

Education for reconciliation: Pedagogy for a Canadian context

Jeremy D. N. Siemens, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

Abstract: Of the 94 Calls to Action within the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's (TRC) Final Report, almost one-fifth focused on matters of education. This represents a strong belief that formal teaching and learning can positively impact the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada. However, there is no established framework for such education. Reflecting on the report and drawing on critical pedagogy scholarship, I work towards a better understanding of the necessary pedagogy required for education for reconciliation. Recognizing the ways in which the work of "reconciliation" is situated in particular cultural, historical, and social realities, I outline an approach to education for reconciliation that is attentive to the Canadian context. Drawing on both critical pedagogy and Indigenous knowledges, this framework attempts to honour the TRC Final Report, offering an approach that is both pointedly critical and deeply relational.

Introduction

In June 2015, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) released its final report. Over the course of thousands of pages, the report described the cultural genocide of residential schools as both a historical tragedy and an expression of a larger colonial framework that has yet to be dismantled (TRC, 2015b). It outlined the generational trauma, perpetual racism, and colonial legacy that continue to shape the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada. While many of its pages are rightly dedicated to documenting the horrors that characterize this relationship, it is nevertheless a document that offers hope for all Canadians through its Calls to Action. As reconciliatory work gains momentum in both public and academic circles, there are new initiatives that point towards the possibility of a better relationship (Kairos, 2016; TRC, 2015c).

Education makes up almost one fifth of the TRC's 94 Calls to Action, and thus is widely considered central to the possibility of reconciliation. These proposed changes span kindergarten classrooms to post-secondary institutions; from teacher education to the education of nurses; from formal education to public engagement (TRC, 2015a). Almost all areas of education were identified as in need of change. As a result, educators and policy makers across the country are beginning to develop curricula for education for reconciliation (Kairos, 2016).

In this paper, I explore the pedagogical framework required for education for reconciliation (EfR) within a Canadian context. First, I establish a working definition of reconciliation and situate this definition into the global work of education for reconciliation. Next, I establish the particular historical and contemporary realities to which Canadian EfR must be responsive. Finally, I examine the TRC Final Report against the work of critical pedagogues (Battiste, 2013; Dei, 2011; Freire, 1972; Giroux, 2011) in order to establish a context-specific approach to EfR in Canada. This approach will provide a pedagogical framework for curriculum designers and educators to engage in the process of establishing a new, healthier relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada.

Theoretical Framework

Drawing on both critical pedagogy (Freire, 1972; Giroux, 2011) and Indigenous epistemologies (Atleo, 2004; Battiste, 2013; Hart, 2002), this paper describes a pedagogy that attempts to honour the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's (TRC) Final Report. This paper is rooted in the belief that education, properly framed, helps students and teachers identify and challenge oppression (Freire, 1972; Giroux, 2011). I also acknowledge the dangerous colonial epistemology that underlies critical pedagogy's rational and individualistic approach to learning (Bowers, 2002; Kumashiro, 2000). Recognizing both the benefits and limitations of critical pedagogy in the work of education for reconciliation, I aim to promote a dialogue between Indigenous and Western knowledge systems (Battiste, 2013). As part of this dialogue, I outline the inherent value of Indigenous knowledges in the work of reconciliation, as a framework that is deeply relational (Atleo, 2004; Hart, 2002) and critical (Battiste, 2013; Dei, 2011).

Definition of Terms

Reconciliation. Before one can begin to imagine the role that teaching and learning can play in the work of reconciliation, it is imperative to establish a working definition of the term. Given the central place of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's (TRC) Final Report in this paper, I will employ the definition it provides. The report presents a complex and multi-faceted approach to reconciliation, which includes government action, but is about "forgiveness, about healing...about truth. And those things are all things of the heart and of relationship, and not of government policy" (TRC, 2015a, p. 20). Despite this relational aspect, the TRC Final Report does not present reconciliation within the popular notion of a "restoration of friendly relations" ("reconciliation," 2017), but importantly argues that "this is a state that many Aboriginal people assert has never existed between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people" (TRC, 2015a, p. 3). In its most relevant and least contested definition, reconciliation is "establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in this country" (TRC, 2015a, p. 3). This definition draws on government involvement, but implicates all people in Canada within fostering this *new* relationship—an understanding that seems to align well with the public enterprise of education and its transformative potential.

Researcher Positionality

I approach this paper as a white male, whose ancestors settled in Treaty One territory, and as such, my understanding of oppression is limited. I have learned about oppression from the stories of others, from the news, and from books, but have never suffered under its weight. That is not to say that I have escaped the wounds of injustice. As someone who has participated in and benefitted from systems of oppression, I acknowledge the damaging legacy of colonization in my thoughts, beliefs, and actions.

My ongoing journey in education provides me with language, insights, and experiences to challenge this oppressive reality. As a graduate student, I have discovered ideas, knowledge systems, and cultures that force me to critically address the legacy of colonization in my own life. As a high school social studies teacher, I bring this discourse into my classroom through critical engagement with the topic of reconciliation. Despite the imperfections of my work, I nevertheless experience the potential of this pedagogy to further the work of reconciliation within my school. These tensioned identities remind me that in order to establish the need for reconciliation and the potential of education in this task, I do not need to look any further than myself.

Reconciliation

Contemporary Discourse of Reconciliation

Over the past few years, the language of reconciliation has dominated popular political discourse. Shortly after his election in 2015, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau stated that, "no relationship is more important to me and to Canada than the one with Indigenous Peoples," and that his government was committed to the work of reconciliation (Government of Canada, n.d., para. 7). For the years of 2016 and 2017, respectively, the mayors of Winnipeg and Victoria declared a "Year of Reconciliation" to promote public and civic engagement in the work of building a better relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians (City of Winnipeg, 2016; City of Victoria, 2016). Upon the announcement of reparations for survivors of the Sixties Scoop in early 2017, Assembly of First Nations chief Perry Bellegarde declared the moment to be a "step towards reconciliation" for all people in Canada (Assembly of First Nations, 2017, para. 2). These examples, and many others like them, situate reconciliation at the centre of widespread discussion.

Education and Reconciliation

Around the world, classrooms are recognized as sites to address civil, racial, and social tensions and imbue reconciliation. In fact, the idea "that education contributes towards reconciliation is one of the foundational assumptions that informs international work around education" (Paulson, 2011, p. 5). Various societies have implemented educational reforms for reconciliation, including Northern Ireland (Smith, 2011), Rwanda (Buckley-Zistel, 2009), and South Africa (Johnson, 2011). Such programs have been shown to have

transformative potential in addressing intergroup conflict (Bar-Tal, 2002; Morrison, 2011; Paulson, 2011). While this global body of literature may tempt some Canadian educators to simply adopt previously successful approaches, doing so would betray one of the key understandings of the field itself—that central to the work of peace education is the notion that such teaching and learning must reflect the nature of the local conflict (Bar-Tal, 2002; Morrison, 2011). Reconciliation is tied to particular relationships in particular places, and its educators must be attentive to the local realities of these conflicts. In this way, “the situatedness and complexity of oppression make problematic any attempts to articulate a strategy that works (for all teachers, with all students, in all situations)” (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 41). Educators must undergo the difficult work of creating curriculum that reflects the local realities and nature of the conflict. Such education must focus on the particular society’s “motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes... regarding the conflict, the nature of the relationship between parties, and the nature of the parties themselves” (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009, p. 558). In order to better understand the role of education in Canada’s reconciliation, educators must examine the particular nature of the relationship that it hopes to improve.

The context for Education for Reconciliation in Canada

Behind the discussion of reconciliation is a relationship in need of repair. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a comprehensive overview of the historical relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians, it is important to briefly examine the intersections of education and oppression vis-à-vis the relationship of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015a).

The idea that education could lie at the heart of reconciliation in Canada is a particularly challenging notion given how education has created and perpetuated the divide between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada (TRC, 2015a). The most blatant example is the residential school system. In the name of “education,” over 150,000 Indigenous youth underwent a project of cultural genocide, which spanned more than a century (TRC, 2015a, p. 1). The main goals of this system were to “remove and isolate children from the influence of their homes, families, traditions and cultures, and to assimilate them into the dominant culture” (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2008, para. 2). Even today, over 20 years after the last residential school closed, both survivors and their descendants experience trauma resulting from the emotional, physical, sexual, and cultural violence that occurred in these schools. Compared to other Indigenous Canadians, they experience poorer health outcomes, lower graduation rates, and higher rates of substance abuse (TRC, 2015b).

More recently, schools have continued to foster the oppression of Indigenous peoples in the curricular presentation of Indigenous peoples. Critics suggest that Indigenous peoples were cast as background characters in the story of European settlers (Clark, 2007) or they were ignored from these stories altogether (McLean, 2013). The presentation of Indigenous peoples reproduced “colonial ideas of race and space by perpetuating colonial frameworks through the erasure of Indigenous bodies, histories, and territories from the curriculum” (McLean, 2013, p. 358). As many governments work to produce curricula that include more Indigenous histories and cultures (Kairos, 2016), oppression within curricula continues in a different form.

The ongoing imbalances within curricula reach beyond the scope of content and date back to colonialism. With the settlement of Europeans in North America came a linear, rational, and positivistic worldview (Bowers, 2002). Bowers argued that such an epistemology and its understanding of the natural world “led to the exploitation of the environment and the exploitation of Indigenous groups” (p. 32). The primacy of the individual and the duality of man and nature created an ontological space for a culture of oppression. Not only was this epistemology directly damaging to Indigenous peoples and their lands, its dominance also silenced their ways of understanding the world.

Reflecting on the legacy of this tradition, Barrett et al. (2017) suggested that Western forms of education continue to practice *epistemicide*—“the deliberate silencing of voices and epistemologies that are inclusive and holistic” (p. 137). This privileging of Post-Enlightenment thought—at the expense of Indigenous knowledges—is a widely-acknowledged form of injustice within contemporary education (Aikenhead & Michell, 2011; Battiste, 2013; Dei, 2011). Even as schools begin to include Indigenous content, the deeply entrenched knowledge systems of Western education prevent barriers for Indigenous achievement and well-being (Kanu, 2011). Taken together, this history of curricular/epistemological exclusion presents a deeply

colonized system in need of pedagogical reform.

To further complicate matters, the work of education for reconciliation must respond to the fact that many non-Indigenous Canadians do not understand this legacy (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). In 2016, a report entitled *Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal People* provided some insight into this reality. Within the non-Indigenous sample, the report identified both *ignorance* (34% of participants said they have never heard or read about residential schools) and *discrimination* (87% of respondents said that Aboriginal people face discrimination in Canada) (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016) as barriers to understanding. However, the most relevant finding was at the intersections of ignorance and discrimination. Whereas the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) Final Report outlined the ways Indigenous Peoples face systemic discrimination within education, health care, and criminal justice (TRC, 2015b), only a minority of survey respondents suggested that these institutions currently treated Aboriginal peoples worse than non-Aboriginals—these were Health (26%), Criminal Justice System (38%), Education System (42%) respectively (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). This divide between reality and perception reminds us that reconciliation is needed and points to the importance of EfR.

Canada's educational system must be acknowledged as a colonial system, historically and contemporarily (Battiste, 2013; TRC, 2015a). There is a long tradition in which Indigenous beliefs, stories, and knowledges have been silenced within the walls of formal education. Despite ongoing cries to remedy these injustices within education, many non-Indigenous Canadians do not acknowledge this oppression. Regan (2010), drawing on the writing of Ravi de Costa, argued that there has been no clear "rupture in the ideological conditions that make settler or national identity possible. That is, a widespread acceptance amongst both victims and perpetrators that the fundamental ideas underpinning social and political arrangements are untenable" (p. 46). Canada needs a new approach to education that has the potential to rupture these damaging ideologies.

Context-Responsive Pedagogy

If education for reconciliation aims to respond to the legacy of colonialism in education, it must be based on new ways of teaching and learning. In describing the work of education for reconciliation, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's (TRC) Final Report acknowledges this need for change: "The education system itself must be transformed into one that rejects the racism embedded in colonial systems of education and treats Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian knowledge systems with equal respect" (TRC, 2015c, p. 21). There is a clear need to challenge ongoing oppression, while at the same time foster interpersonal and epistemological relationships within education. This work requires more than a few revisions of curricula; it demands a new context-responsive pedagogy. Bridging the work of the TRC Final Report with critical pedagogy and Indigenous knowledges, the following sections outline such a pedagogy for reconciliation.

Critical Pedagogy

Before educators can inspire students to challenge ongoing oppression, they must first create space for all of those involved to recognize the current model as unjust; critical pedagogy provides a framework for such work. Rooted in the writing of Freire (1972), its goal is *conscientização*, helping all parties "to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive actions of society" (p. 19). This balance of consciousness-raising and action-taking make critical pedagogy a needed part of EfR.

Critical pedagogy recasts national narratives in a manner that explicitly identifies historical and current injustices, and forces non-Indigenous Canadians to consider their place within these systems:

A pedagogical approach to truth telling and reconciliation...not only challenges mainstream society's deeply held myths about history but also fosters a genuine willingness and ability among settlers to accept responsibility for the residential schools. (Regan, 2010, p. 32)

Such education moves colonialism from the distant past to the present. It similarly shifts responsibility for the legacy of colonialism from former governments to present-day Canadians. Further to this point, Freire and the authors of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's Final Report employ nearly

identical descriptions of the ways in which this oppression affects both Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians: “The perpetrators are wounded and marked by history in ways that are different from the victims, but both groups require healing” (TRC, 2015a, p. 5). The TRC Final Report linked the impacts of colonialism to both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada. This important idea closely mirrors Freire’s notion of the damage of oppression on both the “oppressed” and the “oppressor”: “Dehumanization, which marks not only those whose humanity has been stolen, but also (though in a different way) those who have stolen it, is a distortion of the vocation of becoming more fully human” (Freire, 1972, p. 28). Both the TRC Final Report and Freire’s critical pedagogy shared an essential understanding that the impacts of colonialism are not limited to the past any more than they are confined to the Indigenous community. Educators must embrace a critical perspective that allows students to recognize their place within contemporary systems of injustice, whether as oppressor or oppressed.

Critical pedagogy also draws attention to the oppression that can be inherent in education itself. Such an approach assumes a “political posture that renounces the myth of pedagogic neutrality” (Freire, 1972, p. 22), revealing the ways in which education can “mirror oppressive society as a whole” (p. 59). Given the lengthy history of explicit and implicit oppression within its schools, Canada needs a political framework that allows all people to examine the political and epistemological roots of education in order to challenge these inequities.

Another key aspect of critical pedagogy for EfR is that it works towards an embodied response. For Giroux (2011), the product of such learning is both, “an understanding as well as a form of action designed to overthrow structures of domination” (p. 40). The TRC Final Report foregrounded the significance of an embodied response, stating that reconciliation is realized only “through concrete actions that demonstrate real societal change” (TRC, 2015a, p. 11). Regan (2010) highlighted the potential that critical pedagogy holds as a response to the legacy of residential schools:

Thus, it is necessary to link the individual’s sense of personal responsibility to the collective socio-political, moral, and ethical responsibility that we carry. This involves learning to bear deep witness to survivor’s testimonial stories, paying careful attention to our responses as indicators of empathy for, or resistance to, the hard historical truths we are hearing. These personal responses if reflected upon self-critically, are a springboard for socio-political action. (p. 32)

The purpose of helping students recognize their place within systems of oppression is not to reduce them to guilt or shame, but to provide them with empowering knowledge that allows them to stand against these oppressive systems. The goal of this work, like the ultimate goal of the TRC, is to see true embodied change in the way that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people treat each other. Acknowledging injustice through critical pedagogy can be one way to instigate such transformation.

Critiques

The linear and rational nature of critical pedagogy make it attractive and logical, but these very qualities also raise significant questions about whether critical pedagogy has a place in EfR. Critics of this perspective have argued that the “key assumptions, goals and pedagogical practices fundamental to the literature on critical pedagogy...are repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination” (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 39). A close examination of critical pedagogy reveals a number of issues that limits its role in the work of reconciliation.

First, critical pedagogy often relies on notions of individualism, emancipation, and progress. Bowers (2002) argued that these root metaphors are the same ideas that promoted Western dominance and colonialism in the first place. As a framework built on freeing individuals from previous models of thought, critical pedagogy can limit the role of community and work against intergenerational knowledge. Critical pedagogy’s link between new beliefs and progress is problematic for groups who value traditional knowledge (Bowers, 2002). While the TRC Final Report outlined the importance of freeing one’s self from damaging patterns of thoughts, it also emphasized the importance of communities rediscovering communal wisdom (TRC, 2015a).

The second major critique of critical pedagogy is its reliance on a model of rationality and linear

thought. Critical pedagogy often assumes that once students are presented with injustice, they will internalize their understanding and take steps to address injustice. Not only does this view fail to account for the complexity of relationships and the irrationality of human behavior, it also employs a problematic epistemological framework (Bowers, 2001). Kumashiro (2000) described how “[critical pedagogy’s] goal of consciousness-raising puts into play a modernist and rationalist approach to challenging oppression that is actually harmful to students who are traditionally marginalized in society” (p. 37). As was outlined earlier, Canadian education has already participated in the epistemicide of traditional and holistic forms of knowledge (Barrett et al., 2017). A model of EfR that only draws on critical pedagogy, and its traditionally rational framework, would perpetuate this system of epistemological dominance.

In light of the concerns surrounding its language and knowledge systems, critical pedagogy, as it is most commonly described, cannot be the *only* pedagogy informing EfR in Canada. This pedagogy acknowledges the oppression of knowledge systems, but it does little to disrupt this oppression. The truest way to disrupt this system is through the explicit introduction of Indigenous knowledges systems. The diverse and rich epistemologies of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities offer an alternative to the Eurocentric model of education. Drawing on some shared aspects of various Indigenous knowledges, the following section will outline how such systems foster reconciliation. They not only challenge Canada’s history of epistemological oppression, but also present a deeply relational ontology and a new understanding of the relationships that are in need of repair.

Indigenous Knowledges

Returning to the central call of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s (TRC) Final Report on education, education for reconciliation must find a way to connect Western and Indigenous systems of knowledge (TRC, 2015c). It is not enough to simply criticize the imbalances of the current system; education must offer new ways of being and learning that promote a new relationship. For Battiste (2013), this is the fundamental struggle of decolonizing education. She stated that “the ultimate struggle is a regeneration of new relationships among and between knowledge systems, which needs scholars competent in both knowledge systems to converge and reconcile these and other knowledges, ways of knowing, and systems” (p. 103). Not only does this shift move beyond challenging oppression, it also goes beyond balancing the scales of epistemology in the name of fairness. The need for Indigenous knowledges is not rooted in some sense of curricular equality, but it is in the holistic and critical role such knowledges can play in the work of reconciliation.

Indigenous knowledges offer an alternative to the oppressive imposition of Eurocentric worldviews. Whereas traditional Eurocentric models of knowledge created spaces for exploitation and division, many Indigenous knowledge systems present an embodied understanding of life that promotes interconnection and harmony (citation needed; I’m pretty sure Atleo, 2004 works here). In this orientation, the world and one’s life in it are “characterized by oneness, wholeness, interconnectedness, and interrelationity” (Atleo, 2004, p. 14). This framework stands in direct opposition to European “theologies of empire [which] have understood God and men as separate from and superior to women, Indigenous peoples, and nature (TRC, 2015a, p. 107). Indigenous knowledges offer an image of the world that minimizes the importance of “ego,” reimagines the ontological relationship between all people, and promotes deep connection (Hart, 2002). Indigenous understandings of the web of life present well-being as communal reality, with individual expressions (Atleo, 2004). This deeply interconnected understanding of reality empowers and compels all people to actively participate in the well-being of all living things.

The peacebuilding capacity of Indigenous knowledges reframes the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, but it also reimagines their relationship to the land they share. While, in this paper, I have largely characterized the task of reconciliation as the work that occurs between two groups of people, the interconnected perspectives of Indigenous knowledges extend this relationship to include the earth. A clear message in the TRC Final Report is “that reconciliation will never occur unless we are also reconciled with the earth” (TRC, 2015a, p.18). The historical injustices to which EfR must respond are social, political, economic, *and* ecological. Drawing on Indigenous knowledges, EfR must work towards “regenerating the crucial understanding that people are dependent upon natural processes, and are implicated in relation to human and ecological communities” (Scully, 2012, p. 151). These ancient wisdoms remove the

divisions between humankind and nature that made exploitation of people and the planet possible. This worldview promotes a community in which “everyone—human, animal, plant and planet—fulfils their obligations and goes about their proper business” (Hart, 2002, p. 43). As educators incorporate these holistic models of knowledge and relationship into their classrooms, it will provide opportunities for all students to work towards reconciliation with the earth itself.

In these ways, the inclusion of Indigenous knowledges responds to the shortcomings of critical pedagogy and the calls of the TRC Final Report. Whereas critical pedagogy is often rooted in knowledge systems that are individualized and rational, Indigenous knowledges offer interconnected and experiential understandings of the world. While critical pedagogy emphasizes the renewal and transformation of beliefs, Indigenous knowledges emphasize the value of ancient wisdom and connection to the earth. While notably tensioned, this relationship between critical pedagogy and Indigenous Knowledges is also complimentary.

Indigenous Knowledges as Critical Pedagogy

Although the preceding discussion has described critical pedagogy and Indigenous knowledges as distinct components of education for reconciliation, they are not incompatible ideas. Given Canada’s use of epistemological violence, embracing Indigenous knowledges is an act of defiance against the established educational order. In this way, Indigenous knowledges are “embedded with critical, oppositional, and resisting knowledge and counter narratives for decolonization” (Dei, 2011, p. 2). The use of such epistemologies in the classroom can be a gateway for teachers and students to encounter and understand contemporary oppression and injustice.

The introduction of alternative epistemologies can allow students to recognize how particular forms of knowledge have been privileged in society while others have been silenced (Battiste, 2013; Barrett et al., 2016; Dei, 2011). This epistemologically-diverse approach serves as a window into the legacy of colonialism. Battiste (2013) urged us to “remove our conceptual lenses, learn to immerse ourselves in systems of meaning that are different from ours, think through and challenge invidious hierarchical monism, and examine terms and systems that express and shape hegemonic knowledge” (p. 124). In this way, the use of Indigenous knowledges aligns closely with the work of critical pedagogy—It allows students to experience and process the ongoing injustice within education. Taken in tandem with the relational insights that were outlined earlier, it is clearly a foundational tool for education for reconciliation.

Conclusion

The work of education for reconciliation in Canada must be attentive to the unique colonial realities that have damaged, and continue to damage, the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. For centuries, education has oppressed Indigenous bodies, beliefs, and systems of knowledge, but many non-Indigenous Canadians are unaware or unaccepting of the ongoing nature of this oppression (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). To respond to this context, education for reconciliation requires a particular pedagogy. This pedagogy must draw explicit attention to systems of injustice, while offering the possibility of a deeper relationship. Critical pedagogy is essential for identifying and challenging oppression (Freire, 1972; Giroux, 2011). As an embodied form of teaching and learning, it asks students and teachers to denounce the myth of pedagogical neutrality in their classrooms and communities. Indigenous knowledges give Canadian educators another epistemology with which to do so (Dei, 2014). Not only does this framework for learning and knowing allow students and teachers to examine the epistemological violence that has been present in Canada for so long (Battiste, 2013; TRC, 2015), it also offers interconnected ways of being and knowing that present possibilities for a better future (Atleo, 2002; Hart, 2002). If education for reconciliation is to offer any hope for the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada, it must adopt this pointedly critical and deeply relational approach to teaching and learning.

REFERENCES

- Aikenhead, G., & Michell, H. (2011). *Bridging cultures: Indigenous and scientific ways of knowing nature*. Toronto, ON: Pearson.
- Assembly of First Nations. (2017). *AFN National Chief Perry Bellegarde welcomes Sixties Scoop court decision: 'Children of the Sixties Scoop deserve justice'*. Retrieved from <http://www.afn.ca/en/news-media/latest-news/14-2-17-afn-national-chief-perry-bellegarde-welcomes-sixties-scoop-cou>
- Atleo, E. R. (2004). *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth worldview*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Barrett, M. J., Harmin, M., Maracle, K. B., Patterson, M., Thomson, C., Flowers, M., & Bors, B. (2017). Shifting Relations with the More-than-Human: Six Threshold Concepts for Transformative Sustainability Learning. *Environmental Education Research*, 23(1), 131-143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2015.1121378>
- Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles and practice in the world*. (pp. 27-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Rosen, Y. (2009). Peace education in societies involved in intractable conflicts: Direct and indirect models. *Review of Educational Research*, 79, 557-575.
- Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich.
- Bowers, C. A. (2001). *Educating for eco-justice and community*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Bowers, C. A. (2002). Toward an eco-justice pedagogy. *Environmental Education Research*, 8(1), 21-34.
- Buckley-Zistel, S. (2009). Nation, narration, unification? The politics of history teaching after the Rwandan genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 11(1), 31-53.
- City of Victoria. (2016). 2017 declared a year of reconciliation. Retrieved from http://www.victoria.ca/assets/City~Hall/Media~Releases/2016/2016Jun30_MR_2017%20Declare%20A%20Year%20of%20Reconciliation.pdf
- City of Winnipeg. (2016). Mayor Bowman declares 2016 as the year of reconciliation. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/cao/media/news/nr_2016/nr_20160122.stm
- Clark, P. (2007). Representations of Aboriginal peoples in English Canadian history textbooks: Towards reconciliation. In E. Cole (Ed.), *Teaching the violent past: History education and reconciliation*. (pp. 81-120). New York, NY: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Dei, G. J. S. (2011). Introduction. In G. J. S. Dei (Ed.), *Indigenous philosophies and critical education: A reader*. (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Environics Institute for Survey Research. (2016). *Canadian public opinion on Aboriginal Peoples*. Retrieved from http://nctr.ca/assets/reports/Modern%20Reports/canadian_public_opinion.pdf
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London, UK: Sheed and Ward.
- Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Government of Canada (n.d.). Minister of Northern and Indigenous Affairs letter. Retrieved from <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/minister-indigenous-and-northern-affairs-mandate-letter>
- Hart, M. A. (2002). *Seeking mino-pimatisiwin: An Aboriginal approach to helping*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.
- Kairos. (2016). Education for reconciliation Report Card. Retrieved from: <http://www.kairoscanada.org/product/education-report-card>
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2008). *Prime Minister Harper offers full apology on behalf of Canadians for the Indian Residential Schools system*. Retrieved from <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1100100015649>
- Johnson, D. (2011). A cloud over the rainbow nation? Language, national reconciliation, and educational transformation in post-apartheid South Africa. In J. Paulson (Ed.), *Education and reconciliation: Exploring conflict and post-conflict situations* (pp. 103-125). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Kanu, Y. (2011). *Integrating aboriginal perspectives into the school curriculum: Purposes, possibilities, and challenges*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 25-53.
- Littledyke, M., & Manolas, E. (2011). *Education for sustainability pedagogy: Ideological and epistemological barriers and drivers*. Frankfurt, DE: Peter Lang.
- McLean, S. (2013). The whiteness of green: Racialization and environmental education. *Canadian*

- Geographer*. 57, 354-362.
- Morrison, M. L. (2011). Peace Education. In D.K. Chatterjee (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Justice* (pp. 820-824). SpringerLink. Retrieved from <https://link-springer-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/book/10.1007/978-1-4020-9160-5/page/1>
- Paulson, J. (2011). Introduction: Education and reconciliation. In J. Paulson (Ed.), *Education and reconciliation: Exploring conflict and post-conflict situations*. (pp. 1-10). New York, NY: Continuum.
- “reconciliation.” (2017). OED online. *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/view/Entry/159781?redirectedFrom=reconciliation#eid>
- Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian Residential Schools, truth telling, and reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
- Scully, A. (2012). Decolonization, reinhabitation and reconciliation: Aboriginal and place-based education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 17, 148-158.
- Smith, A. (2011). Education and reconciliation in Northern Ireland. In J. Paulson (Ed.), *Education and reconciliation: Exploring conflict and post-conflict situations* (pp. 55-78). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015a). Honouring the truth, reconciling the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation of Canada. Retrieved from [http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Honouring the Truth Reconciling for the Future July 23 2015.pdf](http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Honouring%20the%20Truth%20Reconciling%20for%20the%20Future%20July%2023%202015.pdf)
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015b). Canada’s residential schools: Legacy. Retrieved from [http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume 5 Legacy English Web.pdf](http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume%205%20Legacy%20English%20Web.pdf)
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015c). Canada’s residential schools: Reconciliation. Retrieved from [http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume 6 Reconciliation English Web.pdf](http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume%206%20Reconciliation%20English%20Web.pdf)

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jeremy D.N. Siemens: Jeremy D. N. Siemens, Department of Education, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Jeremy D. N. Siemens, E-mail: umsieme4@myumanitoba.ca