more prevalent across this archive of texts. At times, discomfort can trigger explicit closures and at others soft refusals in which Indigenous peoples are asked to share truths only in ways that are "palatable to white settlers" (Smith, Tuck and Yang 2019, p. 15). It is common for truth-telling to be softened through discursive processes of renaming (discussed in the previous chapter), or to be surrounded by caveats to alleviate settler discomfort. Indigenous authors across my archive describe their own experiences with these kinds of closures, and caution against them. Fox (2022) explained that when settlers feel discomfort because something "is too hard to hear…too heavy…it stops them and perpetuates [the] problem" (in Vavek et al. 2022). Such closures and refusals reflect how settlers' discomfort in a moment of haunting or truth-telling sometimes can function to reproduce colonial status quos and stabilize settler normalcy.

I have been struck by the tendency for Indigenous authors, especially in the earlier years of the reconciliation change narrative, to emphasize that the truth-telling they sometimes engage in is not intended as "finger pointing" or "casting blame." A poignant example occurred at the closing session of PFC's Symposium in Montreal, in 2017 (Nemtin *et al.* 2017). Mohawk writer and

director of the television series *Mohawk Girls* Tracy Deer began by truth-telling with audience members: "let me tell you, it's bleak…you see the small snippets in the news with sad stories coming from my community" but these are the realities that "my people have been living now for too long." She called on settler philanthropists and philanthropy leaders in the audience "to shake it up, change our perspective, open our mind, open our hearts and come together to work." This, she continued with visible emotion, is not an Indigenous responsibility but a settler one: "I'm going to point to all of *you* just because you represent Canada…this country is responsible for the problems that we are living in." She began to cry as she said, "that is what is at stake." Later in the session, however, she returned to her earlier comments, saying: "I just want to make it clear that it's not blame. And it's about being allies…it's about wanting to build a bridge, wanting to find a friend to show that we are more similar than we are different. And we need you." Unless something was edited out of the recording or there was visible tension among audience members that I cannot see from it, it does not seem that Deer had softened her earlier comments because of a specific reaction of someone in the room. It may have been rather that, having frequently been met with settler refusals of personal responsibility, Indigenous authors sometimes felt compelled to pre-emptively offer such caveats to their moments of truth telling.

Unspoken expectations that settlers be guided through critique gently, comfortably, without being made to feel personally implicated in the truths they are being faced with, are key to the recognition/unknowing dynamic. Softening the blow of discomfort produced by truth-telling in a sense restores settlers in philanthropy to the comfort of what they are already doing well, and have been doing for a long time. Such moments feed what Tuck and Yang (2012) theorize as "settler moves to innocence." The potential openings afforded by the settler discomfort that Deer initially may have triggered in her earlier comments risk being shut down through soft refusals. Settlers and

settler philanthropy institutions become safely re-positioned as outside observers of coloniality and Indigenous suffering, who have critical roles to play in the reconciliation dynamic, rather than as directly and personally implicated in those things. Colonial durabilities are gently set back in place, and settler fragility, momentarily triggered by discomfort, retreats into the shadows to remain unremarked and unseen.

5.4.1 – Embracing discomfort: settler de-centring, reparations and reciprocity

Settler discomfort does have potential to generate possibilities outside of, or beyond, the unknowing and the refusals. Some truth-telling iterations harness settler discomfort to encourage habitual "unearthing" of colonial themes in everyday life and philanthropic practice, and thus to enable the dynamic of reciprocity as a way of imagining reconciliation otherwise. This dynamic reflects what theorist Megan Boler (1998) describes as the "pedagogy of discomfort": a process of challenging and deconstructing "cherished beliefs" in collective moments of learning that in turn act as calls to action (Boler 1999, 176). Unlike the focus on self-reflection emphasized in the "learning about" version of the journey, which as Boler writes, reduces "historical complexities to an overly tidy package that ignores our mutual responsibility to one another," the pedagogy of discomfort demands "a genealogy of one's experience" that pushes beyond compassion and remorse (pp. 177-178). Some Indigenous critics' calls to settlers in the philanthropy sphere mirror this pedagogy of discomfort. They urge settlers to embrace discomfort and engage in decolonial micro-reconciliations, shifting toward settler decentring and reciprocity in the settler philanthropy environment. For example, in a 2021 Twitter thread, Archie described the Circle as "a member-serving organization and we don't serve cupcakes - we serve truth, presence, action and deep relations. We are not a funder, we are not a hand holder, we are not beholden to the comfort of whiteness." Here, Archie declined settler demands to be served the comfort of their own

stabilization through caveats and gentle reframing for palatability. Her declination, and those of other Indigenous critics across this archive, is a critical act of what Gaertner calls incommensurability. The non-cupcake truth-telling dynamic that the Circle "serves up" offers versions of truth and reconciliation that are not commensurable with settler expectations to be lauded as self-reflexive learners and heroes, and that do not feed into the mainstream, state-sponsored version of reconciliation that motivate settler moves to innocence. In this iteration, discomfort is imagined as a doorway to generative decolonial possibilities.

To get to these possibilities, Indigenous and settler authors across the archive tell their readers and listeners to "sit with" their discomfort rather than to allow it to trigger a refusal. Brascoupé asked listeners in a well-attended 2016 webinar by the Circle to "hold a willingness to be uncomfortable" in what she calls "the era of reconciliation" (Brascoupé Peters et al. 2016). She noted that this would lead to better understanding and more sustainable structures of relationality. Just so, in the 2018 plenary panel my former colleague described, Dupré had invited PFC members take part in the discomfort truth-telling might engender, and "not to shut down or get defensive" (in Bahubeshi et al. 2018). She told her audience that embracing discomfort can open the door to important possibilities for the settler philanthropy sector: "I share this information with love and with hope for what we can do together." There are numerous examples like this across the texts in my archive, especially those authored by Indigenous people. In most cases, they suggest that holding space for discomfort and paying attention to fragility – not feeling compassion or remorse – is the critical first step to "unearthing of colonial themes ingrained in day-to-day life and interaction" that the Circle suggests is central to real reconciliation (Munshi and Levi 2021)

Embracing discomfort may be an opening toward what Manning calls "minor key" shifts in the everyday, or toward the work of daily "micro-reconciliations." Micro-reconciliation, a term coined by Opaskwayak Cree critical theorist Greg Younging, are "smaller acts, shifts, and reflections" that may not be "flashy," publicly performed or even acknowledged by anyone else, but are a quiet "starting point for living in better relation" (Toomey *et al.* 2021). Micro-reconciliations move the truth-telling dynamic from the star-studded plenary session offering learnings in comfortable language, to everyday decision-making and practice informed by truth-telling that at times generates deep discomfort. They centre on deliberate acts of settler de-centring in relationship with other settlers, which in turn open the possibility toward incommensurability and reciprocity, encouraging settler decentring. As such, they present dissonant possibilities beyond and against the grand gesture.

One way of settler-decentring that Indigenous writers emphasize in this archive is to remind settlers in philanthropy that settler philanthropic practices and institutions as they are commonly understood are not the only form of philanthropy out there. Innu scholar Shelley Price's research focuses on restorying philanthropy through Indigenous narratives of giving and sharing. In this research, she draws together oral stories from five different Indigenous communities (Innu, Algonquin, Mohawk, Cree and Mi'kmaq) that illuminate Indigenous philosophies of giving, sharing, and reciprocity. She highlights several key commonalities in an interview about the project published in *The Philanthropist* in 2021 (Bérard and Price 2021). To the Elders and knowledge-holders who spoke with her, redistribution and reciprocity are fundamentally linked: the roles of giving and receiving could be reversed at any time, so reciprocity maintains community cohesion. The oral histories Price has recorded also suggest that for some Indigenous communities, reciprocity amongst human beings is a reflection of the relations of reciprocity required between

humans and the world around them. Living in balance with all human and non-human relations in these ontologies means living in reciprocal, not over-extractive, relation with the world around us. Furthermore, panelists at a session of the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit, hosted by the Circle in 2020, told settler funders that "unlearning" colonial and racist assumptions requires humbly recognizing "all the ways in which philanthropy exists" outside of institutional philanthropy (Contreras Correal et al. 2020c). Janine Manning emphasized that Indigenous folks have "always been philanthropists." This is clear refusal of settler centring that pushes settlers to look beyond themselves and their familiar philanthropic settings to imagine possibilities beyond. Acknowledging that settler philanthropies are not the only ones there, and that Indigenous peoples have been sustaining themselves without the intervention of settler philanthropists since time immemorial, may produce discomfort. It can also be an opening toward reciprocity.

Archie also frequently has spoken to the ways that the Circle aims to guide settlers to explore how white settler supremacy "shows up" in everyday, often unseen, ways. Coloniality and white supremacy show up, she suggested, in many ways and places, in turn affecting relationships and funding decisions: "it's their own programming, it's their own systems, it's their own grant applications that are the barriers to building quality relationships" (Archie 2021b). Archie encouraged people working in foundations to compare data on how much their organization grants to Indigenous-led versus non-Indigenous led organizations, and how many grants went to organizations that served Indigenous peoples rather than to those that are led by them. In a 2017 webinar she asked rhetorically if there is a need to "lower the volume on some voices or practices in the nonprofit and philanthropic sector" (Bahubeshi et al. 2017). In the same webinar, Bahubeshi recommended settler philanthropists and settler organizations try what she calls "leading from behind." In this dynamic, those with the power and resources step away from setting the agenda but

continue to support the agendas set by Indigenous and racialized leaders. Shifting relations through the embrace of discomfort is imagined as a necessary step toward sustainable and complex possibilities for Indigenous empowerment and self-determination, reparative philanthropy and meaningful philanthropic/Indigenous community relations built on reciprocity.

Two settler-authored articles in *The Philanthropist* expressed commitments to an intellectual and affective learning journey in the pursuit of reconciliation in ways that are distinct from the “learning from” paradigm. They emphasized the micro-reconciliations and moments of “minor” change on a consistent and intentional basis. Nonprofit Studies scholar Peter Elson’s (2018) and writer Shagufta Pasta’s (2020) articulations of the learning journey motif differed from those described earlier in this chapter because they embraced the truth-telling paradigm and centred on decolonization (rather than reconciliation). Decolonization discourse has often been closely associated with reconciliation but is also differentiated from it because it tends to have more of a focus on critically and explicitly dismantling colonial supremacy internally (i.e. at a personal level) and in social structures and institution. Critics have noted however that decolonization as a concept can be just as susceptible to settler and institutional co-option for the purposes of stabilizing the status quo and uplifting settler reputations (Tuck and Yang 2012; Gaudry and Lorenz 2019). Here, I am concerned with the ways that Elson and Pasta focused their discussion on taking direct, consistent and personal responsibility for the decolonial truth-telling journey. They both discuss efforts to take a critical eye to their own sometimes unmarked settler supremacy regardless of how uncomfortable doing so might be.

Elson, who teaches nonprofit management at the University of Victoria and has written extensively on philanthropy in Western Canada, wrote that addressing one’s ignorance must be followed by

action. For him, this has involved writing about and teaching in nonprofit studies with a decolonial perspective. "First," he wrote, "I wanted to address my own substantial lack of knowledge about Indigenous people in Canada" and then "I wanted to make whatever steps I took toward decolonization and reconciliation to be purposeful and meaningful." He noted that this was not "an easy process" and "it's not over" but rather that his "commitment to this path will be a life-long journey" shifting him from "interested observer to engaged participant." Pasta (2020) wrote similarly, "decolonization, first and foremost, begins with me…It involves reflection, listening deeply, being courageous, and addressing one's fears, assumptions, and discomfort." She described her "personal journey to learn about decolonizing philanthropy and true reconciliation" as an embodied and affective experience that made her feel vulnerable and uncertain: "I listened more, I was more vulnerable, and I was more able to notice when it was hard for me to lean into the unexpected." Elson's and Pasta's version of the journey toward "true" reconciliation entails decolonization first, a process of not just learning more about Indigenous peoples but also shifting one's "way of seeing and being" in the world, seeking to understand the ways one's own social location (one's settlerness) is a position of power and privilege. Yet it emphasizes that the commitment does not end there, but requires a daily "leaning in" to the unexpected and the uncomfortable. In turn, the smaller, intentional and "minor" shifts Elson and Pasta imagine might encourage other settlers in their circles to do the same.

Indigenous authors also repeatedly urge settlers to do the work themselves – and with one another – rather than shuffling the burden of their learning journeys onto Indigenous shoulders (e.g. Dupré 2019; Slater 2021). "So much of the labour and learning that is required by settler philanthropic institutions is actually stuff you can do on your own," Archie explained (2021b), and Indigenous leaders and organizations often do not have the capacity or time to answer to settler learning

journeys. She noted that Indigenous organizations and communities are often inundated with requests from settlers looking to build partnerships toward increasing inclusivity. "We keep telling folks, 'you know what? We're kind of busy,'" she explained. Underfunded and responding to both everyday and systemic racism, she said, Indigenous peoples in the sector do not have the time or capacity take responsibility for settler learning journeys. Sara Lyons, a leader at CFC and former member of the governing circle at the Circle, described a relevant interaction in 2020. She told interviewers that she once called Archie at a critical moment in Canadian colonial history: the evening in 2017 when a white settler farmer from Saskatchewan, Gerald Stanley, escaped both murder and manslaughter convictions after shooting 22-year-old Cree man Coulten Boushie point-blank in the head (in Dirksen et al. 2020). Lyons recalled: "I called [Archie] up seeking…an answer to what organizations like my own, CFC or [other] foundations in Canada should do?" Archie never responded to Lyons' question, "and finally I was like 'you're not going to give me the answer, are you?'" She reflected after, "that's the kind of alchemy that will lead to change…it's funny how I can be years into this work…and I am still consistently catching myself being like 'I am going to get the answer from Kris and she will tell me what to do' instead of recognizing that's my work." It is not that Lyons or Archie do not want settlers in philanthropy to engage with Indigenous peoples, but rather that the burden of that relationship, especially when it comes to identifying the necessary follow-up action one should take in a moment of settler discomfort, should not fall on Indigenous colleagues. Archie urged settlers to "do your homework well" without extracting from Indigenous peoples.

Thus, the truth-telling dynamic and the action that follows can occur in ways incommensurable with the types of reconciliation learning journeys that restore settler normalcy and result in colonial extractions. Learning and "doing your homework", according to Indigenous leaders, should lead

beyond the act of reflection, to actionable possibilities beyond what mainstream reconciliation offers. Embracing discomfort refuses settler stabilization and instead focuses on making everyday commitments, actions, and strategies of settler decentring, reparations and reciprocity. It leads to "undoing systems of colonial capitalism and making space to centre Indigenous ways of knowing and being in relation" rather than reifying colonial recognitions and unknowing in the practice of philanthropy (Gaertner, 2020, p. 174). Here the settler learning journey is repositioned not as an individual conversion experience for the good of the settler, but as an ongoing life commitment to think differently and imagine other possibilities that are not located within the realm of the neoliberal colonial status quo. This is because the truth-telling dynamic refuses to centre the settler, requires the settler to do the work themselves (rather than participation in a learning journey that is extractive, or consumption-based), and does not allow fragility to go unchecked. The generativity of discomfort, Indigenous authors across this archive suggest, lies in its incommensurability with the dominant versions of reconciliation that ultimately serve the settler.

Conclusions and summary of findings across chapters

This chapter analyzed some of the affective contours and dissonant outcomes of a motif that figures centrally in the reconciliation change narrative as expressed across the archive of texts I have assembled. At times, the settler learning journey can be a means of centring settlers and stabilizing the colonial status quo through simultaneous processes of recognition and unknowing, especially via settlers' consumption of Indigenous suffering, which lead to settler experiences and performances of compassion and remorse. The bulk of the chapter explored how the settler learning journey motif often draws on and contributes to the "grand gesture" version of reconciliation, which ultimately gives voice to the "nonvictims" and functions to get them "off the hook" (Manning, 2016, 223). Often the personal learning journey centres on settlers "seeing" Indigenous

suffering for the first time and experiencing or expressing remorse and compassion; in turn, the learner feels inspired to learn more and act. This can function as colonial recognition, which contributes to the stabilization of colonial durabilities in several ways. It positions settlers and settler philanthropy institutions as outsiders to coloniality and Indigenous people's suffering. As such it has the potential to displace the embeddedness of settler philanthropy *within* the landscape of colonial violence. It also often comes with the unspoken caveat that settlers must not be made to feel personally responsible for the causes (or the amelioration) of that suffering. At times, then, the learning journey becomes a means not to advance decolonial possibilities but to protect settler fragilities and stabilize the reputation of settler philanthropy while co-opting Indigenous sufferings as a "canvas" for settler self-reflexivity and transformation. Depending on how it is expressed and undertaken, the emotional elements of the "learning about" iteration present a powerful example of the colonial unknowing/recognition dynamic in the reconciliation change narrative.

I also argue, however, that the learning journey can be rearticulated in different ways – dissonantly – to expand or reframe (or sometimes refuse) reconciliation, looking toward more critical and anti-colonial ways of being. I explored the generative possibilities of settler discomfort when it is invoked and embraced in the pursuit of alternative, decolonial futures. Indigenous authors and some settler authors across my archive note that transformation occurs not through settlers' self-reflective journeys based on colonial recognition, but through quiet receptiveness to discomfort. "Sitting with" discomfort can lead to practical actions that de-centre white settler privilege in philanthropic spaces: a necessary step toward everyday and structural practices aimed at reciprocity, reparations, and incommensurability.

The learning journey motif in the reconciliation change narrative can have dissonant expressions and outcomes – often resulting in closures that reify colonial durabilities, but sometimes also

making generative space for openings toward something otherwise. This all matters at a material level because it influences how resources in the settler philanthropy sector are directed in the name of reconciliation. The learning journey is positioned as a necessary first step toward "doing" reconciliation as framed in this narrative – positioning settlers as having central roles. Yet where it leaves reconciliation within the bounds of colonial recognition and settler feelings, some Indigenous critics argue, more philanthropic energy and money ends up directed toward professional development, self-transformation and settler performances of self-reflexivity than toward addressing the deep-rooted and structural issues of coloniality and white supremacy in the sector, or toward abundantly supporting Indigenous-led work toward self-determination.

Taken together with the findings of the previous two chapters, the analysis I have presented here has aimed to unpack the dissonant functions and entanglements of discourse and affect in the expression of the reconciliation change narrative. I have demonstrated how discourse, and those things that both exceed discourse and shape it, play a critical role in the shifting and often dissonant packaging, expression, experience and functions of reconciliation. In part, the dissonant outcomes of the reconciliation change narrative can be seen in the co-constitutive processes of unknowing and recognition. These stabilize the status quo in the settler philanthropy world, centring settlers, reproducing inequitable and transactional power dynamics, and extracting from Indigenous peoples and communities. While on the surface appearing to be about transforming Indigenous/settler relations for the better, colonial recognition in the reconciliation change narrative often becomes about securing Canadian identities and thus obscuring colonial durabilities.

Some of the foundational texts in my archive, such as the *Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action* and other texts that followed it, begin with the recognition (and the urgent call for others

in the sector to recognize) that there are serious problems in Canada that settler philanthropy actors have a critical role in addressing. These problems are often positioned as past phenomena with present "legacies". They also often centre around the recognitions that settler philanthropy organizations (and the sector as a whole) do not meaningfully include the people they aim to serve, including Indigenous peoples. Settler philanthropy in turn is positioned as having an important role in addressing these "widely recognized" problems. The trouble with this configuration, critical decolonial theorists suggest, is that structural change is not necessarily an outcome. By keeping enduring colonial violence and racism out of the reconciliation conversation, colonial recognitions work together with colonial unknowing to rescue settler stability in the sector and beyond. In the context of the Canadian institutional philanthropy sector, Saifer and Ahmad (2023) write, mythologies rooted in recognition/unknowing affirm the institutional importance of philanthropic organizations "as a force for social change" (pp. 3-6). As such, the key stakeholder and beneficiary of colonial recognition/unknowing in the reconciliation change narrative becomes the settler Canadian working in and for the sector who, through their reconciliation work, can demonstrate how "truly Canadian" they are. Doing so, they affirm philanthropic organizations' and the sector's social legitimacy. The central pattern of dissonance I see in the "grand gesture" strains of reconciliation expressed this archive is that, despite being all about transformation, the change narrative can elevate and uphold – and often conceal – the colonial durabilities at work in the settler philanthropy world and in neoliberal-colonial Canada more broadly.

For this reason, critics in the archive caution settlers in philanthropy to shift their focus away from settler self-improvement toward radical awareness of structures of white supremacy and coloniality in the settler philanthropy sector, with a view to shifting power relations, engaging in reparations, developing relations of reciprocity and amply supporting Indigenous self-determination. Thus,

dissonance is also always present in the archive in the form of resistance, refusals and reimaginings – alternatives to the dominant articulations of reconciliation. In these articulations, Indigenous peoples centre their concerns and visions for the future beyond reconciliatory politics, settler philanthropy and coloniality. Many of the strongest and clearest of such critiques come from Indigenous women and women of colour in the archive. Their critiques tend to focus on "minor tendencies, gestures and interactions" rooted in settler decentring, reparations and reciprocity, toward the advancement of Indigenous self-determination. Such possibilities, incommensurable with dominant reconciliation frameworks and status quos in the settle philanthropy sector, resist and refuse colonial violence explicitly and habitually, and reimagine reconciliation and settler philanthropy completely – even abandoning them altogether. In the concluding chapter of this thesis, I will summarize these analyses and discussions as responses to the research questions I presented in the introductory chapters. I will then turn to limitations of the project and possibilities for future research, and to a discussion of why I think radical awareness of the dissonance at the heart of this change narrative – and of the settler philanthropy sector as a whole – is both necessary and productive.

Conclusion – on philanthropy toward decolonial love

In this concluding chapter, I will return to the main goals and outcomes of my thesis project, discuss some of this project design's key limitations, and outline potential avenues for future research. First, though, I want to share one more personal anecdote that demonstrates some of the tensions and possibilities of critiquing reconciliation and settler philanthropy. In June 2021, I attended the Circle's online All My Relations gathering. This biennial conference brings together Circle members (both Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations) for several days of learning and professional development focused on, among other things, bringing decolonial and anti-racist practices to philanthropy, amplifying the work of Indigenous-led organizations and initiatives, and generating connections between settler philanthropy organizations and Indigenous communities and leaders. Since 2020, the Circle has incorporated a required practice into all its gatherings called "introductions the Circle way." In every small group activity, participants are asked to introduce themselves to their small groups in a very specific way: beginning with names and pronouns, then discussing the Indigenous names and histories of the territories/homelands where one lives, works and plays (if needed, doing some research to learn about this), and sharing details about how one (and/or one's ancestors) got there.

In essence, this practice requires participants to offer a land acknowledgement every time they meet. But it is in some ways more radical than the kinds of land acknowledgements that tend to dominate settler institutions: shifting the message from "this *used* to be Indigenous land, but now I'm here" to "this still is Indigenous land, and I'm here because my ancestors moved here, benefitting from colonial violence, white supremacy and broken treaty promises." The Circle leadership requires the practice in every group setting. At the conference I attended, there were five small group sessions per day over three days, so introductions "the Circle way" happened a lot. The

intention, according to leadership who introduced the requirement, was to bring to the fore the reality of ongoing Indigenous claims to land and sovereignty, and of persistent practices and outcomes of coloniality in Canada.

I heard many variations on the introduction over the three days I attended. I heard some Indigenous attendees say that they and their ancestors had been where they live since time immemorial, and other Indigenous participants who explained that their homelands were elsewhere but they were currently residing as visitors in another Indigenous community's homelands. I heard other individuals from diaspora communities discuss their ancestors' or relatives' move to Canada when circumstances required them to leave their homes and create new ones in Indigenous lands. I heard some settlers explain the stories of how their ancestors had acquired "cheap land" in Western Canada from the federal government in the early 20th century, and that they only recently had learned that these were Indigenous lands. At times, I sensed trepidation and discomfort from my co-attendees. At others, I heard people say that talking out loud about their family's relationships to colonialism turned out to be an important learning experience.

In one instance, I was in a small group with only one other individual – another white settler woman, who worked as a lead program officer at a middle-sized private foundation based in Ontario, which focused on environmental issues. During her introduction the Circle way she expressed clear discomfort, and her delivery and body language seemed restrained. As we began to talk about our work, though, she spoke much more openly. She appeared a little more comfortable as she explained that the foundation she worked for was only just beginning to learn what it needed to do to meaningfully engage with reconciliation. When I described to her the focus of my PhD, and my interest in the settler philanthropy sector's engagement with reconciliation, she said to me

"how are we doing?" – meaning, how are "we, as a sector," doing? I explained to her that from what I had seen in my research so far, engagement with reconciliation could sometimes open the door to transformative practice, but also often reproduced and obscured problematic behaviours rooted in colonial relations of violence in philanthropy. I shared a few details of some of the processes that I have discussed in this thesis. I could see her body language shift again as I was talking – she seemed to shut down. Her shoulders seemed to tense. "Great," she said, rolling her eyes. There was a bit of awkward silence afterward, until we started to delve into the assigned content of the small-group session. However, toward the end of the discussion, she thanked me for what I had shared and said earnestly with eyebrows raised, "I guess we have some work to do."

I don't know exactly what this discussion, or, more importantly, the offerings of the AMR gathering and the Circle, did for her and her organization. Whether she took the learnings from AMR to her foundation's leadership to recommend practices, funding decisions or policies in her foundation is something I really do not know. But her reactions throughout our session embodied some of the key tensions I see at work in the reconciliation change narrative as expressed across the archive of texts I have analyzed. It is easy for settlers in philanthropy to talk about what they are doing, or what they want to do – but it is often much more challenging to talk about the structures and conditions that placed them in the position to do those things in the first place. Exposing the durability of coloniality that persists despite (or because of) commitments to reconciliation can trigger anxiety that leads to closures to the generative possibilities such exposure – such hauntings – could offer. Other times, critiques are embraced as openings toward something else. Often, these reactions occur both at once, in tension, producing dissonance.

Through this study of the reconciliation change narrative as expressed in the settler philanthropy ecosystem, I have sought to shed light on some of these dissonant outcomes. I explored what the discursive/affective entanglements of the change narrative can tell us about the subtle yet enduring ways that colonial relations of power persist and shift in the settler philanthropy world. I explored this bundle of discourse and affect guided by the following research questions:

- How does settler philanthropy engage with reconciliation as expressed across the texts analyzed?
- What are the discursive and affective contours of the reconciliation change narrative (and some of the resistant alternatives to its dominant strains) as expressed across this archive of texts?
- What does the change narrative (and its critiques and alternatives) say about settler philanthropy's place in the wider environment of colonial relations in Canada?

I responded to these questions through a critical textual analysis of a diverse archive of texts I assembled by drawing together documents produced by four philanthropic intermediaries, Philanthropic Foundations Canada, Community Foundations Canada, Imagine Canada and The Circle, as well as a popular sector publication called *The Philanthropist,* and several other adjacent publications and organizations that produced relevant materials as well. My analysis drew on approaches and theory from post-colonial discourse analysis and affect studies, philanthropic studies, as well as decolonial studies to understand the interconnected features of the change narrative, and their complex and often dissonant outcomes.

I have argued that the reconciliation change narrative, as I see it expressed across this archive of texts, provides a useful lens on these dissonant processes, and thus on the complex roles settler philanthropies can occupy in the wider field of neoliberal-colonial relations in Canada. The many layers of dissonance in this change narrative emerge as tensions across the archive, including tensions between a sense of hope in reconciliation's potential and strong cynicism toward its

outcomes; between senses of urgency to increase settler philanthropy's engagement with reconciliation and calls to settler philanthropy to do the work thoughtfully and slowly, in meaningful relationship with communities; between inclusivity and extractivism; between commitments and action; between settler participation and settler centring; between different kinds of colonial "hauntings" and different forms of truth-telling. Such tensions are reflective of the ways in which reconciliation has potential to produce both closures to transformation and space for thinking otherwise. This is what makes it such an interesting and complicated change narrative to address, especially in the philanthropy world which itself is full of tensions and possibilities. It is not always easy to reconcile these tensions, but I think it is important to foreground them. In doing so we can explore and make visible "connectivities to those colonial histories that bear on the present [but] escape scrutiny," and articulate generative possibilities of dismantling them (Stoler 2016 p. 4). In the context of reconciliation, settler philanthropy's intentions and outcomes can be ambiguous and paradoxical, characterized by tensions and dissonance.

The reconciliation change narrative powerfully situates settler philanthropy in the modern colonial order in complex ways. I have argued that what historian Ann Laura Stoler calls colonial durabilities, both in the Canadian settler philanthropy sector and more widely in Canadian society, can hide behind the expression and performance of change narratives like reconciliation: stories that are touted as all about the need for largescale social revolution. As the story that opened my thesis suggested, many Indigenous and settler individuals working in, or adjacent to, the sector had expressed strong hopefulness in the early years of the reconciliation change narrative. Yet critiques of reconciliation quickly emerged, especially voiced by Indigenous leaders in the sector who experienced the dissonance of reconciliation as violence: the continuation of the colonial status quo shrouded by "a prettier, brighter umbrella," as Kris Archie (2021) described it. Settler engagement

with reconciliation was found to be disappointing and underwhelming – masking the "business as usual" of durable settler colonial violence in Canada.

Archie's words point to the main strain of dissonance I have identified in dominant expressions of reconciliation. Although it is all about transformation, reconciliation is often what Erin Manning (2016) calls a "grand gesture," it becomes part of the reproduction of all sorts of mechanisms and structures of domination that persist in and through philanthropy. Even (or perhaps especially) well-meaning attempts to shift structures of power in settler philanthropic spaces can maintain durabilities. Discursive and affective elements of the reconciliation change narrative, especially at the intersections of colonial unknowing and recognition, can stabilize the status quo in settler philanthropic practices and spaces, centring settlers, reproducing inequitable and transactional power dynamics, and extracting from Indigenous peoples and communities. Where engagement with reconciliation causes colonial hauntings, this can trigger colonial unknowing – efforts to (consciously or not) distance settler philanthropy actors and organizations from the durable colonial relations that hauntings remind them of. In turn, everyday processes and policies of dispossession and violence in the present proceed unacknowledged and unchecked, exempting settlers and settler philanthropy from radical transitions in thought and practice.

This in turn, Indigenous leaders across this archive of texts warn, leads to outcomes that are dissonant with the calls for transformation at the heart of the reconciliation change narrative. For example, where recognition of a lack of inclusivity/diversity leads to DEI activities of various kinds (increasing settler philanthropy's funding of Indigenous communities and programs, hiring Indigenous staff and leadership, engaging in learning and professional development for settlers etc.), without radical attention to the underlying structures of coloniality and white supremacy, these activities can become

colonial extractions and reify the status quo (e.g. Goodchild 2019; Manning 2021; Vavek et al. 2022). Where well-worded and genuinely felt commitments by settler philanthropy leaders may signal a desire for change, they can also function as closures if they are not meaningfully accompanied by action and relationship building (Rowe and Roussin 2020). Colonial recognitions of a need for change, combined with colonial unknowing, can result in a reframing of colonial violence into different forms that, in practice, dilute other radical anti-colonial and anti-racist possibilities and rescue settler normalcy.

Yet, some expressions of (or against) this change narrative emerge in the archive I have studied as challenges and resistance to the dominant framing – as spaces where alternative possibilities are articulated. I have aimed to demonstrate throughout my chapters that there is always something more than durable colonial relations, which are durable because they remake themselves in the face of the "something otherwise" that threatens their totality. What Erin Manning (2016) describes as the "minor tendencies, gestures and interactions" – emerge and persist against and beyond the reconciliation change narrative. Critics of "grand gesture" reconciliation reimagine the affective possibilities of settlers' engagement with reconciliation toward reparations, reciprocity and the advancement of Indigenous sovereignties. Critics' articulations are central to understanding the "what else." Gaertner argues that if in Canada we are to continue with reconciliation as a meaningful concept at all, we must "insist on a reconciliation that centres Indigenous perspectives and creates space for Indigenous voices by quieting settler colonial attempts to define the work" and objecting to the translation of reconciliation into "state vernacular" (p. 224; 227). The critical articulations and "unruly ruptures" discussed in this thesis offer a dissonant alternative to dominant strains of reconciliation, both in and beyond reconciliation for the settler philanthropy world. They are examples of what Gaertner calls on readers to centre – refusing translations of reconciliation

into colonial and state vernacular. Authors in this archive present possibilities that emerge as they proceed, that work to continuously unravel and then reshape possibilities by centring the "next now, the now that is chasing at our heels" as Smith, Tuck and Yang put it (2019, p. 16).

Some authors across the archive suggest that the work in the settler philanthropy sector must be led by truth-telling, embracing settler discomfort, boldly facing hauntings, and decentring of whiteness and settlerness. They suggest that affective triggers of settler anxiety and discomfort – like those experienced by the foundation leader I shared space with at the AMR session – can be harnessed toward decolonial possibilities. This is because they can trigger the need to explicitly uncover, on an ongoing basis, the ways that settler philanthropic practices and institutions are implicated in the durabilities of colonial violence and racism – both on a "macro" level and in habitual everyday practice. Settler decentring must rest therefore on a clear awareness that the settler philanthropy ecosystem is structurally imbricated in the field of durable colonial and white supremacist relations, institutions, policies and frameworks that together form and uphold the Canadian state. Yet, even in the settler de-centring dynamic, Indigenous critics argue that care is required. It must also refuse reconciliation practices that re-centre settlers as "constant good works in progress," or inclusivity practices that are extractive.

The discomfort of settler decentring and truth telling in turn can produce an ethical obligation to act, toward radical reparations. Settler decentring becomes a starting place for amply supporting Indigenous sovereignties and then stepping out of the way, perforating the assumed totality of grand gestures like reconciliation and of neoliberal colonial relations writ large. Reparations philanthropy focuses not on "reconciling relationships" with Indigenous peoples through inclusion, but rather abundantly supporting Indigenous-led efforts toward self-determination. As Michi

Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar Leanne Simpson (2014) argues, a politics of reconciliation, representation and recognition that does not "actively affirm Indigenous self-determination" simply perpetuates settler colonialism and Indigenous dispossession, presenting a "multicultural solution" to the "problem" of Indigenous refusals of neoliberal coloniality (p. 14). Supporting Indigenous sovereignties as expressed in this archive translates to the ample support (financial or otherwise) Indigenous-led solutions and potential futures, not necessarily with reference to the reconciliation of Indigenous/settler relations. To avoid replicating and maintaining the status quo in settler philanthropic discourse and action, advocates of reparative philanthropy point to participatory and trust-based philanthropies discussed in the wider literature, drawing those wider conversations into explicit discussions of coloniality and Indigenous sovereignties. This is because settler-led solutions, according to the Circle board members, "have largely failed to alleviate the social issues produced by settler practice" (Couchman, Struthers and Wiebe p. 151). That is, the settlers' tools cannot and will not dismantle the settlers' house, to use the famous phrase of intersectional Black feminist philosopher Audre Lorde (1984). The intention is for settler philanthropists and organizations to "step out of the way," letting go of power and instead supporting Indigenous-led work in the background, on Indigenous people's own terms.

Alternative possibilities are also often reframed in texts across this archive with reference to reciprocity. Reciprocity is positioned as a political and philosophical alternative to dominant reconciliation frameworks that tend to centre the importance of settler leadership in "fixing" problems associated with Indigenous-settler relations – a position that critics argue can reproduce "transactional" philanthropic relations. Thinking and acting in terms of reciprocity in place of transactional relations can shift perspectives from the assumption that settler philanthropy actors should address problems created by "historical colonialism" to the idea that they should enter into

long-term and meaningful relationships with Indigenous communities through "co-created, collaborative, multilateral relationships in which all parties are committed to learning and growing" and Indigenous sovereignty is amplified and activated (Munshi and Levi, 2021, p. 3).

Shifting the view from recognition and reconciliation, which produce unknowing and stabilize status quos, the dissonant possibilities of de-centring, reparations and reciprocity move settler philanthropic relations toward "a more radical exchange of love, responsibility, and attentive listening" (Gaertner, 2020 p. 169). As Kuokkanen and other Indigenous theorists of reciprocity suggest, a reparations lens can draw settlers into radical reimaginings of philanthropy, toward amply supporting "meaningful, comprehensive, and sustainable systems of contemporary Indigenous self-governance" (Kuokkanen, 2011, 217). In some cases, Indigenous critics also urge settlers in philanthropy to consider stepping aside altogether. Settlers in philanthropy are urged to make space for a different kind of future: imagining a world where institutional settler philanthropy as we know it no longer exists (Wiebe and Villanueva 2018; Couchman et al. 2020). Rather than focusing on reforming and improving settler relationships with Indigenous peoples, or on fixing existing philanthropic practices, these critics call into question public consensus around inclusivity and reconciliation, and around the very existence of institutional settler philanthropy. Their anti-colonial imagined futures divorce Indigenous sovereignties from coloniality, question the presumed commonsense of the very existence of many settler philanthropic practices and structures (especially those that exist in perpetuity like foundations), and ultimately present on absolute dissonance with reconciliation – a dissonance which is not, and need not be, resolved. Here, the dissonant becomes the incommensurable.

I should note that although the structure of my chapters may have suggested dichotomies of expressions and outcomes, the way things actually happen in the archive is much more complex. Texts across this archive demonstrate that there is never a simple, binary equation: either reconciliation *or* reparations/reciprocity; either dominant forms *or* dissonant forms; either commitment/intention *or* action; either transaction *or* relationship; either immediate *or* long-term responses, and so on. Rather, I see the concept of dissonance as useful for framing this change narrative– as opposed to the idea of a "janus-faced" depiction of philanthropy or reconciliation (Schervish 2006), which suggests an either/or situation. Defining and enacting possible settler roles in reconciliation has always been an ongoing process. That is to say, dissonance is not reactive: moving from a "bad" or problematic version of reconciliation to a better one, or from reconciliation to something else altogether. Rather, dissonance occurs immanently. It continuously introduces complexity and messiness to a change narrative that is often thought of in formulas and structures, which are passed down from state-articulated versions of reconciliation.

Dissonance in this archive does not appear in a chronological or teleological progression either (or even in a dialectic). As is clear from the texts in the archive I assembled, there were marked waves and lulls in the popular and sectoral embrace of reconciliation discourse over time, and in the frequency and urgency with which it was discussed. Waves of reconciliatory rhetoric tended to occur in the sector when major public events took place and captured national attention: the federal apology for residential schools in 2008, the release of the findings of the TRC in 2015; the identification of unmarked graves of children forced into residential schools in 2021, with apparent lulls in the texts in between. As dominant iterations of reconciliation were being voiced in the archive, so too were critiques and warnings, and dissonant counter-offerings. Often, Indigenous-voiced strains of dissonance are actually being re-presented: woven throughout the archive in the

form of an ostinato,[30] on repeat in the background or the foreground, depending on the composition of the texts. The most generative possibilities often happened behind the scenes, so to speak, outside of the splashy pronouncements of grand gesture reconciliation. Many critiques of dominant strains of reconciliation were critiques that Indigenous and racialized peoples had been voicing about institutional philanthropy for a long time – long before reconciliation entered dominant settler discourses in 2008. What may have seemed like profound and radical possibilities for some settlers in philanthropy were things that Indigenous and allied activists and leaders had been advancing both across this sector and in other spaces and contexts for generations.

Contributions and possibilities for future research

My study hopefully makes contributions to knowledge on both empirical and theoretical levels. The rich and diverse archive of texts I have analyzed has been subject to limited scholarly critique. This critical textual analysis therefore contributes to the study of contemporary settler philanthropy in Canada through the unique archive on which it is based. Furthermore, by drawing connections between philanthropic studies, affect theory, scholarly analyses of reconciliation and decolonial studies in Canada, I have aimed to contribute theoretical perspectives, hopefully not simply restating existing and well-articulated critiques of reconciliation but rather building on these to analyze the change narrative's specific functions and power within the ecosystem of settler philanthropy in Canada. Settler philanthropy actors' engagement with the reconciliation change narrative demands in-depth critical analysis because it is both a window on, and an influencer of, durable relations of colonial power in philanthropy and beyond.

[30] A device in Western music in which a short melodic phrase is repeated throughout a composition (sometimes with variations in pitch or harmony), while other musical phrases at times layer on top of it.

I have also aimed to highlight Indigenous-led perspectives on reconciliation and on the settler philanthropy sector here. As Carey and Silverstein (2020) note, the "intellectual debts to Indigenous thought and action" of white settlers writing about colonialism (like me) is often overlooked (p. 2). While there is certainly value in decolonial critique, Indigenous scholars challenge us to go beyond – considering persistent, resistant and resurgent motions toward something else. They also challenge us to de-centre the tendency in colonial studies to only focus on how Indigenous peoples interface with colonial subjects and structures. Indigenous lives and sovereignties, as Crystal McKinnon and Daniel Heath Justice have argued, both resist and exist without reference to coloniality. I have tried to point to these tensions in my sections on the alternatives and otherwise possibilities beyond the grand gestures of reconciliation. By drawing heavily on Indigenous-authored texts in this archive, and by situating my own critique to some extent within the fields of affect theory and decolonial theory, I have aimed to bring this balance to my study.

Limitations of this study and possibilities for further research

My study could not, and does not, do everything. One area that I think could use more systematic fleshing out is the study of the colonial contours of neoliberal discourse and policy, and their specific outcomes and implications for the settler philanthropy and voluntary sector. I think "deeper dives" could be done into settler philanthropists' contributions and responses to neoliberal-colonial policies of social-economic restructuring that have had such intensive impacts on the sector as a whole, with disproportionate and inequitable outcomes for racialized and Indigenous peoples. INCITE! authors (2007) and Damien Lee (2023) have begun the conversation, focusing on policies and regulatory frameworks that govern the nonprofit sector as inherently colonial: requiring Indigenous leaders to be formally recognized by the colonial state in order to be eligible

for tax-effective philanthropic funding. Lee advances radical, decolonial possibilities beyond state recognition and colonial policy frameworks, stating that philanthropy institutions in Canada need to look beyond the limitations imposed by neoliberal-colonial policy, and imagine possibilities outside of registered and institutionalized funding practices. I think more research can be done to look into the colonial contours of specific policies, and how these have shifted over time – as well as Indigenous leaders' and communities' resistance and refusals of colonial policies of recognition and regulation in the sector (for example, by refusing to apply for charitable status under the *Canada Income Tax Act* because they consider it to be colonial).

I would also love to conduct further analysis into the colonial shape and functions of other change narratives with common uptake across some of the settler philanthropy sector: whether narratives about strategic or effective philanthropy; about poverty and inequality; about inclusivity, diversity and multiculturalism in philanthropy; about advancing climate awareness/justice through philanthropy; or about philanthropy's roles in advancing gender equality. Change narratives are at the heart of philanthropic actions, decisions, practices and processes. As I have expressed throughout this thesis, they are the stories whereby philanthropic actors situate themselves in the social order. Because in colonial states all philanthropic action and discourse is framed in the wider context of colonial relations (regardless of the philanthropic intentions or priorities), any of these change narratives could shed light on the complex roles that settler philanthropists and settler philanthropic institutions occupy in the wider field of colonial relations in Canada. Further exploration of more change narratives as affective and discursive formations could shed more analytical light, therefore, on the functions of philanthropy in colonial states.

I think there is also room for more historical research on the connections between philanthropies (in its many forms) and coloniality throughout the history of settler colonialism in Canada. For example, a study of philanthropists' contributions to residential schools, or of Indigenous-led collective philanthropy initiatives, or of philanthropic contributions to Indigenous organizing (such as to the National Indian Brotherhood, or to Friendship Centre Movements) could all shed light on these complex connections. Scholars such as Lambert and Lester (2004) and Saifer (2019) have begun this work, but there are so many dimensions and shifting priorities of settler philanthropies throughout Canadian history that could be unpacked.

Finally, I think there is work to be done to theorize diverse Indigenous sovereignties as expressed through local philanthropic practices of giving, sharing and reciprocity. This is work that is already happening in academic research (for example, in Shelley Price's research on restorying philanthropy, and in Dara Kelly's studies of Xwélmexw economies of affection), and has long been a focus of Indigenous activists and practitioners in the sector. There are many ways that Indigenous authors across the archive articulate Indigenous giving, sharing, and reciprocity: whether through Indigenous-led community foundations, community freezers, ceremonial gatherings, Aboriginal Friendship Centres, or deeply embedded sharing protocols that are essential parts of harvesting in many Indigenous communities. I think that further research into Indigenous philanthropies as expressions of sovereignty, love, and community identity will be most powerfully articulated through Indigenous-led research in community. Advancing this work is one space that I think settlers like me should probably step back from and instead aim to support and amplify in the background. For some time now, Indigenous scholars in Canada have been asking settlers to stop speaking for them or "unfairly, inappropriately" filtering their voices through the academic machine (Smith, Tuck and Yang, 2019, p. 16). As historian Winona Wheeler said at the 2016

Canadian Historical Association annual meeting, "Indigenous peoples don't need any more spokespeople. We need space makers." Settlers getting out of the way shifts the power and potential toward Indigenized, resurgent research on philanthropy, by and for those who for too long have only been allowed to be the "researched" (Gaudry 2018).

As I discussed at the end of Chapter 2, I believe that research can and should be an act of love, but only if it is done out of "humility, compassion, and a willingness to fight against human injustices" (Giroux 2010, p. 719). bell hooks (2000) tells us that love is an action: an everyday choice to serve (p. 216). It can never coexist with domination or injustice (what Freire calls lovelessness). The point of research as love, then, is simple: to act and to serve, and never to oppress. I think any of the above possibilities (and of course many others that I have not imagined here) contain potential to be actioned toward love and against lovelessness.

Concluding thoughts: on philanthropy toward decolonial love

In efforts to define the "complex and contested concept" that is philanthropy, philanthropic studies scholars often refer to the Greek etymology of the word: "philo" meaning "to love or be fond of" and "anthropos" meaning "humankind" – translating the word to mean the love of humankind (Sulek 2010a; Payton and Moody 2008). I want to conclude this thesis with some reflections on the possibilities and tensions of mobilizing settler philanthropies toward a specific *type* of love: decolonial love. Dominican novelist Junot Díaz speaks of decolonial love as "the only kind of love that could liberate them [i.e. the racialized characters in his novels] from that horrible legacy of colonial violence" (Moya and Díaz 2012). This is a kind of love that "radically embraces" ways of being, ways of thinking and knowing, people and communities who have through structural colonial violence been devalued and dispossessed – assumed in the colonial present to be not

worthy of love (Butler 2023). Leanne Betasamosake Simpson thinks of decolonial love as Indigenous reclamations of life, hope, freedom, land, water, knowledge, ways of being. It is resistance to the brutality of coloniality and the violence of its durable structures, but also a mode of existence that precedes and exceeds coloniality (Simpson 2015). Decolonial love requires honest and continuous "bearing witness" to the pain and traumas imposed by coloniality, but drives toward decolonial action and work. It struggles against lovelessness, and consists of ongoing refusals and disconnections from colonial structures of violence and oppression in our daily lives.

What much of this thesis has shown is that, although engagement with reconciliation in the Canadian settler philanthropy ecosystem could hold the potential to advance decolonial futures designed in love, it often does not. This is a key point of dissonance, as I have said throughout this thesis, in the change narrative and in the settler philanthropy sector's relationship with coloniality. It is the reason I felt such tension working in the space of institutional philanthropy when I did, and the reason I still am critical of many expressions of settler philanthropy in Canada, and of dominant performances of reconciliation. Reconciliation, and settler philanthropy, at times function as apparatuses of or justifications for ongoing colonial relations of violence, elimination and assimilation. They subtly work to mask or obscure the workings of neoliberal-colonial violence in the sector and the wider world.

I agree with decolonial critics who suggest that charitable tax law in the Canadian state is fundamentally colonial and colonizing, that other infrastructures governing publicly "recognized" forms of philanthropic activity and charity are products and producers of colonial relations/structures of domination (Lee 2023). I also believe that *all* accumulations of power, privilege and wealth in a settler colonial state like Canada are rooted in colonial violence and white

supremacy, and I agree that settlers in philanthropy have much work to do in "taking a hard look" at the foundations of their own privilege and positionality (Martin 2018; Carmichael and Elson 2022). For these reasons, as Lee (2023) argues, "despite its benefits, philanthropic activity is a part of the structure of state-making that Indigenous peoples experience as part of colonization" (p. 5). Dominant discourses and affective formations framing settler philanthropic concepts of reconciliation may signal a desire to shift toward radical transformation, but often in reality keep colonial durabilities in place.

I feel cynical about grand gesture articulations of reconciliation, which are common in settler institutions like universities, governments, and in settler philanthropy organizations. I think there is danger assuming that colonial institutions, upheld by colonial regulatory frameworks, are best positioned to bring about decolonial change. Reconciliation is often framed as a revolutionary and momentous goal (or means) of major social transformation, but it gives way to the routine and minor forms of transformation that keep coloniality durable and thriving, and that occur at frequencies not always readily perceived. The reconciliation change narrative, among others, can advance "commonsense knowledge or self-evident truths that affirm the dominant political economic system and the institutional position of philanthropy within that system" while dehistoricizing, deracializing and depoliticizing the positionality of settler philanthropy (Saifer and Ahmad 2023, p. 3). As Audra Simpson (2016b) and other Indigenous critics of reconciliation have explained, the "emotional gestures" characterizing institutional reconciliation without radical and continuous efforts to dismantle the "extractive and simultaneously murderous state of affairs" in present-day Canada suggests that reconciliatory performances are really just instruments of dispossession and violence.

But, I also think there is always something more. Listening deeply to Indigenous-led critiques helps us to see that durable coloniality is not the only possibility. As Laduke and Cowen (2020), and many Indigenous authors across the archive I have analyzed emphasize, “another future is possible” (p. 255). This is a future disconnected from structures of violence and extraction, a future where Indigenous sovereignties are advanced and amplified. It is a future where settlers in philanthropy must reimagine themselves and their relationships with Indigenous peoples beyond the reconciliation the dominant neoliberal-colonial framework offers, toward mobilizing settler philanthropies in the support of decolonial love. The alternative possibilities emergent across the archive I have analyzed here ask us to consider what would happen if more people in the settler philanthropy world thought and worked “against the grain” and in a “minor key.” What are the creative possibilities and potentials of listening radically to Indigenous critique instead of embracing reconciliation as it has been articulated by the colonial state? What could be the material implications?

Lumbee philanthropy activist Edgar Villenueva (2018) expresses hope that this is possible. “Money,” he writes, “should be a tool of love, to facilitate relationships, to help us thrive, rather than to hurt and divide us. If it’s used for sacred, life-giving, restorative purposes, it can be medicine. Money, used as medicine, can help us decolonize” (p. 9). Discussions of reparations, reciprocity, and the ample support of Indigenous sovereignties across the archive of texts I have analyzed suggest that, combined with money as medicine, radical shifts in philanthropic relationships, and intentional efforts to dismantle structures of colonial white supremacy, are a critical “something else.” This something else urges settlers in philanthropy to consider radical levels of humility: imagining a world where they do not always have to be in the picture; paying attention to when they are not invited; stepping out of the way (or amply supporting from the

background) in the advancement of Indigenous-defined and -enacted decolonial love. It asks them to imagine the possibilities of opposing lovelessness, of abundantly supporting and amplifying diverse Indigenous expressions of self-determination, and even of walking toward a future where the institutions and structures of settler philanthropy as we presently know them no longer even exist.

Appendix I: The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action

Preamble

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) has done a great service by focusing the attention of Canadians on the shared and ongoing impact of the Indian Residential School System.

The participants and the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission have brought forward important truths of Canada's relationship with the Aboriginal peoples — the First Nations, Inuit, and Métis, be they in urban, rural or remote locations.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission has provided a platform for Indian Residential School Survivors, as well as their descendants, to share their stories and experiences. It has given voice to those who were previously silenced, who had not been heard, listened to, or believed. These courageous Survivors have brought understanding and hope into the lives of those affected across generations. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission process has also begun to map the direction to healing and reconciliation.

This historic process has provided both a place and a way for Canadians, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal alike, to learn and remember, to understand and acknowledge, as well as to participate and take action in supporting the healing and reconciliation so necessary for our country to become stronger and more inclusive for future generations.

Aboriginal peoples in Canada have contributed much, often willingly and freely, but too often without consent or choice. Yet they have persevered, demonstrated strength and resilience, and held faith that a better relationship is possible.

It falls on all people living in Canada to continue the hard work of healing and reconciliation, each in our own way and where possible, together, in our families and communities, in the organizations we work with and belong to, and as a nation. This is an important calling to which all of us are duty bound to respond.

Today we, the undersigned, come to you as a group from Canada's philanthropic community. We thank the Truth and Reconciliation Commission for inviting us into this circle that is built on the seven sacred lessons of: Truth, Humility, Honesty, Respect, Courage, Wisdom, and Love. These teachings are consistent with our collective purposes, principles and missions.

This is an opportune moment for Canada's philanthropic community to engage in and demonstrate leadership on reconciliation. We bring with us our networks, our voices, and our resources, along with new ways of thinking and doing to our work in areas such as: Inclusion, Culture and Language, Health, Housing, Education, Employment, and Environment.

We are committed to supporting the fulfillment of the vision of Aboriginal peoples, to building a fairer and more just country, and to the recommendations that will be outlined by the findings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. We will work, each in our own way, and together, towards achieving the goal of reconciliation and, in the end, a much stronger, more inclusive Canada.

Therefore, here in this space made sacred through the sharing of the stories and experiences of the Survivors and their descendants, we bring our diversity and distinctiveness, our emerging vision of renewal, and our determination to ensure that the philanthropic community is engaged in the work of reconciliation.

We will:

Learn and Remember by…

1) Listening with respect, compassion and empathy while reaching out to those who have given voice to the tragedy that was the Indian Residential School System experience, understand the cumulative impact of unresolved trauma passed from generation to generation as well as to remember the voices that were silenced; and
2) Engaging the philanthropic community in the dialogue necessary to ensure that we do this with, and not for, Aboriginal peoples in all their diversity.

Understand and Acknowledge by…

3) Learning about the history and legacy of the colonial system that imposed the Indian Residential School System, that dispossessed and inflicted harm upon Aboriginal peoples and their cultures, so that we can understand how to work toward the reconciliation that is needed now and into the future; and
4) Recognizing the need for an ongoing commitment to support the continuation of this multi-generational journey of healing and reconciliation.

Participate and Act by…

5) Sharing our networks, our voices, and our resources to include and benefit Aboriginal peoples;
6) Committing to building relationships with Aboriginal peoples, and extending the reach of our efforts in both policy and practice; and
7) Exploring new opportunities to support healing and reconciliation and the implementation of the spirit, intent and content of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's findings and recommendations.

Conclusion

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission has set a path that will determine what reconciliation could look like in Canada, as well as how it may be achieved. We are honoured to participate, encouraged by the work that has been done, and emboldened to ensure that Aboriginal peoples' voices and needs remain an essential part of our work.

We thank the Commissioners and the staff who have worked tirelessly to support the mandate of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and those who shared their stories, memories, and experiences.

We place our Declaration of Action herewith to symbolize that this is concrete and will continue. Our signatures are a call to action inviting others to join in moving forward in an atmosphere of understanding, dignity and respect towards the shared goal of reconciliation.

Appendix II: Chart of Archive Sources

Organization	Author(s)	Title	Publication	Date	Type	URL/DOI (if applicable)
The Circle						
		The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action		2015	Declaration	https://www.the-circle.ca/the-declaration.html
	Archie, Kris	Twitter thread @WeyktKris	@WeyktKris	2021	Twitter Thread	https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dYJhpB2G3XuLSaMmS0Nz0qcfqN9Bxg3Wk-j4OfUwFbY/edit?pli=1
with Natoa	Archie, Kris	Philanthro - Whaaat? A Philanthropy 101 Session with The Circle's Kris Archie	The Circle Webinars	2021	Webinar	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CU5UaMJsqTc
	Avery, Sharon and Wanda Brascoupé Peters	What is reconciliation and why does it matter to philanthropy?	LinkedIn Blog	2017	Blog Post	https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/conversation-wanda-brascoupé-peters-sharon-avery
	Bahubeshi, Rudayna, Tanvi Bhatia, Nada Elmasry, Kris Archie	The Role of Allyship in Reconciliation	The Circle Webinars	2017	Webinar	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b8CvobUyFTo
	Brascoupé Peters, Wanda, Victoria Grant, Udloriak Hanson, Marilyn Poitras	I Don't Want to Say the Wrong Thing! Shedding Light on Language	The Circle Webinars	2016	Webinar	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jXReJHwfxuo
with Philanthropic Foundation Canada, Community Foundations Canada, Inspirit Foundation, Martin Family Educational Initiative, Lawson Foundation	Brascoupé Peters, Wanda, Victoria Grant, Bruce Lawson, Sara Lyons, Andrea Nemtin, Lucy Santoro	Pens to Paper, Words to Action: Activating the Philanthropic Community's First Step from Truth to Reconciliation	The Circle Webinars	2017	Webinar	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=55RjLXUwtWo
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Buchholz, Michelle, Jara Dean-Coffey, Vu Le, Kris Archie, Vi Nguyen	Afternoon Plenary - The Future of Philanthropy	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/day_3_-_afternoon_plenary_web.jpg
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Buchholz, Michelle, Eugene Kung, Eriel Deranger, Sonja Swift, Wanjiku Gatheru	Intersections of Environment, Philanthropy & Justice	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/intersections_of_environment_philanthropy_and_justice_print.pdf
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Buchholz, Michelle, Jess Bolduc, Kevin Huang, Kris Archie	Calls to Action from the Shifting Structures in Black Philanthropy Session	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/day_3_-_afternoon_plenary_and_closing_remarks_web.jpg
with PhiLab	Catherine Donnelly Foundation	Healing Through the Land - Navigating philanthropy's role in reconciliation: A funder's learning journey	*The Philanthropic Year*	2020	Journal Article	https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147
	The Circle	*All My Relations: A gathering to strengthen understanding between foundations and Aboriginal Communities*		2008	Research Report	https://web.archive.org/web/20140913110505/http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/documents/all-my-relations-oct-16-2008.pdf
	The Circle	*Aboriginal Philanthrophy in Canada: A Foundation for Understanding*		2010	Research Report	https://caid.ca/AboPhiCan2010.pdf
	The Circle	*Measuring the Circle: Emerging Trends in Philanthropy for First Nations, Métis and Inuit Communities in Canada*		2014	Research Report	https://www.issuelab.org/resources/21368/21368.pdf
	The Circle	*Measuring the Circle 2017: Emerging Trends in Philanthropy for First Nations, Métis and Inuit Communities in Canada: A Focus on Manitoba*		2017	Research Report	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/manitoba-indigenous-report_web__1_.pdf
	The Circle	Moving Through Fear into Abundance		2018	Practice Guidance	
	The Circle	I4DM Definitional Matrix		2022	Practice Guidance	https://www.the-circle.ca/the-i4dm.html
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Contreras Correal, A., Nguyen, V., Tune, D., Blais-Amare, D., and Archie, K.	Daylighting Realities that Exist in the Shadows.	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/updated_%7C_02_daylighting_june23_2020_print_11x17_copy.pdf
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Contreras Correal, Adriana, Aneil Gokhale, Ross Curtner, Norman Young, Bailey Greenspoon, Zahra Ebrahim	The New Philanthropy: Learning and Unlearning as a Collective	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/05_new_philanthropy_june24_2020_web.jpg
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Contreras Correal, Adriana, Yanique Redwood, Ginger Gosnell-Myers, Hanifa Kassam, Tim Fox, Mark Gifford	Governance Re-Imagined	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/dc_governance_reimagined_june23_2020.pdf
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Contreras Correal, Adriana, and Dorla Tune	Shifting Structures in Black Philanthropy	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/updated_|_01_shifting_structures_in_black_philanthropy_june22_2020_print_11x17_copy.pdf
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Contreras Correal, Adriana, Bina M. Patel and Kris Archie	Staying Rooted in Equity when the Wind Howls	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/04_staying_rooted_june24_2020.jpg

	Couchman, Stephen, Marilyn Struthers, Justin Weibe	All My Relations: A journey of reciprocity. The first ten years of the Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada	*Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, indigenous Perspectives and Pathways to Change*	2020	Book Section: Chapter 6, pages 130-156	https://philab.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Philanthropic-Foundations-in-Canada-Landscapes-Indigenous-perspectives-and-pathways-to-change-1.pdf
with PhiLab	Dirksen, Alexander, Kris Archie, Sara Lyons, Tim Fox	Interview: The Governing Circle with Kris Archie, Sara Lyons and Tim Fox	*The Philanthropic Year*	2020	Journal Article	https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147
	Jamieson, Roberta	Decolonizing Philanthropy: Building New Relations	*Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, indigenous Perspectives and Pathways to Change*	2020	Book Section:pages 157-172	https://philab.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Philanthropic-Foundations-in-Canada-Landscapes-Indigenous-perspectives-and-pathways-to-change-1.pdf
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Jung, Tiaré, Kris Archie, Paulette Senior, Lori Villarosa, Sara Lyons	Opening Plenary Session: Increasing BIPOC Philanthropic Leadership	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/05_new_philanthropy_june24_2020_web.jpg
with the Vancouver Foundation and the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia	Jung, Tiaré, Kris Archie, Gerri Nakirigya Lutaaya, Daisee Francour, Mohamed Huque	Elevating BIPOC Leadership in Philanthropy	Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit	2020	Live Graphic Recording of conference proceedings	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/elevating_bipoc_leadership.pdf
	Munshi, Shereen, Sonia Dayal, Marnie Grona, Holly McLellan	Circles of Accountability for Non-Profit Action: Webinar on Accountability	The Circle Webinars	2017	Webinar Recording	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gJozyWvarec&t=1285s.
	Rowe, Gladys and Diane Roussin	Relationship, Reciprocity and respect: Reflecting on our journey at The Winnipeg Boldness Project	*The Philanthropic Year*	2020	Journal Article	https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147
with PhiLab	Tune, Dorla	Moving Beyond the Words: Where is Candian Philanthropy on its Journey to Dismantle Anti-Black Racism?	*Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, indigenous Perspectives and Pathways to Change*	2020	Book section, pages 173-188	https://philab.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Philanthropic-Foundations-in-Canada-Landscapes-Indigenous-perspectives-and-pathways-to-change-1.pdf
with PhiLab	Ulrichs, Martina	How to Redefine Funder-grantee Relationships to Support Indigenous-led Organizations.	*The Philanthropic Year*	2020	Journal Article	https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147
Community Foundations Canada						
	Atleo, Shawn A-in-Chut	Keynote Session: Assembly of First Nations Message to the Community Foundations of Canada	*CFC Annual Conference: Inspiring Smart and Caring Communities* In Winnipeg, MB	2013	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HIUXoKsMDHY&t=110s
	Cardinal, Rob	Speech for the 2013 CFC Conference	*CFC Annual Conference* 2013	2013	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jXNRB81gxLA
	CFC	*2015 Year in Review*		2015	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/CFC_2015AnnualReport.pdf
	CFC	*2016 Year in Review*		2016	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Annual-Report-2016-2.pdf
	CFC	*2017 Year in Review*		2017	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/CFC046_AR2017_Digital_Aug28.pdf
	CFC	*CFC 2018 Annual Report*		2018	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/CFC-2018-Annual-Report-Digital-Version-EN.pdf
	CFC	*CFC 2019 Annual Report*		2019	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/transparency/2019-annual-report/
	CFC	*CFC 2020 Annual Report*		2020	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/transparency/2020-annual-report/
	CFC	*CFC's 2021 Annual Report*		2021	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/annual-report-2021/
	CFC	*CFC's 2022 Annual Report*		2022	Annual Report	https://communityfoundations.ca/cfcs-2022-annual-report/
	CFC	Community foundations on the path towards reconciliation	CFC Blog	2017	Blog Post	https://www.communityfoundations.ca/community-foundations-path-towards-reconciliation/
	Vavek, Tracey, Andrea Dicks, Tim Fox, Jeska Slater	ReconciliACTION: Fostering trust-based relationships with Indigenous communities through action	The Learning Institute Webinars	2022	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9UzXqHe_l-I

Philanthropic Foundations Canada						
	Atleo, Shawn	Keynote Speech	PFC 2011 Conference in Toronto	2011	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FDiQh9sC8Fs&list=PL_jQG2oIyzPmiwOFkJLS0KePlLieL4vaD&index=14
	Austen, Janet, Kevin McCort, Kavita Ramdas, Katrina Pacey	Changing the Frame: Inequality & the Creation of Opportunity	PFC 2016 Biennial Conference	2016	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DdlqIaYhZGQ&list=PL_jQG2oIyzPn3bchEPTYgV3g0fVfC8XwS&index=5
	Avery, Sharon, Katia Iverson, Roberta Jamieson, Paulette Senior	Philanthrophy's Work: Empowering Woment and Girls	PFC 2018 Biennial Conference	2018	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S_GqsnO6_9I
	Bahubeshi, Rudayna, Lindsey DuPré, J Watzer Macphedran, Hilary Pearson	What's next for Philanthrophy in Canada? An Intergenerational Conversation	PFC 2018 Biennial Conference	2018	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JJB8phhh8ys&t=3s
with the Circle	Brascoupé Peters , Wanda	Leading Together: Indigenous Youth in Community Partnership	PFC 2014 National Conference	2014	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=znGkPGzHCzs
With CFC, the Circle, Environment Funders Canada, Equality Fund	Contreras Correal, Adriana, Thea Belanger, Andrea Dicks, Kristyn Wong-Tam, Djaka Blais-Amare, Remi Abi-Farrage	Funding the Future - Feminist Philanthropy in Practice	PFC Webinars	2021	Webinar - Graphic Recording	https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/funding_the_future_-_feminist_philanthropy_in_practice_-_march_2021_-_11x17in_print.pdf
	Davies, Sarah	Reflections from an Aussie Guest	PFC Blog	2018	Blog Post	
	Joseph, Robert, Khalil Shariff, Melanie Mark	Opening Conversations - New Horizons: A Conversation about Inequality, Pluralism and Reconciliation	2016 PFC Biennial Conference	2016	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDd6SNJyc2M
	Lacerte, Paul	Reconciliation & Social Change: New Roles for Canadian Philanthropy	PFC 2016 Biennial Conference.	2016	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JWXuxn2so6M&t=1s.
	Lawson, Bruce, Nadia Joe and Paul Martin	Building Bridges for the Future.	PFC 2016 Biennial Conference.	2016	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yg3jnWpOZ0o
	Manning, Laura, Katherine Bambrick, Caroline Fiennes, Janet Smylie	The Possibilities and Pitfalls of Evidence-Based Philanthropy	2018 Biennial PFC Conference	2018	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xzVEMnPy2OA
	Manwaring, Susan, L Hunter, Wanda Brascoupé Peters	Indigenous Partners Essentials	PFC Webinars	2016	Conference Proceedings	
	Nemtin, Andrea, Tracy Deer, Zarqa Nawaz, Allan Northcott	Closing Plenary: From Listening to Action - Stories from the Storytellers	PFC 2017 Symposium	2017	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=afkxF2a5OTU
	Pearson, Hilary	Hopes (Not Predictions) For 2016	PFC Blog	2015	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	Effective Conversations…Effective Philanthropy?	PFC Blog	2016	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	Looking Back, Looking Forward	PFC Blog	2016	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	New Thinking about Philanthropy and Inequality	PFC Blog	2016	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	The Room Where It Happened	PFC Blog	2016	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	Philanthropy's Voice: Raising it During these Times	PFC Blog	2017	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	2017: The Year We Talk About Listening and Belonging?	PFC Blog	2017	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	Canadian Philanthropy: The Year Ahead	PFC Blog	2018	Blog Post	
	Pearson, Hilary	Connect. Create. Change: Six TakeAways From the PFC 2018 Conference	PFC Blog	2018	Blog Post	
	PFC	*Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion in Canadian Philanthropy: Survey Results and Future Directions*		2019	Research Report	https://afpglobal.org/report-reports-diversity-equity-inclusion-canadian-philanthropy-philanthropic-foundations-canada

	PFC	*Governance and Grantmaking: Approaches to Achieve greater diversity, equity and inclusion - A toolkit for Canadian Philanthropic Foundations*		2019	Practice Guide	https://pfc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/pfc_dei_toolkit_en_2019.pdf
	PFC	*Snapshot of Foundation Giving in 2015*		2017	Research Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/snapshot-of-foundation-giving-in-2015/
with Lumiere Consulting	PFC	*Connect, Contribute, Collaborate: PFC Annual Report 2015*	PFC	2015	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/ar-2015-en.pdf
	PFC	*2016 Year in Review*	PFC	2016	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/2016-annual-report/
	PFC	*2017 Year in Review*	PFC	2017	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/2017-annual-report/
	PFC	*Connecting, Inspiring, Creating Change: 2018 Annual Report*	PFC	2018	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/2018-annual-report/
	PFC	*Connecting, Inspiring, Creating Change: 2019 Annual Report*	PFC	2019	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/2019-annual-report/
	PFC	*2020 Year in Review: Learning, Connecting, Inspiring, and Mobilizing*	PFC	2020	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/2020-annual-report/
	PFC	*In partnership for a just, equitable, and sustainable world: 2021 Annual Report*	PFC	2021	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/2021-annual-report/
	PFC	*Annual Report, 2022*	PFC	2022	Annual Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/pfc-2022-annual-report/
	PFC	*COVID-19, Social inequalities and foundations' response*	PFC	2020	Report	https://pfc.ca/documents/pfc-learning-series-tool-1-covid-19-social-inequalities-and-foundations-response/
	Rigillo, Nicole	Partnering with Indigenous Communities: A Challenge for Canadian Grantmakers	PFC Blog	2016	Blog Post	
with PhiLab	Saifer, Adam	*COVID-19 and Beyond: How to Better Support Equity-Focused Grantees*	Research Report	2021	Research Report	https://philab.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/COVID-19-and-Beyond-How-to-Better-Support-Equity-Focused-Grantees.pdf
	Simon, Mary, Bruce Lawson, Brian Jackson, Victoria Grant, Amber Jensen, Wanda Brascoupé, Andrew Chunilail	Indigenous Peoples Resilience Fund	PFC: Webinar Wednesdays	2021	Webinar Recording	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PHUxoFdVOG8
	Witt, Jillian	Moving Beyond Good Intentions	PFC Blog	2017	Blog Post	
Imagine Canada						
	Allen, Nneka	The Two Faces of Charity	*Imagine Canada 360 Blog*	2020	Blog Post	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/two-faces-charity
	Atleo, Shawn A-in-Chut	Keynote Speech	*Imagine Canada National Summit for the Charitable and Nonprofit Sector*	2011	Conference Proceedings	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vL-K9b639WA&t=11s.
	Ayer, Steven and Paul Anderson	*Trust and Impact: Funders' Perspectives on Unrestricted Giving in Canada*		2022	Research Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2022-05/Trust-%26-Impact-Funders-Perspectives-on-Unrestricted-Funding-report_0.pdf
	Gebremikael, Liben	When We're Not at the Table, We End Up on the Menu	*Imagine Canada 360 Blog*	2021	Blog Post	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/when-were-not-table-we-end-menu.
	Dewar Gully, Anna and Kristen Liesch	Building Equality One Decision and One Question at a Time: Imagine Canada Learns the Equity Sequence ™	*Imagine Canada 360 Blog*	2020	Blog Post	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/building-equality-imagine-canada-learns-equity-sequence
with Johns Hopkins University	Hall, Michael H., Cathy W. Barr, M. Easwaramoorthy, S. Wojciech Sokolowski, Lester M. Salamon	*The Canadian Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector in Comparative Perspective*		2005	Research Report	https://sectorsource.ca/sites/default/files/resources/files/jhu_report_en.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*Multicultural & Newcomer Charitable Giving Study*		2020	Research Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/multicultural-newcomer-charitable-giving-study-download
	Imagine Canada	Canada's Charities and Nonprofits - Infographic		2021	Infographic	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/Infographic-sector-stat-2021.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*Alignment: 2016 Annual Report*		2016	Annual Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2016-Annual-Report-English.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*Building Momentum: 2017 Annual Report*		2017	Annual Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2017-Annual-Report-English.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*Together: 2018 Annual Report*		2018	Annual Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2019-06/Annual%20Report%202018_1.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*2019 Annual Report*		2019	Annual Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2020-06/2019ICAnnualReport_1.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*Annual Report 2020: Stabilizing for Recovery*		2020	Annual Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2021-06/Annual-Report-2020-Imagine-Canada.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*Annual Report 2021: Collective Work for a Stronger Future*		2021	Annual Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2021-annual-report.pdf
	Imagine Canada	*Deepening Connections, Strengthening Communities: Annual Report 2022*		2022	Annual Report	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/annual-report-2022.pdf
	Imagine Canada Staff	Imagine Canada Reads *Collecting Courage: Joy, Pain, Freedom, Love*	*Imagine Canada 360 Blog*	2022	Blog Post	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/Imagine-Canada-reads-collecting-courage-joy-pain-freedom-love
	Imagine Canada	Land Acknowledgement		2023	Webpage	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/who-we-are/land-acknowledgment#:~:text=We%20acknowledge%20that%20these%20lands%20are%20still%20home%20to%20many,settlement%20and%20Confederation%2C%20and%20since.
	Kim, Nayeon	Beyond the 'Ideal' Fundraiser: equitable recovery requires confronting uncomfortable truths in philanthropy	*Imagine Canada 360 Blog*	2020	Blog Post	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/beyond-ideal-fundraiser.
With Rideau Hall Foundation	Lasby, David and Cathy Bar	*30 Years of Giving in Canada - The Giving Behaviours of Canadians: Who gives, how, and why?*		2018	Research Report	https://www.cagp-acpdp.org/sites/default/files/media/rideau_hall_foundation_30years_report_eng_fnl.pdf

	Little, Lois	Engaging Aboriginal Volunteers in Voluntary Groups with Territorial Mandates in the Northwest Territories Case Study - Aboriginal Participation in the Voluntary Sector		2005	Research Report	https://iportal.usask.ca/record/47482
	Miedama, Suanne	Driving Diversity: 5 Steps to Hiring Board Members	*Imagine Canada 360 Blog*	2017	Blog Post	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/driving-diversity-5-steps-hiring-board-members
	Returning to Spirit	Creating Reconciliation For You, Others, And Life	*Imagine Canada 360 Blog*	2021	Blog Post	https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/creating-reconciliation-you-others-and-life
The Philanthropist						
	Bahubeshi, Rudayna	150 Profiles: Rudayna Bahubeshi	*The Philanthropist*	2017	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/07/150-profiles-rudayna-bahubeshi/ [Accessed: 15 May 2024].
	Belanger, Théa	Interview with Chief Dr. Robert Joseph and Karen Joseph	*The Philanthropist*	2015	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/07/interview-with-chief-dr-robert-joseph-and-karen-joseph/
	Bérard, Diane and Shelley Price	Shelley Price: Storytelling the philanthropic landscape - Collective restorying of giving and sharing through Indigenous perspectives	*The Philanthropist*	2021	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2021/06/shelley-price-storytelling-the-philanthropic-landscape-collective-restorying-of-giving-and-sharing-through-indigenous-perspectives/
	Brascoupé Peters, Wanda, Stephen Couchman, Udloriak Hanson, Marilyn Struthers	100 Words for Philanthropy: Traditions of Caring & Sharing in Canada	*The Philanthropist*	2015	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/06/100-words-for-philanthropy-traditions-of-caring-sharing-in-canada/
	Brascoupé Peters,Wanda, Stephen Couchman, Udloriak Hanson, Marilyn Struthers	Journey of Reciprocity: The First Eight Years of the Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada	*The Philanthropist*	2016	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/03/journey-of-reciprocity-the-first-eight-years-of-the-circle-on-philanthropy-and-aboriginal-peoples-in-canada/
	Brennan, Jennifer and Shereen Munshi	Investing in Indigenous philanthropy through reciprocity	*The Philanthropist*	2022	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2022/08/investing-in-indigenous-philanthropy-through-reciprocity/
	Bridge, Richard	Philanthropy and Aboriginal Communities - Encouraging Developments in Atlantic Canada	*The Philanthropist*	2015	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/10/philanthropy-and-aboriginal-communities-encouraging-developments-in-atlantic-canada/
	Campbell, Ariane and Justin Wiebe	Transforming philanthropy: Embedding Indigenous principles in learning and evaluation	*The Philanthropist*	2021	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2021/08/transforming-philanthropy-embedding-indigenous-principles-in-learning-and-evaluation/
	Carmichael, Peyton and Peter Elson	A short history of voluntary sector-government relations in Canada (revisited)	*The Philanthropist*	2022	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2022/04/a-short-history-of-voluntary-sectorgovernment-relations-in-canada-revisited/#indigenous–settler-relations
	Dupré, Lindsay	Centring Indigenous Youth Leadership in Reconciliation Philanthropy: Promising Practices at the Laidlaw Foundation	*The Philanthropist*	2018	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/02/centring-indigenous-youth-leadership-in-reconciliation-philanthropy-promising-practices-at-the-laidlaw-foundation/.
	Elson, Peter	A Journey Toward Decolonization: One Step at a Time	*The Philanthropist*	2018	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/author/peter-r-elson/.
	Exner-Pirot, Heather	Philanthropy in the Arctic: Good Intentions or Good Works?	*The Philanthropist*	2015	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/10/philanthropy-in-the-arctic-good-intentions-or-good-works/
	Formsma, Jocelyn	Indigenous Youth and the Role of Philanthropy	*The Philanthropist*	2013	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2013/04/indigenous-youth-voices-and-the-role-of-philanthropy/
	Fox, Tim	150 Profiles: Tim Fox	*The Philanthropist*	2018	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/02/150-profiles-tim-fox/ [Accessed: 22 May 2024].
	Goodchild, Melanie	Reparations and Reconciliation: Embracing Indigenous Social Innovation and Changing the Rules of Philanthropy	*The Philanthropist*	2019	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2019/08/reparations-and-reconciliation-embracing-indigenous-social-innovation-and-changing-the-rules-of-philanthropy/
	Grant, Victoria	Belonging, Community and Indigenous Philanthropy	*The Philanthropist*	2016	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/03/belonging-community-and-indigenous-philanthropy/
	Karim, Omar	Words to Action:the 2017 MBA Games show reconciliation at work	*The Philanthropist*	2017	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/02/words-to-action-the-2017-mba-games-illustrate-reconciliation-at-work/
	Lorinc, John	Renewed Commitment from the Philanthropic Secotr - and Ottawa - is Necessary to Address the "Unfinished Business" of Reconciliation: Sector Leaders	*The Philanthropist*	2020	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2020/02/a-renewed-commitment-from-the-philanthropic-sector-and-ottawa-is-needed-to-address-the-unfinished-business-of-reconciliation-sector-leaders/
	Manning, Janine and Miles Morrisseau	Indigenous folks have always been philanthropists': A conversation with Janine Manning	*The Philanthropist*	2021	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2021/11/indigenous-folks-have-always-been-philanthropists-a-conversation-with-janine-manning/

	McLellan, Holly, Joleen Mitton, Justin Wiebe, Josh Paterson	Not your typical conference: Insights about hosting from The Circle's All My Relations gathering	*The Philanthropist*	2023	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2023/10/not-your-typical-conference-insights-about-hosting-from-the-circles-all-my-relations-gathering/
	Nakua, Abdul	Reflecting on the CRA audits of Muslim charities	*The Philanthropist*	2023	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2023/12/reflecting-on-the-cra-audits-of-muslim-charities/
	Omidvar, Ratna, Kris Archie, Edgar Villanueva	What would true, reparative giving in the philanthropy sector look like?	*Reimaging Philanthropy in Canada Podcast*	2022	Webinar	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9AAj2PP_fIU&t=2s
	Pasta, Shagufta	The sweetness of summer berries: My personal journey to learn about decolonizing philanthropy and true reconciliation	*The Philanthropist*	2020	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2020/02/the-sweetness-of-summer-berries-my-personal-journey-to-learn-about-decolonizing-philanthropy-and-true-reconciliation/
	Pearson, Hilary, Bruce Lawson, Andrea Nemtin, Wanda Brascoupé Peters, Lucie Santoro, Sara Lyons, Victoria Grant	The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action	*The Philanthropist*	2015	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/06/the-philanthropic-communitys-declaration-of-action/
	Prankard, Wesley and Pyotor Hodgson	One Starfish at a Time: A Growing Movement of Change-makers	*The Philanthropist*	2013	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2013/04/one-starfish-at-a-time-a-growing-movement-of-change-makers/
	Redvers, Tunchai	150 Profiles: Tunchai Redvers	*The Philanthropist*	2017	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/11/150-profiles-tunchai-redvers/
	Scott-Enns, Itoah	Reconciliation in Philanthropy: Learning by Doing	*The Philanthropist*	2017	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/05/reconciliation-in-philanthropy-learning-by-doing/
	Simon, Mary	The Urgency to Make a Personal Commitment	*The Philanthropist*	2016	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/06/the-urgency-to-make-a-personal-commitment/
	Stauch, James and Evelyn Erickson	Drops in the Soil, Not in the Bucket: The Case for Borderless Indigenous Philanthropy	*The Philanthropist*	2016	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/07/drops-in-the-soil-not-in-the-bucket-the-case-for-borderless-indigenous-philanthropy/
	Wiebe, Justin	Reconcilable differences? Philanthropy, decolonization, and existing while Indigenous	*The Philanthropist*	2018	Article	https://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/10/reconcilable-differences-philanthropy-decolonization-and-existing-while-indigenous/
Other Organizations/Publications						
	Dupré, Lindsay	I Hope This Finds You Well: A Love Letter to Indigenous Youth	*Research & Reconciliation: Unsettling Ways of Knowing through Indigenous Relationships*	2019	Book Section	
Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID), International Indigenous Women's Forum (FIMI), and International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP)	AWID, FIMI, IFIP	*A Call to Action: Insights into the Status of Funding for Indigenous Women's Groups: A Joint AWID-FIMI-IFIP Report*		2017	Research Report	https://www.awid.org/publications/call-action-insights-status-funding-indigenous-womens-groups
Bright the Mag	Martin, Courtney	Philanthropy Needs To Take A Hard Look At Its Colonial Roots	*BRIGHT Magazine*	2018	Magazine Article	https://brightthemag.com/decolonizing-wealth-edgar-villanueva-philanthropy-needs-to-take-a-hard-look-at-its-colonial-roots-837fe17e0ab5?gi=b3db89a82052
Calgary Foundation	Calgary Foundation	Strengthening Relationships with Indigenous Communities: Calgary Foundation Impact Report		2019	Report	https://calgaryfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/StrengtheningRelationsImpactReport2019.pdf
Canada Helps, Environics Institute		*From Disconnection to Collective Action: The Giving Report 2024*		2024	Research Report	https://www.canadahelps.org/en/the-giving-report/
Candid	Sato, Grace and Sarina Dayal	Changing from the Inside Out: Calgary Foundation's Relationship to Strengthen Relationships with Indigenous Communities		2020	Blog Post	https://learningforfunders.candid.org/content/case-studies/changing-from-the-inside-out/
First Nations Caring Society	Nadjiwin, Samantha and Cindy Blackstock	Caring Across the Boundaries: Promoting Access to Voluntary Sector Resources for First Nations Children and Families		2004	Research Report	https://fncaringsociety.com/sites/default/files/docs/Communities_in_Crisis.pdf
First Nations Development Institute (FNDI)		*Growing Inequity: Large Foundation Giving to Native American Organizations and Causes, 2006-2014*		2018	Research Report	https://www.firstnations.org/publications/growing-inequity-large-foundation-giving-to-native-american-organizations-and-causes-2006-2014/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers, Washington DC	Berry, Mindy L. and Jessica Chao	*New Ventures in Philanthropy. Engaging Diverse Communities For and Through Philanthropy*		2001	Research Report	
Government of Canada	Rick J. Ponting	A Preliminary Assessment Of Canadian Philanthropic Foundations as Potential Sources of Funding For Projects by or about Native People - A Summary Report		1979	Research Report	
GrantCraft	Gibson, Cynthia and Jen Bokoff	*Deciding Together: Shifting Power and Resources Through Participatory Grantmaking*		2018	Research Report	https://learningforfunders.candid.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/12/DecidingTogether_Final_20181002.pdf
International Funders for Indigenous Peoples	International Funders for Indigenous Peoples	*Grantmaker's Guide: Strengthening International Indigenous Philanthropy.*		2014	Practice Guide	https://internationalfunders.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Grantmakers-Guide-updated-2014.pdf
International Funders for Indigenous Peoples	Scott-Enns, Itoah	Indigenous Ways of Giving + Sharing: Indigenous-led Funds Landscape Scan Report		2020	Research Report	https://internationalfunders.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IFIP-Indigenous-Ways-of-Giving-and-Sharing-Landscape-Scan-Report-1.pdf
Muttart Foundation	Shereen Munshi and Elise Levi	Indigenous Peoples, Communities, and the Canadian Charitable Sector	*Intersections and Innovations: Change for Canada's Voluntary and Nonprofit Sector .*	2021	Book Section	https://muttart.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Intersections-and-Innovations-Change-for-Canadas-Voluntary-and-Nonprofit-Sector.pdf
Native Americans in Philanthropy and Candid	Native Americans in Philanthropy and Candid	*Investing in Native Communities: Philanthropic Funding for Native American Communities and Causes*		2019	Research Report	https://www.issuelab.org/resources/35493/35493.pdf?download=true&_ga=2.56827946.1209014558.1604941390-1531925363.1604941390
PANL Perspectives	Brennan, Jennifer and Dorcas Babet Kwofie	Mastercard Foundation & Ulnooweg Foundation	*PANL Perspectives*	2021	Journal Article	https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/mastercard-foundation-supports-indigenous-youth/

PANL Perspectives	MacDonald, Katie and Tim Fox	Calgary Foundation's Work on Reconciliation and Racial Equity	*PANL Perspectives*	2021	Journal Article	https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/calgary-foundations-work-on-reconciliation-and-racial-equity/
PANL Perspectives	Slater, Jeska	Vancouver Foundation & Indigenous Partners	*PANL Perspectives*	2021	Journal Article	https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/vancouver-foundation-a-focus-on-capacity-building-with-indigenous-partners/
PANL Perspectives	Zaman, Sadia	Inspirit: Fostering Reconciliation & Building Trust with Indigenous Communities.	*PANL Perspectives*	2021	Journal Article	https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/inspirit-fostering-reconciliation-building-trust-with-indigenous-communities/.
PhiLab	Glass, Juniper	An Indigenous-philanthropic partnership that didn't work, and what we can learn from it	PhiLab Blog	2018	Blog Post	https://philab.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/juniper_blog_january_2018.pdf
PhiLab	Saifer, Adam	*Philanthropy During COVID-19: The Urgency of Taking a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Lens*	PhiLab Blog	2020	Blog Post	https://philab.uqam.ca/en/home-blog/philanthropy-during-covid-19-the-urgency-of-a-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-dei-lens/.
Redsky Fundraising and Blumberg Charity Law	Redsky, Sharon, Wanda Brascoupé, Mark Blumberg and Jessie Lang	*Canadian Charities Giving to Indigenous Charities and Qualified Donees - 2018 .*	*Canadian Charity Law Blog*	2021	Research Report	https://www.canadiancharitylaw.ca/blog/canadian-charities-giving-to-indigenous-charities-and-qualified-donees-2018/.
Redsky Fundraising and Blumberg Charity Law	Redsky, Sharon, Wanda Brascoupé, Mark Blumberg and Jessie Lang	*Canadian Charities Giving to Indigenous Charities and Qualified Donees - 2019*	*Canadian Charity Law Blog*	2022	Research Report	https://www.canadiancharitylaw.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Canadian-charities-giving-to-Indigenous-Charities-and-Qualified-Donees-2019-Final.pdf
Right Relations Collaborative	Right Relations Collaborative Aunties Council	2023 Reciprocity Report		2023	Annual Report	https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6182cb8fe5fdbc61502f756a/t/642a3ad64240134643ad2dec/1680489186950/RRC+2023+Reciprocity+Report+Final.pdf

References

Ahmad, F. and Saifer, A. (2023). The Ideological Work of Philanthropic Myths: A Study of Post-pandemic Disbursement Quota Reforms in Canada. *Voluntas* [Online] **35:** 649-660. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-023-00628-1.

Ahmed, S. (2014). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2006). The Nonperformativity of Antiracism. *Meridians: feminism, race, transnationalism* **7(1)**:104–126.

Aina, T.A. (2013). The State, Politics and Philanthropy in Africa: Framing the Context. In: Aina, T. A. and Moyo, B. eds. *Giving to Help, Helping to Give: The Context and Politics of African Philanthropy*. Dakar-Fann, Senegal: Amalion, pp. 1–36.

Alberg-Seberich, M. (2018). Analyzing Canada's Philanthropy Support Landscape to Enhance Giving. *The Philanthropist* (5 March). [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/03/analyzing-canadas-philanthropy-support-landscape-to-enhance-giving/.

Alfred, T. (2004). Warrior scholarship: Seeing the university as a ground of contention. In: Mihesuah, D.A. and Wilson, A.C. Eds. *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*. Eds. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2004, pp. 88-99.

Allen, N. (2020). The Two Faces of Charity. *Imagine Canada: 360 Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/two-faces-charity [Accessed: 25 May 2024].

Allen, N., Pereira, C.V.N. and Salmon, N. eds. (2021). *Collecting Courage: Joy, Pain, Freedom, Love - Anti-Black Racism in the Charitable Sector*. Rootstock Publishing.

Ansloos, J. (2023). Hydrocolonial Affects: Suicide and the Somatechnics of Long-Term Drinking Water Advisories in First Nations in Canada. *Somatechnics* [Online] **13(2):** 113-133. Available at: DOI: 10.3366/soma.2023.0403.

Archie, Kris (2021a). June 11, 2021 [Transcription of Tweet]. [Online]. Available at: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dYJhpB2G3XuLSaMmS0Nz0qcfqN9Bxg3Wk-j4OfUwFbY/edit?pli=1

Archie, K (2021b). Philanthro – Whaaat? A Philanthropy 101 Session with The Circle's Kris Archie. In: *The Circle Webinars*. The Circle and Natoa. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CU5UaMJsqTc.

Asch, M. (2018). Confederation Treaties and Reconciliation: Stepping Back into the Future. In: Asch, M., Borrows, J. and Tully, J. eds. *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 29–48.

Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID), International Indigenous Women's Forum (FIMI) and International Funders for Indigenous Peoples (IFIP) (2016). A Call to Action: Insights into the Status of Funding for Indigenous Women's Groups: A Joint AWID-FIMI-IFIP Report. [Online]. Available at: https://www.awid.org/publications/call-action-insights-status-funding-indigenous-womens-groups.

Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation, with Sabina Trimble and Peter Fortna. (2023). *Remembering Our Relations: Dënesųłıné Oral Histories of Wood Buffalo National Park.* Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Atleo, S. (2011a). Keynote Speech. In: *PFC Conference: 2011*. Toronto: PFC. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FDiQh9sC8Fs&list=PL_jQG2oIyzPmiwOFkJLS0KePlLieL4vaD&index=13.

Atleo, S. (2011b). Keynote Speech. In: *Imagine Canada National Summit for the Charitable and Nonprofit Sector*. Ottawa: Imagine Canada. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vL-K9b639WA&t=11s.

Atleo, S. (2013). Keynote Session: Assembly of First Nations Message to the Community Foundations of Canada. In: *CFC Annual Conference: Inspiring Smart and Caring Communities*. Winnipeg, MB: CFC. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HIUXoKsMDHY&t=110s.

Austen, J., McCort, K., Ramdas, K., and Pacey, K. (2016). Changing the Frame: Inequality & the Creation of Opportunity. In: *PFC 2016 Biennial Conference*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Philanthropic Foundations Canada. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DdlqIaYhZGQ&list=PL_jQG2oIyzPn3bchEPTYgV3g0fVfC8XwS&index=4.

Avery, S., Iverson, K., Jamieson, R., and Senior, P. (2018). Philanthropy's Work: Empowering Women and Girls. In: *PFC 2018 Biennial Conference*. Toronto: PFC. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S_GqsnO6_9I [Accessed: 29 May 2024].

Avery, S. and Brascoupé Peters, W. (2017). What is reconciliation and why does it matter to philanthropy? *LinkedIn Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/conversation-wanda-brascoupé-peters-sharon-avery [Accessed: 22 May 2024].

Ayer, S. and Anderson, P (2022). *Trust and Impact: Funders' Perspectives on Unrestricted Giving in Canada.* Imagine Canada. [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2022-05/Trust-%26-Impact-Funders-Perspectives-on-Unrestricted-Funding-report_0.pdf [Accessed: 22 May 2024].

Bahubeshi, R. (2017). 150 Profiles: Rudayna Bahubeshi. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/07/150-profiles-rudayna-bahubeshi/ [Accessed: 15 May 2024].

Bahubeshi, R., Bhatia, T., Elmasry, N, and Archie K. (2017). The Role of Allyship in Reconciliation. In: *The Circle Webinars*. The Circle. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b8CvobUyFTo [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Bahubeshi, R., Dupré, L., Waitzer McPhedran, J., and Pearson, H. (2018). What's next for Philanthropy in Canada? An Intergenerational Conversation. In: *PFC 2018 Biennial Conference*. Toronto: PFC. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JJB8phhh8ys&t=3s.

Ballard, M. (2017). Who is Minding First Nations during the Flood? Failing Advocacy at Every Policy during a Human/Environmental Crisis. In: Mulé, N. J. and Desantis, G. C. eds. *The Shifting Terrain: Non-Profit Policy Advocacy in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 140–172.

Baloy, N.J.K. (2016). Spectacles and spectres: settler colonial spaces in Vancouver. *Settler Colonial Studies* [Online] **6(3)**:209–234. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1018101.

Baltodano, M.P. (2017). The power brokers of neoliberalism: Philanthrocapitalists and public education. *Policy Futures in Education* [Online] **15(2):** 141-156. Available at: doi.org/10.1177/1478210316652008.

Banivanua-Mar, T. and P. Edmonds. Eds. (2010). *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Barnes, A. (2022). Modernizing the Definition of Charity in Canada. *The Canadian Bar Association: Charities and Not-for-profit Law.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.cba.org/Sections/Charities-and-Not-for-Profit-Law/Resources/Resources/2022/Modernizing-the-Definition-of-Charity-in-Canada.

Baskin, C. (2016). *Strong Helpers' Teachings: The Value of Indigenous Knowledges in the Helping Professions.* 2nd Edition. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing Education: Nourishing the Learning Spirit*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.
Beeston, E. (2018). Why you need a philanthropy advisor on your team. *Philanthropy Impact* **19** [Online]. Available at: http://philanthropy-impact.org/article/why-you-need-philanthropy-advisor-your-team-0.
Belanger, T. (2015). Interview with Chief Dr. Robert Joseph and Karen Joseph. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/07/interview-with-chief-dr-robertjoseph-and-karen-joseph/ [Accessed: 16 May 2024].
Bérard, D. and Price, S. (2021). Shelley Price: Storytelling the philanthropic landscape – Collective restorying of giving and sharing through Indigenous perspectives. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2021/06/shelley-price-storytelling-the-philanthropic-landscape-collective-restorying-of-giving-and-sharing-through-indigenous-perspectives/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
Bergland, R.L. (2000). *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects*. Hanover and London: University Press of New England: Dartmouth College.
Berlant, L. (2010). Cruel Optimism. In: Gregg, M. and Seigworth, G. J. eds. *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 93–117.
Berlant, L. (2004). Introduction: Compassion (and Withholding). In: Gilbert, P. ed. *Compassion: The Culture and Politics of an Emotion*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 1–13.
Berlant, L., Cvetkovich, A., Gould, D., Boler, M., and Davis, E. (2022). On taking the affective turn: interview with Lauren Berlant, Ann Cvetkovich, and Deborah Gould. *Cultural Studies* [Online] **36(3)**:360–377. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2022.2040562.
Berry, M. L. and Chao, J., eds. (2001). *New Ventures in Philanthropy. Engaging Diverse Communities For and Through Philanthropy*. Washington, DC: Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers.
Bhattacharyya, G. (2018). *Rethinking Racial Capitalism: Questions of Reproduction and Survival*. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
Blackstock, C. (2005). Same Country: Same Lands; 78 Countries Away. *The First Peoples Child & Family Review* **2(1)**:130-158.
Blackstock, C. (2007). Residential Schools: Did they really close or just morph into child welfare? *Indigenous Law Journal* **6(1):** 71-78.
Blackstock, C. (2011). The Canadian Human Rights Tribunal on First Nations Child Welfare: Why if Canada wins, equality and justice lose. *Children and Youth Services Review* **33(1)**: 187-194.
Blackstock, C., Brown, I., and Bennett, M. (2007). Reconciliation: Rebuilding the Canadian Child Welfare System to Better Serve Aboriginal Children and Youth. In: Brown, I., Ferzana, C., Fuchs, D., Lafrance, J., McKay, S. and Thomas-Prokop, S. eds. *Putting a Human Face on Child Welfare: Voices from the Prairies*. Regina, pp. 59–87. Available at: https://cwrp.ca/sites/default/files/publications/prairiebook/Chapter3.pdf.
Blackstock, C. and Palmater, P. (2021). Opinion: Canada's government needs to face up to its role in Indigenous children's deaths. *The Guardian* [Online]. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/jul/08/canada-indigenous-children-deaths-residential-schools [Accessed: 20 May 2024].
Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. and Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* [Online] **29**: 447-466. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.447.

Bloor, M. and Bloor, T. (2013). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling Power: Emotions and Education*. New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). Selections from the Logic of Practice. In: Schrift, A. D. ed. *The Logic of the Gift. Toward an Ethic of Generosity*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 190–230.

Brascoupé Peters, W. (2014). Leading Together: Indigenous Youth in Community Partnership. In: *PFC 2014 National Conference*. Halifax, NS. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=znGkPGzHCzs [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Brascoupé Peters, W., Couchman, S., Hanson, U., and Struthers, M. (2015). 100 Words for Philanthropy: Traditions of Caring & Sharing in Canada. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/06/100-words-for-philanthropy-traditions-of-caring-sharing-in-canada/.

Brascoupé Peters, W., Grant, V., Hanson, U., and Poitras, S. (2016). I Don't Want to Say the Wrong Thing! Shedding Light on Language. In: *The Circle Webinars*. The Circle. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jXReJHwfxuo.

Brascoupé Peters, W., Couchman, S., Hanson, U., and Struthers, M. (2016b). Journey of Reciprocity: The First Eight Years of the Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/03/journey-of-reciprocity-the-first-eight-years-of-the-circle-on-philanthropy-and-aboriginal-peoples-in-canada/.

Brascoupé Peters, W., Grant, V., Lawson, B., Lyons, S. Nemtin, A., Santoro, L. (2017). Pens to Paper, Words to Action: Activating the Philanthropic Community's First Step from Truth to Reconciliation. In: *The Circle Webinars*. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=55RjLXUwtWo [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Breeze, B. (2021). *In Defence of Philanthropy*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Agenda Publishing.

Breeze, B. and Moody, M. (2016). Editors' Introduction. In: Breeze, B. and Moody, M. eds. *The Philanthropy Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 3–6.

Brennan, J. and Kwofie, D.B. (2021). Mastercard Foundation & Ulnooweg Foundation. *PANL Perspectives* [Online]. Available at: https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/mastercard-foundation-supports-indigenous-youth/.

Brennan, J. and Munshi, S. (2022). Investing in Indigenous philanthropy through reciprocity. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2022/08/investing-in-indigenous-philanthropy-through-reciprocity/.

Bridge, R. (2015). Philanthropy and Aboriginal Communities – Encouraging Developments in Atlantic Canada. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/10/philanthropy-and-aboriginal-communities-encouraging-developments-in-atlantic-canada/.

Broder, P. (2002). The Legal Definition of Charity and Canada Customs and Revenue Agency's Charitable Registration Process. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2002/10/the-legal-definition-of-charity-and-canada-customs-and-revenue-agencys-charitable-registration-process/.

Brooks, N. (2001a). The Role of the Voluntary Sector in a Modern Welfare State. In: Phillips, J., Chapman, B. and Stevens, D. eds. *Between State and Market: Essays on Charity Law and Policy in Canada*. Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 166–218.

Brooks, N. (2001b). The Tax Credit for Charitable Contributions: Giving Credit where None is Due. In: Philips, J., Chapman, B. and Stevens, D. eds. *Between State and Market: Essays on Charity Law and Policy in Canada*. Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 457–481.

de Bruin, T. and Gallant, D.J. (2020). Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement. *The Canadian Encyclopedia Online* [Online]. Available at: https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/indian-residential-schools-settlement-agreement.

Buchanan, P. (2019). *Giving Done Right: Effective Philanthropy and Making Every Dollar Count*. New York: Public Affairs.

Buchholz, M., Dean-Coffey, J., Le, V., Archie, K., and Nguyen, Vi (2020). Afternoon Plenary - The Future of Philanthropy: Live Graphic Recording of a Panel for the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit. In: *Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/day_3_-_afternoon_plenary_web.jpg [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Buchholz, M., Bolduc, J., Huang, K., and Archie, K. (2020). Calls to Action from the Shifting Structures in Black Philanthropy: Live Graphic Recording of a Panel for the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit. In: *Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/day_3_-_afternoon_plenary_and_closing_remarks_web.jpg [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Buffett, P. (2013). The Charitable-Industrial Complex. *New York Times* [Online]. Available at: http://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/2013/07/27/opinion/the-charitable-industrial-complex.html?pagewanted=print.

Bumsted, J.M, Foot, R., Yarhi, E., and McIntosh, A. (2006). Red River Resistance. *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* [Online]. Updated 8 July 2021. Available at: https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/red-river-rebellion.

Burlingame, D.F. (1993). *Altruism and Philanthropy: Definitional Issues.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.

Burnett, K. and Hay, T. (2023). *Plundering the North: A History of Settler Colonialism, Corporate Welfare, and Food Insecurity*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Butler, A. (2023). Decolonial love as a pedagogy of care for Black immigrant post-secondary students. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* [Online] **44(8)**:1378–1393. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2023.2260113.

Byrd, J.A. (2011). *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Calgary Foundation. (2019). *Strengthening Relationships with Indigenous Communities: Calgary Foundation Impact Report*. [Online]. Available at: https://calgaryfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/StrengtheningRelationsImpactReport2019.pdf.

Callahan, D. (2017). *The Givers: Wealth, Power and Philanthropy in a New Gilded Age*. New York: Vintage Books.

Campbell, A. and Wiebe, J. (2021). Transforming philanthropy: Embedding Indigenous principles in learning and evaluation. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2021/08/transforming-philanthropy-embedding-indigenous-principles-in-learning-and-evaluation/.

Canada Helps and Environics Institute (2024). *From Disconnection to Collective Action: The Giving Report 2024*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.canadahelps.org/en/the-giving-report/ [Accessed: 20 May 2024].

Canada, Senate (2022). *The Scars that we Carry: Forced and Coerced Sterilization of Persons in Canada – Part II.* [Online]. Ottawa: Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2022/sen/yc32-0/YC32-0-441-4-eng.pdf.

Candid. (2021). Key Facts on U.S. Nonprofits and Foundations. Issulab. [Online]. Available at: https://www.issuelab.org/resources/38265/38265.pdf

Cardinal, R. (2013). Rob Cardinal Speaking at CFC Conference 2013. In: *CFC Annual Conference: Inspiring Smart and Caring Communities*. Winnipeg, MB: Community Foundations Canada. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jXNRB81gxLA&t=8s.

Carey, J. and Silverstein, B. (2020). Thinking with and beyond settler colonial studies: new histories after the postcolonial. *Postcolonial Studies* **23(1)**:1–20.

Carlton, L. and Lyons, S. Community Foundations at work: Mobilizing and connecting place-based philanthropy. In: Elson, P. R., Lefèvre, S. A. and Fontan, J. M. eds. *Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous Perspectives and Pathways to Change*. Montreal: PhiLab, pp. 216-238.

Carmichael, P. and Elson, P.R. (2022). A short history of voluntary sector-government relations in Canada (revisited). *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2022/04/a-short-history-of-voluntary-sectorgovernment-relations-in-canada-revisited/#indigenous–settler-relations.

Carter, S. (2019). *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy.* 2nd Edition. Montreal and Queens: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Catherine Donnelly Foundation (2020). Healing Through the Land - Navigating philanthropy's role in reconciliation: A funder's learning journey. *PhiLab - The Philanthropic Year, Vol. 2* [Online]:26–30. Available at: https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147.

CBC News (2014). Atleo resignation restores 'integrity,' says Derek Nepinak. *CBC News* [Online]. Available at: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/atleo-resignation-restores-integrity-says-derek-nepinak-1.2630522 [Accessed: 19 May 2024].

CBC News (2008). FAQs: Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *CBC News* [Online]. Available at: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/faqs-truth-and-reconciliation-commission-1.699883 [Accessed: 19 May 2024].

CFC (2015). *2015 Year in Review/ Revue de l'Année 2015*. [Online]. Available at: https://communityfoundations.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/CFC_2015AnnualReport.pdf

CFC (2022). *2022 Annual Report*. [Online]. Available at: https://communityfoundations.ca/cfcs-2022-annual-report/ [Accessed: 13 May 2024].

CFC (2021). *Community Foundations Canada's Annual Report 2021*. [Online]. Available at: https://communityfoundations.ca/annual-report-2021/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

CFC (2017). Community foundations on the path towards Reconciliation. Blog post. [Online]. Available at: https://www.communityfoundations.ca/community-foundations-path-towards-reconciliation/.

Chartrand, V. and Savarese, J. (2022). *Unsettling Colonialism in the Canadian Criminal Justice System.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chioke Williams, N. and Bonner, L. (2024). Racial Justice Requires Trust. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. [Online]. Available at: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/racial-justice-trust-based-philanthropy#.

Chun, C. (2018). Neoliberalism, globalization and critical discourse studies. In: Flowerdew, J. and Richardson, J.E. Eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies.* London: Routledge, pp. 421-433.

Cleveland Foundation (2014). Introduction: An Idea Whose Time Had Come. *The Cleve1and F0undati0n: Leading a Century of Change*. The Foundation Effect. [Online]. Available at: http://www.clevelandfoundation100.org/timeline/?hide=#view-event-3483.

Comack, E. (2012). *Racialized Policing: Aboriginal People's Encounters with the Police.* Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Contreras Correal, A., Nguyen, V., Tune, D., Blais-Amare, D., and Archie, K. (2020a). Daylighting Realities that Exist in the Shadows: Live Graphic Recording of a Panel for the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit. In: *Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/updated_|_02_daylighting_june23_2020_print_11x17_copy.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Contreras Correal, A., Redwood, Y., Gosnell-Myers, G., Kassam, H., Fox, T., and Gifford, M. (2020b). Governance Re-Imagined: A Live Graphic Recording of a Panel of the Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit. In: *Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/dc_governance_reimagined_june23_2020.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Contreras Correal, A., Gokhale, A., Redwood, Y., Gosnell-Myers, G., Kassam, H., Fox, T. and Gifford, M. (2020c). The New Philanthropy: Learning and Unlearning as a Collective: Live graphic recording of a Panel at the Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit. In: *Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://the-circle.ca/media-and-publications/.

Contreras Correal, A., Patel, B.M. and Archie, K. (2020d). Staying Rooted in Equity when the Wind Howls: Live graphic recording of a Panel at the Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit. In: *Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/04_staying_rooted_june24_2020.jpg [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Contreras Correal, A., Abi-Ferrage, R., Belanger, T., Dicks, A., Wong-Tam, K., and Blais-Amar, D. (2021). Funding the Future - Feminist Philanthropy in Practice. In: *PFC Webinars* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/funding_the_future_-_feminist_philanthropy_in_practice_-_march_2021_-_11x17in_print.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Cote-Meek, S. (2014). *Colonized Classrooms: Racism, Trauma and Resistance in Post-Secondary Education.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Couchman, S., Struthers, M. and Wiebe, J. (2020). All My Relations: A journey of reciprocity. The first ten years of the Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada. In: Elson, P. R., Lefèvre, S. A. and Fontan, J. M. eds. *Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous Perspectives and Pathways to Change*. Montreal: PhiLab, pp. 130–156.

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

Coulthard, G. and Bard Epstein, A. (2015). The Colonialism of the Present: An Interview with Glen Coulthard. *Jacobin*. [Online]. Available at: https://jacobin.com/2015/01/indigenous-left-glen-coulthard-interview/.

Crosby, A. and Monaghan, J. (2018). *Policing Indigenous Movements: Dissent and the Security State.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Daigle, M. (2019). The spectacle of reconciliation: On (the) unsettling responsibilities to Indigenous peoples in the academy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **37(4)**:703–721.

Daly, S. (2012). Philanthropy as an Essentially Contested Concept. *Voluntas* **23**:537–557.

Daniels, A. (2024). The Push for Payback: Robert Wood Johnson and 80 Other Foundations Make a Case for Reparations. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* [Online]. Available at: https://www.philanthropy.com/article/the-push-for-payback-robert-wood-johnson-and-80-other-foundations-make-a-case-for-reparations.

Daniels, C. (2023). Why Is Philanthropy Afraid to Talk about Reparations? *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* [Online]. Available at: https://www.philanthropy.com/article/why-is-philanthropy-afraid-to-talk-about-reparations.

Daschuk, J. (2014). *Clearing the Plains: Disease, the Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life*. Regina SK: University of Regina Press.

Davis, L., Hiller, C., James, C., Lloyd, K., Nasca, T., and 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.

Derrida, J. (1992). *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Dewar Gully, A. and Liesch, K. Building Equality One Decision and One Question at a Time: Imagine Canada Learns the Equity Sequence ™. *Imagine Canada 360 Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/building-equality-imagine-canada-learns-equity-sequence

DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Dirksen, A., Archie, K., Lyons, S., and Fox, T. (2020). Interview: Kris Archie, Sara Lyons & Tim Fox, The Governing Circle. *PhiLab - The Philanthropic Year, Vol. 2* [Online]:16–24. Available at: https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147.

Double the Donation (2022). Fundraising Statistics: Charitable Donations. [Online]. Available at: https://doublethedonation.com/nonprofit-fundraising-statistics/.

Douglas, B. and Ballard, C. (2012). "Race, Place and Civilization." *The Journal of Pacific History* **47(3)**: 245-262.

Dupré, L. (2018). Centring Indigenous Youth Leadership in Reconciliation Philanthropy: Promising Practices at the Laidlaw Foundation. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/02/centring-indigenous-youth-leadership-in-reconciliation-philanthropy-promising-practices-at-the-laidlaw-foundation/.

Dupré, L. (2019). I Hope This Finds You Well: A Love Letter to Indigenous Youth. In: Wilson S. ; Breen, A. V. D. L. ed. *Research & Reconciliation: Unsettling Ways of Knowing through Indigenous Relationships*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, pp. 96–100.

Edmonds, P. (2016). *Settler Colonialism and (Re)Conciliation: Frontier Violence, Affective Performances, and Imaginative Refoundings*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Edwards, M. (2008). *Just Another Emperor? The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*. New York: Demos & Young Foundation.

Eikenberry, A. (2009). *Giving Circles: Philanthropy, Voluntary Association, and Democracy.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Eikenberry, A. and Mirabella, R.M. (2018). Extreme Philanthropy: Philanthrocapitalism, Effective Altruism, and the Discourse of Neoliberalism. *American Political Science Association*:43–47.

Elson, P.R. (2018). A Journey Toward Decolonization: One Step at a Time. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/author/peter-r-elson/.

Elson, P.R. (2011). *High Ideals and Noble Intentions: Voluntary Sector-Government Relations in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Elson, P.R. Ed. (2016). *Funding Policies and the Nonprofit Sector in Western Canada: Evolving Relationships in a Changing Environment.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Elson, P.R., Fontan, J.M., Lefèvre, S., and Stauch, J. (2018). Foundations in Canada: A Comparative Perspective. *American Behavioral Scientist* **62(13)**: 1777-1802.

Exner-Pirot, H. (2015). Philanthropy in the Arctic: Good Intentions or Good Works? *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/10/philanthropy-in-the-arctic-good-intentions-or-good-works/.

Fairclough, N. (2004). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. 1st ed. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: A Critical Study of Language.* 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.

First Nations Development Institute (2018). *Growing Inequity: Large Foundation Giving to Native American Organizations and Causes, 2006-2014*. [Online]. Longmont, CO. Available at: https://www.firstnations.org/publications/growing-inequity-large-foundation-giving-to-native-american-organizations-and-causes-2006-2014/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

First Nations Child & Family Caring Society. (2016). Information Sheet. Victory for First Nations Children: Canadian Human Rights Tribunal Finds Discrimination Against First Nations Children Living on Reserve. [Online]. Ottawa: First Nations Child & Family Caring Society. Available at: https://fncaringsociety.com/sites/default/files/information_sheet_-_chrt_decision_0.pdf.

First Nations Child & Family Caring Society. (2024). First Nations Child & Family Caring Society Approach to Ending Canada’s Discrimination and Preventing its Recurrence in First Nations Child and Family Services. [Online]. Ottawa: First Nations Child & Family Caring Society. Available at: https://fncaringsociety.com/sites/default/files/2024-03/Caring%20Society%20approach%20to%20ending%20discrimination.pdf

Florant, A., Edwards, T., Daniels, C., Williams, A., and Asare, M. (2023). A Reparations Roadmap for Philanthropy. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* [Online]. Available at: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/a_reparations_roadmap_for_philanthropy [Accessed: 21 May 2024].

Florant, A. and Williams, V. (2022). Reimagining Philanthropy to Build a Culture of Repair. *Nonprofit Quarterly* [Online]. Available at: https://nonprofitquarterly.org/reimagining-philanthropy-to-build-a-culture-of-repair/ [Accessed: 20 May 2024].

Fontaine, T.N. (2010). *Broken Circle: The Dark Legacy of Indian Residential Schools*. Victoria, BC: Heritage House Publishing.

Fontan, J.-M. and Pearson, H. (2021). Philanthropy in Canada: The Role and Impact of Private Foundations. In: Phillips, S. D. and Wyatt, B. eds. *Intersections and Innovations: Change for Canada’s Voluntary and Nonprofit Sector*. Toronto: The Muttart Foundation.

Formsma, J. (2013). Indigenous Youth and the Role of Philanthropy. *The Philanthropist*. [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/original-pdfs/Philanthropist-25-2-529.pdf.

Fortier, C. (2022). The Humber is a Haunting: Settler Deathscapes, Indigenous Spectres, and the Memorialisation of a Canadian Heritage River. *Antipode* **54(1)**:259–283.

Fowler, A. and Mati, J.M. (2019). African Gifting: Pluralising the Concept of Philanthropy. *Voluntas* **30(4)**:724–737.

Foucault, M. (1972). Two Lectures. In: Foucault, M. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.* Gordon, C., Ed. Gordon, C., Marshall, L., Mepham, J., Soper, K., trans. New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 78-108.

Fox, T. (2018). 150 Profiles: Tim Fox. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/02/150-profiles-tim-fox/

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin Classics.

Fugiel-Gartner, M. (2024). *An Evolving Landscape: Reflecting Canada's Philanthropic Foundations.* PFC and PhiLab Landscape Reports [Online]. Toronto and Montreal: PFC and PhiLab. Available at: https://pfc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2024-Landscape-Report.pdf.

Gaertner, D. (2020). *The Theatre of Regret: Literature, Art, and the Politics of Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Gaudry, A. (2018). Epilogue. Next Steps in Indigenous Community-Engaged Research: Supporting Research Self-Sufficiency in Indigenous Communities. In: Carlson, K., Lutz, J.S., Schaepe, D.M., and Naxaxalhts'i (Mchalsie, A.). eds. *Towards a New Ethnohistory: Community Engaged Scholarship among the People of the River*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press, pp. 254–258.

Gebhard, A. (2022). Policing Indigenous Students: The School/Prison Nexus on the Canadian Prairies. In: Gebhard, A., McLean, S. and St. Denis, V. Eds. *White Benevolence: Racism and Colonial Violence in the Helping Professions.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, pp. 104-117.

Gebhard, A., McLean, S. and St. Denis, V. Eds. (2022). *White Benevolence: Racism and Colonial Violence in the Helping Professions.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Gebremikael, L. (2021). When We're Not at the Table, We End Up on the Menu. *Imagine Canada: 360 Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/when-were-not-table-we-end-menu.

Ghaddar, J.J. (2016). The Spectre in the Archive: Truth, Reconciliation, and Archival Memory. *Archivaria* **82**:3–26. https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13579.

Gibson, C. and Bokoff, J. (2018). *Deciding Together: Shifting Power and Resources Through Participatory Grantmaking*. Grantcraft [Online]. Available at: https://learningforfunders.candid.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/12/DecidingTogether_Final_20181002.pdf

Gibson, C.M., Pilar, L.C. and Rainey, J. (2024). Philanthropy Needs to Trust the Real Experts—the People It Supports. *Nonprofit Quarterly* [Online]. Available at: https://nonprofitquarterly.org/philanthropy-needs-to-trust-the-real-experts/

Gikino'amaagewinini (2017). Naming as Theft and Misdirection. *BC Studies* **195**:106–109. https://doi.org/10.14288/bcs.v0i195.189604

Giridharadas, A. (2018). *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Giroux, H.A. (2010). Rethinking Education as the Practice of Freedom: Paulo Freire and the promise of critical pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education* **8(6)**:715–721.

Glass, J. (2018). An Indigenous-philanthropic partnership that didn't work, and what we can learn from it. *Blog PhiLab* [Online]. Available at: https://philab.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/juniper_blog_january_2018.pdf.

Glover, C. and Stevens, K. (2020). Corporate Foundations: Cases and Causes. In: Elson, P. R., Lefèvre, S. A. and Fontan, J. M. eds. *Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous Perspectives, and Pathways to Change*. Montreal: Philab, 109-127.

Goggins Gregory, A. and Howard, D. (2009). The Nonprofit Starvation Cycle. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* [Online]. Available at: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_nonprofit_starvation_cycle.

Goldberg, D.T. (2015). *Are We All Post-Racial Yet?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Goldberg, D.T. (2016). Rejoinder: Vanishing Points - reflecting on my respondents. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **39(3)**:2278–2283.
Goldberg, D.T. (2009). *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Goodchild, M. (2019). Reparations and Reconciliation: Embracing Indigenous Social Innovation and Changing the Rules of Philanthropy. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2019/08/reparations-and-reconciliation-embracing-indigenous-social-innovation-and-changing-the-rules-of-philanthropy/.
Gordon, A. (2008). *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Government of Canada (2008). Statement of apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools. [Online]. Available at: https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1571589171655.
Graham, L. (2011). The Product of Text and 'Other' Statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Educational Theory* [Online]. 43(6). Available at: doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00698.x.
Grant, A. (2019). *Doing Excellent Social Research with Documents: Practical Examples and Guidance for Qualitative Researchers*. London: Routledge.
Grant, V. (2016). Belonging, Community and Indigenous Philanthropy. *The Philanthropist*. [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/03/belonging-community-and-indigenous-philanthropy/.
Greer, A. (2020). Settler Colonialism and Beyond. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* **30(1)**:61–86.
Grimm, J. A. (1998). A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy. In Ilchman, W.F., S. Katz and E.L. Queen. (Eds.) (1998). *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Pp. 25-53.
Haggarty, L. (2015). *Negotiated Identities: A History of Sharing and Indigenous-Settler Relations in Western Canada, 1800-1970*. Faculty of History. Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan. Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
Hahmann, T., Lee, H., and Godin, S. (2024). Indigenous foster children living in private households: Rates and sociodemographic characteristics of foster children and their households. Statistics Canada: Indigenous Peoples Thematic Series. [Online]. Available at: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/41-20-0002/412000022024001-eng.htm.
Hall, M.H., Barr, C., Easwaramoorthy, M., Wjciech Sokolowski, S., and Salamon, L.M. (2005). The Canadian nonprofit and voluntary sector in comparative perspective. *Imagine Canada* [Online]. Available at: http://sectorsource.ca/resource/file/canadian-nonprofit-and-voluntary-sector-comparative-perspective.
Hall, S. (1997). The Work of Representation. In: Hall, S., ed. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* London: Sage Publications, pp. 13-74.
Hanlon, P. (2005). ALLOWAY, WILLIAM FORBES. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* [Online]. Volume 15. Montréal and Toronto: University of Toronto and Université de Laval. Available at: https://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/alloway_william_forbes_15E.html.
Hansen, J. (2015). Indigenous-Settler Incarceration Disparities in Canada: How Tribal Justice Programming Helps Urban Indigenous Youth. *Indigenous Policy Journal* **25(3)**: 1-16.

Hantke, S. (2022). Unmasking the Whiteness of Nursing. In: Gebhard, A., McLean, S. and St. Denis, V. Eds. *White Benevolence: Racism and Colonial Violence in the Helping Professions.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, pp. 177-188.

Hay, T. (2021). *Inventing the Thrifty Gene*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Herro, A. and Obeng-Odoom, F. (2019). Foundations of Radical Philanthropy. *Voluntas* **30(4)**:881–890.

Hodes, C. (2018). Gender, Race and Justification: The Value of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in Contemporary Settler Colonial Contexts. *Journal of International Women's Studies.* [Online]. **19(3).** Available at: https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol19/iss3/7/.

hooks, bell. (2000). *All about Love: New Visions*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Hunnik, O., De Wit, A. and Wiepking, P. (2021). (In)equality Through Unrestricted Grantmaking: Examining Trust and Power in the Collaboration Between the Dutch Charity Lotteries and Their Grantees. *Foundation Review* **13(2)**:38–51.

Ilchman, W.F., Katz, S. N. and Queen, E.L. II. Eds. (1998). *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Imagine Canada (2021). *Canada's Charities and Nonprofits*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/Infographic-sector-stat-2021.pdf [Accessed: 20 May 2024].

Imagine Canada (2022). *Deepening Connections, Strengthening Communities: Annual Report 2022*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/annual-report-2022.pdf [Accessed: 13 May 2024].

Imagine Canada (2023). Land Acknowledgement [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/who-we-are/land-acknowledgment#:~:text=We%20acknowledge%20that%20these%20lands%20are%20still%20home%20to%20many,settlement%20and%20Confederation%2C%20and%20since. [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Imagine Canada. (2020). *Multicultural & Newcomer Charitable Giving Study.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/multicultural-newcomer-charitable-giving-study-download

Imagine Canada (2018). *Together: 2018 Annual Report*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/2019-06/Annual%20Report%202018_1.pdf [Accessed: 29 May 2024].

Imagine Canada Staff (2022). Imagine Canada Reads Collecting Courage: Joy, Pain, Freedom, Love. *Imagine Canada 360 Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/Imagine-Canada-reads-collecting-courage-joy-pain-freedom-love [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

International Funders of Indigenous Peoples (2014). Grantmaker's Guide: Strengthening International Indigenous Philanthropy. [Online]. Available at: https://internationalfunders.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Grantmakers-Guide-updated-2014.pdf.

Issar, S. (2021). Theorising 'racial/colonial primitive accumulation'': settler colonialism, slavery and racial capitalism'. *Race and Class* **63(1)**:23–50.

James-Gallaway, A.D. (2019). All Money Ain't Good Money: The Interest Convergence Principle, White Philanthropy, and Black Education of the Past and Present. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher* **31(3)**: 348-374.

Jamieson, R. (2020). Decolonizing Philanthropy: Building New Relations. In: Elson, P. R., Lefèvre, S. A. and Fontan, J.-M. eds. *Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous Perspectives, and Pathways to Change*. Montreal, Quebec: PhiLab, pp. 157–172.

Janzen, C., Jeffery, D. and Smith, K. (2015). Introduction: Encounters with Difference in a Neoliberal Context. In: Janzen, C., Jeffery, D. and Smith, K. eds. *Unravelling Encounters: Ethics, Knowledge and Resistance under Neoliberalism*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, pp. 1–19.

Johnson, P. (1983). *Native children and the child welfare system.* Toronto: Canadian Council on Social Development, in association with James Lorimer & Co.

Jones de Almeida, A.F. (2007). Radical Social Change: Searching for a New foundation. In: INCITE!: Women of Color Against Violence. ed. *INCITE! The Revolution Will Not Be Funded*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 185–195.

Joseph, R., Shariff, K. and Mark, M. (2016). Opening Conversations – New Horizons: A Conversation about Inequality, Pluralism and Reconciliation. In: *2016 PFC Biennial Conference*. Vancouver, British Columbia. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDd6SNJyc2M&feature=emb_logo.

Jung, T., Archie, K., Lutaaya, G.N., Francour, D., and Huque, M. (2020). Elevating BIPOC Leadership in Philanthropy: Live Graphic Recording of a Panel for the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit. In: *Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/elevating_bipoc_leadership.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Jung, T., Archie, K., Senior, P. Villarosa, L., and Lyons, S. (2020). Increasing BIPOC Philanthropic Leadership: Live Graphic Recording of a Panel for the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit. In: *Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/05_new_philanthropy_june24_2020_web.jpg [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Justice, D.H. (2018). *Why Indigenous Literatures Matter:* Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Karim, O. (2017). Words to Action: the 2017 MBA Games show reconciliation at work. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/02/words-to-action-the-2017-mba-games-illustrate-reconciliation-at-work/.

Karuka, M. (2019). *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad.* Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Kelly, D. (2017). *Feed the People and You Will Never Go Hungry: Illuminating Coast Salish Economy of Affection*. University of Auckland. Available at: https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/2292/33554/whole.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=2.

Kelly, D. and Woods, C. (2021). Ethical Indigenous Economies. *Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning* **7(1)**:140–158.

Kelm, M.E. (1999). *Colonizing Bodies: Aboriginal Health and Healing in British Columbia.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Khovrenkov, I. (2021). Canada's United Way Centraide as a Community Impact Funder: A Reinvention or a Failed Endeavour? In: Phillips, S. D. and Wyatt, B. eds. *Intersections and Innovations: Change for Canada's Voluntary and Nonprofit Sector*. Toronto: The Muttart Foundation.

Kim, N. (2020). Beyond the 'Ideal' Fundraiser: equitable recovery requires confronting uncomfortable truths in philanthropy. *Imagine Canada: 360 Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/beyond-ideal-fundraiser.

Kinew, W. (2014). Why Canada Still Needs the Assembly of First Nations. *The Huffington Post* [Online]. Available at: https://www.huffpost.com/archive/ca/entry/why-canada-still-needs-the-assembly-of-first-nations_b_5280412 [Accessed: 19 May 2024].

Kizuk, S. (2020). Settler Shame: A Critique of the Role of Shame in Settler-Indigenous Relationships in Canada. *Hypatia* **35(1)**:161–177.

Kohl-Arenas, E. (2016). *The Self-Help Myth: How Philanthropy Fails to Alleviate Poverty*. Oakland, CA: UC Press.

Koshy, S., Cacho, L.M., Byrd, J.A., and Jordan Jefferson, B. Eds. (2022). *Colonial Racial Capitalism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Krause, M. (2014). *The Good Project: Humanitarian Relief NGOs and the Fragmentation of Reason.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuokkanen, R. (2011). Indigenous Economies, Theories of Subsistence, and Women: Exploring the Social Economy Model for Indigenous Governance. *American Indian Quarterly* **35(2)**:215–240.

Kuokkanen, R. (2004). The Gift as Worldview in Indigenous Thought. *Athanor* **8**:81–95.

Lacerte, P. (2016). Reconciliation & Social Change: New Roles for Canadian Philanthropy. In: *PFC 2016 Biennial Conference*. Vancouver, British Columbia. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JWXuxn2so6M&t=1s.

LaDuke, W. and Cowen, D. (2020). Beyond wiindigo infrastructure. *South Atlantic Quarterly* **119(2)**:243–268.

Lasby, D. and Barr, C. (2015). Giving in Canada: Strong Philanthropic Traditions Supporting a Large Nonprofit Sector. In: Wiepking, P. and Handy, F. Eds. *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy.* London: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 25-43.

Lasby, D. and Barr, C. (2018). 30 Years of Giving in Canada – The Giving Behaviour of Canadians: Who gives, how, and why? *Rideau Hall Foundation and Imagine Canada* [Online]. Available at: https://www.cagp-acpdp.org/sites/default/files/media/rideau_hall_foundation_30years_report_eng_fnl.pdf.

Lavalee, B. and Harding, L. (2022). How Indigenous-Specific Racism is Coached into Health Systems. In: Gebhard, A., McLean, S. and St. Denis, V. Eds. *White Benevolence: Racism and Colonial Violence in the Helping Professions.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, pp. 51-68.

Lawson, B., Joe, N. and Martin, P. (2016). Building Bridges for the Future. In: *PFC 2016 Biennial Conference*. Vancouver, British Columbia. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yg3jnWpOZ0o [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Lee, D. (2023). Remaining Unreconciled: Philanthropy and Indigenous Governance in Canada. *Aboriginal Policy Studies* **10(2)**:2–32.

de Leeuw, S., Lindsay, N.M., and Greenwood M. (2015). Introduction: Rethinking Determinants of Indigenous Peoples' Health in Canada. In: Greenwood, M., de Leeuw, S., Lindsay, N.M., and Reading, C. Eds. *Determinants of Indigenous Peoples' Health in Canada: Beyond the Social.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, pp. xi-xxix.

de Leeuw, S. and Hunt, S. (2018). Unsettling decolonizing geographies. *Geography Compass* **12(7)**:1–14.

Lefèvre, S. and Elson, P.R. (2020). A Contextual History of Foundations in Canada. In: Elson, P. R., Lefèvre, S. A. and Fontan, J. M. eds. *Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous Perspectives, and Pathways to Change*. Montreal: Philab, pp. 13-32.

Liboiron, M. (2021). *Pollution is Colonialism.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Liljeström, M. (2016). Affect. In: Disch, L. and Hawkeworth, M. eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 16–38.

Liljeström, M. and Paasonen, S. (2010). Introduction: Feeling differences – affect and feminist reading. In: Lilijeström, M. and Paasonen, S. eds. *Working with Affect in Feminist Readings: Disturbing Differences*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1–7.

Lipman, P. (2015). Capitalizing on crisis: venture philanthropy's colonial project to remake urban education. *Critical Studies in Education* **56(2):** 241-258.

Little, L. (2005). *Engaging Aboriginal Volunteers in Voluntary Groups with Territorial Mandates in the Northwest Territories Case Study - Aboriginal Participation in the Voluntary Sector*. [Online]. Toronto. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yg3jnWpOZ0o [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Lloyd, D. and Wolfe, P. (2016). Settler colonial logics and the neoliberal regime. *Settler Colonial Studies* [Online] **6(2)**:109–118. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1035361.

Lorde, A. (2018). *The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House*. London: Penguin Classics.

Lorinc, J. (2020). Renewed Commitment from the Philanthropic Sector – and Ottawa – is Necessary to Address the 'Unfinished Business'' of Reconciliation: Sector Leaders.' *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2020/02/a-renewed-commitment-from-the-philanthropic-sector-and-ottawa-is-needed-to-address-the-unfinished-business-of-reconciliation-sector-leaders/.

Lowman, E.B. and Barker, A.J. (2015). *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*. Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Luby, B. (2020). *Dammed: The Politics of Loss and Survival in Anishinaabe Territory*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Lux, M. (2001). *Medicine that Walks: Disease, Medicine, and Canadian Plains Native People, 1880-1940.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lux, M. (2016). *Separate Beds: A History of Indian Hospitals in Canada, 1920s-1980s.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

MacDonald, K. and Fox, T. (2021). Calgary Foundation's Work on Reconciliation and Racial Equity. *PANL Perspectives* [Online]. Available at: https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/calgary-foundations-work-on-reconciliation-and-racial-equity/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Mackey, E. (2013). The apologizers' apology. In: Henderson, J. and Wakeham, P. eds. *Reconciling Canada: Critical Perspectives on the Culture of Redress*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 47–62.

Maddison, S. and Nakata, S. (2020). Introduction. In: Maddison, S. and Nakata, S. eds. *Questioning Indigenous-Settler Relations: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 1–13.

Mahomed, M. and Moyo, B. (2013). Whose agenda? Power and philanthropy in Africa. *Alliance Magazine - for Philanthropy and Social Investment Worldwide* [Online] **18(3)**. Available at: https://www.alliancemagazine.org/feature/whose-agenda-power-and-philanthropy-in-africa/.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd.

Manning, E. (2016). *The Minor Gesture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Manning, J. and Morrisseau, M. (2021). 'Indigenous folks have always been philanthropists'': A conversation with Janine Manning'. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2021/11/indigenous-folks-have-always-been-philanthropists-a-conversation-with-janine-manning/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Manning, L., Bambrick, K., Fiennes, C., and Smylie, J. (2018). The Possibilities and Pitfalls of Evidence-Based Philanthropy. In: *2018 Biennial PFC Conference*. Toronto: PFC. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xzVEMnPy2OA [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Manuel, A. and R. Derrickson. (2017). *The Reconciliation Manifesto.* Toronto: Lorimer and Company Publishers.

Manwaring, S., Hunter, L. and Brascoupé Peters, W. (2016). Indigenous Partners Essentials. *PFC Webinars*. PFC.

Marques, O., and Monchalin, L. (2020). The Mass Incarceration of Indigenous Women in Canada: A Colonial Tactic of Control and Assimilation. In: George, L., Norris, A.N., Deckert, A., and Tauri, J. (eds). *Neo-Colonial Injustice and the Mass Imprisonment of Indigenous Women.* Palgrave Studies in Race, Ethnicity, Indigeneity and Criminal Justice. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marshall, D. (2021). Four Keys to Make Sense of Traditions in the Nonprofit Sector in Canada: Historical Contexts. In: Phillips, S. D. and Wyatt, B. eds. *Intersections and Innovations: Change for Canada's Voluntary and Nonprofit Sector*. Toronto: The Muttart Foundation.

Martin, C. (2018). Philanthropy Needs to Take a Hard Look at its Colonial Roots. *Bright the Mag* [Online]. Available at: https://brightthemag.com/decolonizing-wealth-edgar-villanueva-philanthropy-needs-to-take-a-hard-look-at-its-colonial-roots-837fe17e0ab5.

Mauss, M. (1990). *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Trans. W.D. London: Routledge.

Max Bell Foundation. (2023). Our Founder: Who was Max Bell? *About us: History.* Max Bell Foundation. [Online]. Available at: https://www.maxbell.org/about-us/history/.

McCort, K. and Phillips, S. (2021). Community Foundations in Canada: Survive, or Thrive? (with apologies to lawn bowlers). In: Phillips, S. D. and Wyatt, B. eds. *Intersections and Innovations: Change for Canada's Voluntary and Nonprofit Sector*. Toronto: The Muttart Foundation.

McGregor, N. and Wardrop, P. Massey. (2006) *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* [Online]. Last edited 16 December 2013. Available at: https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/massey-emc.

McLean, S. (2022). Toxic Encounters: What's Whiteness Doing in a Nice Field like Education? In: Gebhard, A., McLean, S. and St. Denis, V. Eds. *White Benevolence: Racism and Colonial Violence in the Helping Professions.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, pp. 37-50.

McLellan, H., Mitton, J., Wiebe, J., and Paterson, J. (2023). Not your typical conference: Insights about hosting from The Circle's All My Relations gathering. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2023/10/not-your-typical-conference-insights-about-hosting-from-the-circles-all-my-relations-gathering/ [Accessed: 15 May 2024].

McMahon, R., Hudson, H.E. and Fabian, L. (2017). Canada's Northern Communications Policies: The Role of Aboriginal Organizations. In: Mulé, N. J. and Desantis, G. C. eds. *The Shifting Terrain: Non-Profit Policy Advocacy in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 259–292.

Meijer Drees, L. (2013). *Healing Histories: Stories from Canada's Indian Hospitals*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In: Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. eds. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 14–31.

Miedama, S. (2017). Driving Diversity: 5 Steps to Hiring Board Members. *Imagine Canada 360 Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/driving-diversity-5-steps-hiring-board-members.

Mignolo, W. and Walsh, C.E. (2018). *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Miller, J.R. (2017). *Residential Schools and Reconciliation: Canada Confront Its History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Miller, J.R. (1996). *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools*. Toronto: UofT Press.
Mottiar, S. and Ngcoya, M. (2016). Indigenous Philanthropy: Challenging Western Preconceptions. In: Jung, T., Phillips, S. D. and Harrow, J. eds. *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. London: Routledge, pp. 151–162.
Moya, P.M.L. and Díaz, J. (2012). The Search for Decolonial Love: An Interview with Junot Díaz. *Boston Review*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.bostonreview.net/articles/paula-ml-moya-decolonial-love-interview-junot-diaz/.
Moyo, B. and Ramsamy, K. (2014). African Philanthropy, pan-Africanism, and Africa's development. *Development in Practice* **24(5-6)**: 656-671.
Mulé, N.J. and Desantis, G.C. eds. (2017). *The Shifting Terrain: Non-Profit Policy Advocacy in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Munshi, S., Dayal, S., Grona, M., and McLellan, H. (2017). Circles of Accountability for Non-Profit Action: Webinar on Accountability. In: *The Circle Webinars*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gJozyWvarec&t=1285s.
Munshi, S. and Levi, E. (2021). Indigenous Peoples, Communities, and the Canadian Charitable Sector. In: Phillips, S. D. and Wyatt, B. eds. *Intersections and Innovations: Change for Canada's Voluntary and Nonprofit Sector*. Toronto: The Muttart Foundation.
Munshi, S. and Willse, C. (2007). Foreword. In: INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. Eds. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. 1st ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Nadjiwin, S. and Blackstock, C. (2004). *Caring Across the Boundaries: Promoting Access to Voluntary Sector Resources for First Nations Children and Families*. First Nations Child and Family Caring Society. [Online]. Available at: https://fncaringsociety.com/sites/default/files/docs/Communities_in_Crisis.pdf.
Nakua, A. (2023). Reflecting on the CRA audits of Muslim charities. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2023/12/reflecting-on-the-cra-audits-of-muslim-charities/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
National Philanthropic Trust (2024). Charitable Giving Statistics. [Online]. Available at: https://www.nptrust.org/philanthropic-resources/charitable-giving-statistics/.
Native Americans in Philanthropy and Candid (2019). *Investing in Native Communities: Philanthropic Funding for Native American Communities and Causes*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.issuelab.org/resources/35493/35493.pdf?download=true&_ga=2.56827946.1209014558.1604941390-1531925363.1604941390 [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
Nemtin, A., Deer, T., Nawaz, Z., and Northcott, A. (2017). Closing Plenary: From Listening to Action - Stories from the Storytellers. In: *PFC 2017 Symposium*. Montreal, Quebec: PFC. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=afkxF2a5OTU.
Newell, R. (2013). Making Matters Worse: The *Safe Streets and Communtiies Act* and the Ongoing Crisis of Indigenous Incarceration. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* **51(1)**: 199-249.
Noakes, T.C. (2023). Potlatch Ban. *The Canadian Encyclopedia Online* [Online]. Available at: https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/potlatch-ban.

Odendahl, T. (1990). *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest among the Philanthropic Elite*. New York: Basic Books.

Omidvar, R., Archie, K. and Villanueva, E. (2022). What would true, reparative giving in the philanthropy sector look like? In: *Reimagining Philanthropy in Canada Podcast*. The Philanthropist. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9AAj2PP_fIU&t=2s [Accessed: 14 May 2024].

Ostrander, S. A. (2004). Moderating contradictions of feminist philanthropy: Women's community organizations and the Boston Women's Fund (1995 to 2000). *Gender & Society* **18**:29–46.

Ostrander, S.A. (2007). The Growth of Donor Control: Revisiting the Social Relations of Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **36(2):** 356-372.

Ostrower, F. (1995). *Why the Wealthy Give*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Parachin, A. (2017). Chapter 2: Shifting Legal Terrain: Legal and Regulatory Restrictions on Political Advocacy by Charities. In: Mule, N. J. and DeSantis, G. C. eds. *The Shifting Terrain: Non-Profit Policy Advocacy in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 33–62.

Pasta, S. (2020). The Sweetness of Summer Berries: My Personal Journey to Learn About Decolonizing Philanthropy and True Reconciliation. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2020/02/the-sweetness-of-summer-berries-my-personal-journey-to-learn-about-decolonizing-philanthropy-and-true-reconciliation/.

Payton, R.L. and Moody, M.P. (2008). *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Pearson, H. (2017). 2017: The Year We Talk About Listening and Belonging? *PFC Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/2017-year-of-belonging/. [Accessed: 19 November 2020]

Pearson, H. (2018a). Canadian Philanthropy: The Year Ahead. *PFC Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/canadian-philanthropy-the-year-ahead/. [Accessed: 19 November 2020]

Pearson, H. (2018b). Connect. Create. Change: Six TakeAways From the PFC 2018 Conference. *PFC Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/pfc-philanthropy-conference-take-aways/.

Pearson, H. (2016a). Looking Back, Looking Forward. *PFC Blog*. [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/looking-back-looking-forward/ [Accessed: 19 November 2020].

Pearson, H. (2016b). New Thinking about Philanthropy and Inequality. *PFC Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/philanthropy-and-inequality/ [Accessed: 19 November 2020].

Pearson, H. (2016c). The Room Where It Happened. *PFC Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/lessons-from-vancouver/. [Accessed: 19 November 2020].

Pearson, H. (2020). Philanthropic Foundations Canada: Building a community and a voice for philanthropy. In: In: Elson, P. R., Lefèvre, S. A. and Fontan, J. M. eds. *Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous Perspectives, and Pathways to Change*. Montreal: Philab, pp. 33-53.

Pearson, H., Lawson, B., Nemtin, A., Brascoupé Peters, W., Santoro, L., Lyons, S., and Grant, V. (2015). The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2015/06/the-philanthropic-communitys-declaration-of-action/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Peck, J. Theodore, N. and Brenner, N. (2009). Postneoliberalism and its malcontents. *Antipode* **41(S1):** 94-116.

Pedwell, C. (2014). *Affective Relations: The Transnational Politics of Empathy*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pedwell, C. (2021). *Revolutionary Routines: The Habits of Social Transformation*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Pete, S. (2001). *Kiskinawacihcikana: Aboriginal Women Faculty Experiences in the Academy*. University of Arizona. Available at: https://search.proquest.com/docview/304686380/fulltextPDF.
PFC (2022). *Annual Report 2022*. [Online]. Montreal. Available at: https://pfc.ca/documents/pfc-2022-annual-report/ [Accessed: 13 May 2024].
PFC (2015). *Connect, Contribute, Collaborate: PFC Annual Report 2015*. [Online]. Montreal. Available at: https://pfc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/ar-2015-en.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
PFC (2020). *COVID-19, Social Inequalities and Foundations' Response*. [Online]. Montreal. Available at: https://pfc.ca/documents/pfc-learning-series-tool-1-covid-19-social-inequalities-and-foundations-response/ [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
PFC (2019a). *Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion in Canadian Philanthropy: Survey Results and Future Directions*. [Online]. Available at: https://afpglobal.org/report-reports-diversity-equity-inclusion-canadian-philanthropy-philanthropic-foundations-canada [Accessed: 15 May 2024].
PFC (2019b). *Governance and Grantmaking: Approaches to Achieve Greater Diversity, Equity and Inclusion - A Toolkit for Canadian Philanthropic Foundations*. [Online]. Montreal & Kingston. Available at: https://pfc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/pfc_dei_toolkit_en_2019.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
PFC (2017). *Snapshot of Giving in 2015*. [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/documents/snapshot-of-foundation-giving-in-2015/.
Philanthropy New York. (2008). History of U.S. Philanthropy. Philanthropy New York: A Regional Association of Grantmakers with Global Impact. *Resources.* [Online]. Available at: https://philanthropynewyork.org/sites/default/files/resources/History%20of%20Philanthropy.pdf.
Phillips, J., Chapman, B. and Stevens, D. (2001). *Between State and Market: Essays on Charity Law and Policy in Canada.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Phillips, S.D. (2018). Dancing with giraffes: Why philanthropy matters for public management. *Canadian Public Administration* **61(2)**:151–183.
Plummer, K. (2001). *Documents of Life 2: An Invitation to A Critical Humanism*. London: Sage Publications.
Ponting, R.J. (1979). *A Preliminary Assessment Of Canadian Philanthropic Foundations as Potential Sources of Funding For Projects by or about Native People - A Summary Report*. Ottawa, ON.
Prankard, W. and Hodgson, P. (2013). One Starfish at a Time: A Growing Movement of Change-makers. *The Philanthropist*. [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2013/04/one-starfish-at-a-time-a-growing-movement-of-change-makers/.
Raybould- Wilson, J. (2019). *From Where I Stand: Rebuilding Indigenous Nations for a Stronger Canada*. Vancouver: Purich Books.
Redsky, S., Brascoupé, W., Blumberg, M., and Lang, J. (2021). *Canadian Charities Giving to Indigenous Charities and Qualified Donees - 2018*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.canadiancharitylaw.ca/blog/canadian-charities-giving-to-indigenous-charities-and-qualified-donees-2018/.
Redsky, S. Brascoupé, W., Blumberg, M., and Lang, J. (2022). *Canadian Charities Giving to Indigenous Charities and Qualified Donees - 2019*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.canadiancharitylaw.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Canadian-charities-giving-to-Indigenous-Charities-and-Qualified-Donees-2019-Final.pdf.
Redvers, T. (2017). 150 Profiles: Tunchai Redvers. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/11/150-profiles-tunchai-redvers/ [Accessed: 15 May 2024].

Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
Reich, R. (2018). *Just Giving: Why Philanthropy Is Failing Democracy and How It Can Do Better*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Returning to Spirit. (2021). Creating Reconciliation For You, Others, And Life. *Imagine Canada 360 Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://www.imaginecanada.ca/en/360/creating-reconciliation-you-others-and-life.
Right Relations Collaborative (2023). *2023 Reciprocity Report*. [Online]. Available at: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6182cb8fe5fdbc61502f756a/t/642a3ad64240134643ad2dec/1680489186950/RRC+2023+Reciprocity+Report+Final.pdf [Accessed: 17 May 2024].
Rigillo, N. (2016). Partnering with Indigenous Communities: A Challenge for Canadian Grantmakers. *PFC Blog*. [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/partnering-indigenous-communities/. [Accessed: 19 Nov. 2020].
Rigillo, N., Rabinowitz-Bussell, M., Stauch, J., Lajevardi, N. (2018). *Grantmaking in Canada and the United States: A Comparative Review and Analysis of the Literature.* Cahier de Recherche #17. Montreal: PhiLab.
Robinson, A. and Filice, M. (2018). Métis Scrip in Canada. *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* [Online]. Last edited 2 October 2019. Available at: https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/metis-scrip-in-canada.
Robinson, C.J. (2020). *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. 3rd ed. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
Roelefs, J. (2003). *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism*. Albany: State of University of New York Press.
Rotz, S. (2017). 'They took our beads, it was a fair trade, get over it': Settler colonial logics, racial hierarchies and material dominance in Canadian agriculture. *Geoforum* **82:** 158-169.
Rotz, S., Rück, D. and Carleton, S. (2020). The Settler Playbook: Understanding Responses to #ShutDownCanada in Historical Context. *Active History* [Online]. Available at: http://activehistory.ca/2020/02/exposing-the-settler-playbook-responses-to-shutdowncanada-in-historical-context/.
Rowe, G. and Roussin, D. (2020). Relationship, Reciprocity and respect: Reflecting on our journey at The Winnipeg Boldness Project. In: Elson, P. R., Lefèvre, S. A. and Fontan, J. M. eds. *Philanthropic Foundations in Canada: Landscapes, Indigenous Perspectives, and Pathways to Change*. Montreal: Philab, pp. 173–188.
Sabido, R. (2019). *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in the British Press*. London: Palgrave-MacMillan.
Sandlos, J. (2007). *Hunters at the Margin: Native People and Wildlife Conservation in the Northwest Territories.* Vancouver: UBC Press.
Saifer, A. (2019). Imagining the exceptional Canada: Nation, art, and social change in Canada's charitable sector. *Journal of Canadian Studies* **53(1)**:95–122.
Saifer, A. (2018). *Nation, Race, and the Cultural Political Economy of Art for Social Change Philanthropy in Canada*. Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/1974/25677.
Saifer, A. (2021). Philanthropic Nation Branding, Ideology, and Accumulation: Insights from the Canadian Context. *Journal of Business Ethics* **173(3)**:559–576.
Saifer, Adam (2020a). Philanthropy During COVID-19: The Urgency of a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Lens. *Canadian Philanthropy Partnership Network Blog* [Online]. Available at:

https://philab.uqam.ca/en/home-blog/philanthropy-during-covid-19-the-urgency-of-a-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-dei-lens/.

Saifer, Adam (2020b). Racial neoliberal philanthropy and the arts for social change. *Organization* **30(2)**. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420973327.

Salehi, S. (2024). The Rise of Trust-Based Philanthropy. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* [Online]. (Spring 2024). Available at: https://ssir.ebookhost.net/ssir/digital/90/ebook/1/index.php?e=90&user_id=241847&flash=0.

Sato, G. and Dayal, S. (2020). *Changing from the Inside Out: Calgary Foundation's Journey to Strengthen Relationships with Indigenous Communities*. Calgary Foundation. [Online]. Available at: https://learningforfunders.candid.org/content/case-studies/changing-from-the-inside-out/.

Scott-Enns, I. (2020). *Indigenous Ways of Giving + Sharing: Indigenous-Led Funds Landscape Scan Report*. [Online]. International Funders of Indigenous Peoples Available at: https://internationalfunders.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IFIP-Indigenous-Ways-of-Giving-and-Sharing-Landscape-Scan-Report-1.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Scott-Enns, I. (2017). Reconciliation in Philanthropy: Learning by Doing. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2017/05/reconciliation-in-philanthropy-learning-by-doing/.

Scottie, J., Bernauer, W. and Hicks, J. (2022). *I Will Live For Both of Us: A History of Colonialism, Uranium Mining, and Inuit Resistance*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Seigworth, G.J. and Gregg, M. (2010). Introduction: An Inventory of Shimmers. In: Gregg, M. and Seigworth, G. J. eds. *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 1–25.

Seigworth, G.J. and Pedwell, C. (2023). Introduction: A Shimmer of Inventories. In: Seigworth, G.J. and Pedwell, C. Eds. *The Affect Theory Reader 2: Worldings, Tensions, Futures*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 1–59.

Sharpe, J. and Spivak, G.C. (2003). A Conversation with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: Politics and the Imagination. *Signs* **28(2)**:609–624.

Silver, I. (2006). *Unequal Partnerships: Beyond the Rhetoric of Philanthropic Collaboration*. New York: Routledge.

Simon, M., Lawson, B., Jackson, B., Grant, V., Jensen, A., Brascoupé, W., and Chunihail, A. (2021). Indigenous Peoples Resilience Fund. *PFC Webinar Wednesdays*. Philanthropic Foundations Canada. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PHUxoFdVOG8.

Simon, M. (2016). The Urgency to Make a Personal Commitment. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/06/the-urgency-to-make-a-personal-commitment/.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Simpson, A. (2016a). The State is a Man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the Gender of Settler Sovereignty. *Theory and Event* [Online] **19(4)**. Available at: https://muse.jhu.edu/article/633280.

Simpson, A. (2016b). Whither settler colonialism? *Settler Colonial Studies* [Online] **6(4)**:438–445. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1124427.

Simpson, L.B. (2015). *Islands of Decolonial Love: Stories and Songs*. Winnipeg: ARP Books.

Sinclair, R. (2007). Identity lost and found: Lessons from the sixties scoop. *First Peoples Child & Family Review* [Online]. **3(1):** 65-82. Available at: https://fpcfr.com/index.php/FPCFR/article/view/25/63.

Singh, J. (2018). *Unthinking Mastery: Dehumanism and Decolonial Entanglements.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Sklair, J. (2022). *Brazilian Elites and Their Philanthropy: Wealth at the Service of Development*. London and New York: Routledge.
Sklair, J. and Glucksberg, L. (2021). Philanthrocapitalism as wealth management strategy: Philanthropy, inheritance and succession planning among the global elite. *The Sociological Review* **69(2)**:314–329.
Slater, J. (2021). Vancouver Foundation & Indigenous Partners. *PANL Perspectives* [Online]. Available at: https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/vancouver-foundation-a-focus-on-capacity-building-with-indigenous-partners/ [Accessed: 17 May 2024].
Smith, K. (2015). Mourning the Death of Social Welfare: Remaining Inconsolable before History. In: Janzen, C., Jeffery, D. and Smith, K. eds. *Unravelling Encounters: Ethics, Knowledge and Resistance under Neoliberalism*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, pp. 21–46.
Smith, L.T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd edition. London: Zed Books, Ltd., 2012.
Smith, L.T., Tuck, Eve and Yang, K. Wayne (2019). Introduction. In: Smith, L. T., Tuck, E and Yang, K.W. eds. *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1–23.
Snelgrove, C., Dhamoon, R.K. and Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling Settler Colonialism: The Discourse and Politics of Settlers and Solidarity with Indigenous Nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* **4(2)**:1–32.
Sointu, E. (2016). Discourse, affect and affliction. *Sociological Review* **64(2)**:312–328.
Somerville, A.T.P. and Justice, D.H. (2016). Introduction: Indigenous Conversations about Biography. *Biography* **39(3)**:239–247.
Sonpal-Valias, N., Sigurdson, L. and Elson, P R (2016). Chapter 4: Alberta's Social Policy: The Neoliberal Legacy of the Klein Reforms. In: Elson, P. R ed. *In Funding Policies and the Nonprofit Sector in Western Canada: Evolving Relationship in a Changing Environment*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 74–106.
Srivastava, P. and Oh, S.A. (2010). Private foundations, philanthropy, and partnership in education and development: Mapping the terrain. *International Journal of Educational Development* **30**:460–471.
St. Denis, V. (2022). Living My Family Through Colonialism. In: Gebhard, A., McLean, S. and St. Denis, V. Eds. *White Benevolence: Racism and Colonial Violence in the Helping Professions.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, pp. 23-36.
Stauch, J. and Erickson, E. (2016). Drops in the Soil, Not in the Bucket: The Case for Borderless Indigenous Philanthropy. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2016/07/drops-in-the-soil-not-in-the-bucket-the-case-for-borderless-indigenous-philanthropy/ [Accessed: 15 May 2024].
Stelkia, K. (2020). Police Brutality in Canada: A Symptom of Structural Racism and Colonial Violence. *Yellowhead Institute.* [Online]. Available at: https://yellowheadinstitute.org/2020/07/15/police-brutality-in-canada-a-symptom-of-structural-racism-and-colonial-violence/.
Stewart, K. (2017). In the world that affect proposed. *Cultural Anthropology* **32(2)**:192–198.
Stoler, A.L. (2009). *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Stoler, A.L. (2016). *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Stoler, A.L. (2013). Introduction: ‘The Rot Remains’: From Ruins to Ruination. In: Stoler, A. L. ed. *Imperial Debris: On Ruins and Ruination*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 1–35.
Sulek, M. (2010a). On the Classical Meaning of Philanthrôpía. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **39(3)**:385–408.
Sulek, M. (2010b). On the Modern Meaning of Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **39(2):** 193-212.
Supreme Court of Canada. (2024). Reference re: *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families.* 2024 SCC 5. [Online]. Available at: https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/20264/index.do.
Swidrovich, J. (2022). The Whiteness of Medicine. In: Gebhard, A., McLean, S. and St. Denis, V. Eds. *White Benevolence: Racism and Colonial Violence in the Helping Professions.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, pp. 189-199.
The Charity Report (2020). Who Gives and Who Gets: The Beneficiaries of Private Foundation Philanthropy. *Intelligence Report* **1(5).** [Online]. Available at: https://www.thecharityreport.com/intelligence-reports/who-give-and-who-gets-the-beneficiaries-of-private-foundation-philanthropy/
The Circle (2022). I4DM Definitional Matrix. [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/the-i4dm.html [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
The Circle (2010). *Aboriginal Philanthropy in Canada: A Foundation for Understanding*. [Online]. Winnipeg, MB. Available at: https://caid.ca/AboPhiCan2010.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
The Circle (2008). *All My Relations: A Gathering to Strengthen Understanding between Foundations and Aboriginal Communities*. [Online]. Winnipeg, MB. Available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20140913110505/http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/documents/all-my-relations-oct-16-2008.pdf.
The Circle (2017). Measuring the Circle 2017. Emerging Trends in Philanthropy for First Nations, Métis and Inuit Communities in Canada: A Focus on Manitoba. [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/manitoba-indigenous-report_web__1_.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].
The Circle (2014). *Measuring the Circle: Emerging Trends in Philanthropy for First Nations, Métis and Inuit Communities in Canada*. [Online]. Winnipeg, MB. Available at: https://www.issuelab.org/resources/21368/21368.pdf.
The Circle (2018). Moving through Fear into Abundance.
The Circle (2015). *The Philanthropic Community's Declaration of Action*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/the-declaration.html.
Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Thomas, A.-R. (2019). Who Is a Settler, According to Indigenous and Black Scholars. *Vice* [Online]. Available at: https://www.vice.com/en/article/gyajj4/who-is-a-settler-according-to-indigenous-and-black-scholars#.
Thomson, C. (2022). *Digging Roots and Remembering Relatives: Lakota Kinship and Movement in the Northern Great Plains from the Wood Mountain Uplands across Lakóta Tȟamákȟočhe/Lakota Country, 1881-1940*. Edmonton: University of Alberta. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation.
Tomiak, J. (2016). Navigating the contradictions of the shadow state: the Assembly of First Nations, state funding, and scales of Indigenous resistance. *Studies in political economy* **97(3)**:217–233.

Tompkins-Stange, M. (2016). *Policy Patrons: Philanthropy, Education Reform, and the Politics of Influence.* Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.

Toomey, N., Ho, Y.C.J., Del Vecchio, D., and Tuck, E. (2021). Reconciliation through kits and tests? Reconsidering newcomer responsibilities on Indigenous lands. In: Datta, R. ed. *Indigenous Reconciliation and Decolonization: Narratives of Social Justice and Community Engagement*. London: Routledge, pp. 61–77.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). Honouring Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication* [Online]. Available at: http://www.trc.ca/assets/pdf/Executive_Summary_English_Web.pdf.

Tuck, E. and Yang, K.W. (2012). Decolonization is Not a Metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* **1(1)**:1–40.

Tune, D. (2020). Moving Beyond the Words: Where is Canadian Philanthropy on its Journey to Dismantle Anti-Black Racism? *PhiLab - The Philanthropic Year, Vol. 2* [Online]:54–58. Available at: https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147.

Tune, D. and Contreras Correal, A. (2020). Shifting Structures in Black Philanthropy: Live Graphic Recording of a Panel for the Racial Equity & Justice in Philanthropy Funders Summit. In: *Racial Equity and Justice in Philanthropy Funders' Summit* [Online]. Available at: https://www.the-circle.ca/uploads/1/2/5/6/125694502/updated_|_01_shifting_structures_in_black_philanthropy_june22_2020_print_11x17_copy.pdf [Accessed: 28 May 2024].

Ulrichs, M. (2020). How to Redefine Funder-grantee Relationships to Support Indigenous-led Organizations. *PhiLab - The Philanthropic Year, Vol. 2* [Online]:59–64. Available at: https://www.calameo.com/read/0058239481d5d4717c147.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society* **4(2):** 249-283. [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006.

Van Til, J. (1990). *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: strengthening theory and practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vavek, T., Dicks, A., Fox, T., and J. Slater (2022). ReconciliACTION: Fostering trust-based relationships with Indigenous communities through action. In: *The Learning Institute Webinars*. [Online]. Community Foundations Canada. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9UzXqHe_l-I.

Villanueva, E. (2018). *Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance*. Oakland, CA: BK Publishers.

Vimalassery, M., Pegues, J.H. and Goldstein, A. (2016). On Colonial Unknowing. *Theory and Event* **19(4)**:1–13.

Walker, D. (2015). Toward a New Gospel of Wealth. *Ford Foundation Ideas* [Online]. Ford Foundation. Available at: https://www.fordfoundation.org/ideas/equals-change-blog/posts/toward-a-new-gospel-of-wealth/.

Walton, J. (2020). The Forgotten History of Ohio's Indigenous Peoples. *MIDSTORY.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.midstory.org/the-forgotten-history-of-ohios-indigenous-peoples/.

Watts, V. and King, H. (2018). After AFN national chief election, apathy and resignation remain. *The Globe & Mail* [Online]. Available at: https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-after-afn-national-chief-election-apathy-and-resignation-remain/ [Accessed: 19 May 2024].

Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2007). Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. eds. *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–32.

Wente, J. (2020). Reconciliation is dead and it was never really alive. *CBC: Metro Morning* [Online]. Available at: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/jesse-wente-metro-morning-blockades-indigenous-1.5475492.

Westman, Clinton, Joly, T. and Gross, L. (2020). Introduction: At Home in the Oil Sands. In: Westman, Clint, Joly, T. and Gross, L. eds. *Extracting Home in the Oil Sands: Settler Colonialism and Environmental Change in Subarctic Canada*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, pp. 1–22.

Wiebe, J (2018). Reconcilable Differences?: Philanthropy, Decolonization, and Existing While Indigenous. *The Philanthropist* [Online]. Available at: https://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/10/reconcilable-differences-philanthropy-decolonization-and-existing-while-indigenous.

Wildcat, M. (2015). Fearing social and cultural death: genocide and elimination in settler colonial Canada—an Indigenous perspective. *Journal of Genocide Research - Special Issue on Canada and Colonial Genocide* **17(4)**:391–409.

Winnipeg Foundation (2019). Who We Are & What We Do: History. [Online]. Available at: https://www.wpgfdn.org/about-us/who-we-are-what-we-do/history/

Witt, J. (2017). Moving Beyond Good Intentions. *PFC Blog* [Online]. Available at: https://pfc.ca/moving-beyond-good-intentions/.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse.* London: Longman.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. eds. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

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

Wrobel, B. and Massey, M. (2021). *Letting Go: How Philanthropists and Impact Investors Can Do the Most Good by Giving up Control*. Self published.

Wymer, W., Scaife, W., and McDonald, K. (2012). Financial Planners and Philanthropic Planning. *Voluntas* **23:**350-370.

Yellowhead Institute (2021). *Cash Back: A Yellowhead Institute Red Paper*. [Online]. Available at: https://cashback.yellowheadinstitute.org.

Zaman, S. (2021). Inspirit: Fostering Reconciliation & Building Trust with Indigenous Communities. *PANL Perspectives* [Online]. Available at: https://carleton.ca/panl/2021/inspirit-fostering-reconciliation-building-trust-with-indigenous-communities/.