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Abstract: The findings and recommendations of the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC, 2008–2015) offer Canadians and their public institutions an opportunity to better confront the ongoing injustice of their colonial relationship with Indigenous peoples, but this task requires also assessing the specific contributions of the TRC. The specific contribution in which this article is interested is the discourse of reconciliation that the commission has made Canada’s master keyword for debating Indigenous-settler relations. The article analyzes representations of reconciliation in the mainstream Canadian print media before and over the life of the commission, concluding that the commission during its national events did much to promote a relatively quiescent notion of reconciliation that in fact displaced conceptions with more substantive connotations of the return of land, jurisdiction, and resources. This finding has implications for how Canadians discuss reconciliation in the future and for the broader literature interested in the role of reconciliation discourse in truth commissions and other enterprises of transitional justice.
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Résumé : Les résultats obtenus par la Commission de vérité et réconciliation relative aux pensionnats indiens du Canada (la Commission, 2008–2015) et les recommandations qu’elle a formulées donnent à la population canadienne et à ses institutions l’occasion de regarder en face l’injustice qui continue de caractériser leur relation coloniale avec les peuples autochtones ; mais cela ne saurait se faire sans évaluer également les apports précis de la Commission. L’apport particulier sur lequel se penche cet article est le discours de réconciliation, devenu, à la suite des travaux de la Commission, l’expression clé des débats sur les relations entre autochtones et pionniers. L’article analyse les représentations de la réconciliation dans les principaux journaux canadiens imprimés avant et pendant la tenue de la Commission. Il en conclut qu’au fil de ses rencontres nationales, celle-ci s’est efforcée de promouvoir une version relativement passive de la réconciliation qui, dans les faits, a supplanté les idées porteuses de connotations plus substantielles, telles la restitution des terres, la juridiction et les ressources. Ce constat a des conséquences sur la façon dont les Canadiens discutent de la réconciliation à l’avenir, de
mêmes que sur les travaux plus généraux concernant le rôle du discours de réconciliation dans les commissions de vérité et autres projets de justice transitionnelle.
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Introduction

In 2015, Canada’s residential schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) concluded its seven-year mandate of healing, witnessing, investigation, and public education. Its final report (TRC 2015b) indicts Canada’s century-long residential school policy as part of a program of cultural genocide. As the report explains, the overriding purpose of residential schooling was to attack Indigenous social reproduction and thus to destroy self-determining nations by forcibly separating generations of children from their families, languages, and cultures. The commission’s findings and 94 calls to action (TRC 2015d) offer Canadians and their public institutions an opportunity to better confront the ongoing injustice of this country’s colonial relationship with Indigenous peoples. Taking this opportunity, however, demands also that Canadians assess the TRC’s contributions in order to proceed with a more informed understanding of the new discursive landscape that the commission is at least partly responsible for bequeathing us.

This kind of assessment requires engaging in broader debates about how political communities reckon with legacies of mass atrocity. Truth commissions began in Latin America as bodies responsible for investigating state outrages, determining which individuals and institutions were responsible, and issuing recommendations aimed at promoting transitions from cultures of impunity and abuse (Hayner 2011; Phelps 2006). In the wake of South Africa’s celebrated example (Rotberg and Thompson 2000), however, truth commissions have tended to emphasize reconciliation in their mandates, as well. Informed crucially by notions of group trauma and healing, this reconciliatory turn emphasizes practices of witnessing and rituals of disclosure and atonement as means of individual recovery and improved inter-group relations.¹

There is now a significant body of scholarship (e.g., Hirsch 2011, 2012; Kymlicka and Bashir 2008; Murphy 2010; Schaap 2005; Verdeja 2009), particularly in legal, democratic, and critical theory, on conceptions and practices of reconciliation. Not all contributors are enthusiasts. In Canada, for example, the Mohawk Indigenous governance scholar Taiaiake Alfred (2009, 165) warned at the TRC’s creation that reconciliation as a concept was “weak-kneed and too easily accepting of half-hearted measures of a notion of justice.” Others present more defensible approaches. Some were developed in response to the South African TRC; authors dismayed by that
commission’s overriding stress on forgiveness (Dwyer 1999; Minow 1999) proposed that reconciliation should instead be conceived as a process of decentring dominant narratives with the stories and experiences of the oppressed. More recently, democratic theorists have reckoned specifically with reconciliation in contexts of settler colonial injustice. Concerned to transcend simplistic and depoliticizing notions that dwell one-sidedly on comity and fence-mending, theorists (e.g., Schaap 2008; Short 2012; Tully 2008) of what is called agonistic democracy conceive reconciliation as an open-ended process of struggle oriented toward transforming conditions of oppression into political relationships of free reciprocity resting on Indigenous consent.

There is scarcely any literature addressing the roles of actual truth commissions in bringing specific conceptions of reconciliation to bear on specific cases of historic injustice, however (but see Moon 2006; Nagy 2002; Quinn 2009). Instead, because most truth commissions address cases of recent, direct, and widespread state-directed political violence, the relevant scholarship tends to focus on readily measurable impacts relevant to questions of short-run political transition. In the transitional justice literature, for instance, scholars interested in how to effect regime transformation in conditions of authoritarianism or dictatorship (e.g., Bakiner 2014; Olsen et al. 2010) ask about the impact of truth commissions on constitutional reform, on the punishment or removal of perpetrators from office, and on the observance of human rights.

The Canadian case involves a long-term colonial relationship where the prospect of immediate or wholesale regime change is not imminent and in which ongoing human rights violations are often more insidiously subtle than those caught by the indicators used in leading international studies (Jung 2010). Indeed, scholars (Balint, Evans, and McMillan 2014; Matsunaga 2016; Nagy 2012) worry that the standard template of today’s globally diffused model of transitional justice (Nagy 2008) is particularly inappropriate for settler colonial contexts. As they note, the template’s basic teleology is liberal: it emphasizes narrow and immediate rather than more expansive, positive conceptions of peace; it focuses less on minority nationhood and more on national unity; and it prioritizes individualist conceptions of accountability and rights over more structurally oriented visions. The Canadian TRC was designed with at least some of these concerns in mind.² For example, its emphasis on reconciliation was never some naive injunction to forgive and forget in the interests of unity and stability. The commission hoped to further restorative justice goals of social accountability and change by using practices of disclosure and witnessing to confront the dominant society with the narratives and aspirations of Indigenous trauma survivors (Llewellyn 2007; Stanton 2012). These practices are the aspect of the Canadian commission with which this article is centrally concerned.
Disclosure and witnessing were at the heart of the seven national events and the dozens more regional and local events that the TRC held between the years 2010 and 2014. For survivors, the events were designed as occasions to pursue healing by narrating their experiences of trauma and hopes for the future; for societal and media audiences, they were opportunities to engage as witnesses in order to bring the lessons learned to other public spheres and spaces (Niezen 2013). Over 9,000 survivors registered to participate in the seven national events, roughly 155,000 persons attended, and the event livestreams attracted an additional estimated 93,350 concurrent views (TRC 2015c, 29, 31).

Also demanding careful analysis, now and for years to come, is the treatment of reconciliation in the TRC’s (2015b) mammoth six-volume report, which was released in late 2015. Although this article concludes by briefly discussing the report, it is concerned more specifically with the commission’s high-profile national events. The practices of witnessing and disclosure around which the events revolved are the most widely known domestic adaptations of the reconciliatory emphasis that has been transforming truth commissions and transitional justice around the world (Teitel 2003). In Canada, one notable result has been the ascent of reconciliation as this country’s keyword in Indigenous-settler relations, a commitment invoked by governments, corporations, artists, professional sports organizations, and more (e.g., Hornby 2016).

The following text addresses this reconciliatory turn with an approach attuned specifically to the Canadian settler colonial context. Focusing on representations of reconciliation in the mainstream print media before and during the course of the TRC’s national events, it asks, at the most general level, the following questions: What particular understandings of reconciliation and its requirements do the commission’s events of disclosure and witnessing, as filtered via the print media, appear to have given Canadians? What might be the effects of these meanings on the country’s capacity to address structural injustice by renegotiating Indigenous-settler relationships in fairness and respect?

Here, I can state schematically the article’s three core findings. First, the media representations were overwhelmingly quietistic rather than substantive: they stressed reconciliation as a matter of comity and fence-mending, and they treated the settler society’s contribution to these goals in the primarily affective terms of listening, learning, and goodwill. Second, even before the advent of the TRC, these predominantly affective representations had come to overshadow more substantive conceptions that linked reconciliation to the business of returning lands, jurisdiction, and resources; the TRC thus had an inauspicious landscape with which to contend. The article’s third key finding, however, is that the public events and outreach strategies that the TRC carried out during its mandate found little success in changing this landscape;
neither did the TRC prepare Canadians for what turned out to be its big surprise: the
careful and emphatic attention paid to matters of substantive reconciliation in the
final report (see especially TRC 2015a). I conclude by suggesting that a new official
apology that reframes residential schooling in terms of the final report’s core recom-
mendations and findings might advance the cause of substantive reconciliation.

Approach

My analysis builds on recent work in the *Journal of Canadian Studies* by literary and
cultural critic Jennifer Henderson (2015) on Canadian media framings of residential
schooling prior to the TRC. Henderson shows how two distinct but mutually reinforcing
channels produced a Canadian common sense about harms and remedies in relation
to residential schooling. The first channel was tort law: the schools came to mainstream
consciousness when survivors of residential schools began to launch civil compensation
claims for sexual and physical abuse. As Henderson explains, the search for healing and
support through the compensatory mechanisms of law often resulted in an individual-
izing discourse that emphasized specific victims, particular perpetrators, and relatively
narrow understandings of wrongdoer responsibility. The second channel of truth pro-
duction in Henderson’s analysis involved the frames that the mainstream media used
to report on the suits and the ensuing public debates. The reportage tended to treat
residential schooling in the terms already presented to it by law, thus reinforcing the
prevailing individualistic understandings of residential school abuse, healing, and re-
sponsibility. Indeed, much of the early opinion writing on residential schools redress ex-
hibited a stridently neo-liberal refusal to entertain any notion of collective responsibility
that might link residential schooling to contemporary Canadian injustices or obligations.

The other touchstone for this article is a study by transitional justice scholars
Rosemary Nagy and Emily Gillespie (2015), which considers how the mainstream
print media framed *truth* and *reconciliation* in its coverage of the TRC. Addressing
a two-year period falling roughly in the middle of the TRC’s mandate, Nagy and
Gillespie find that media discussions about the truth of the residential schools had
begun to increase in nuance and complexity. Although careful not to impute a direct
causal role to the TRC, they note that the one-sidedly individualist focus of the early
coverage was supplemented by a broader recognition of collective residential school
harms, such as intergenerational suffering and the loss of language and culture; but they found no similarly expansive trajectory in the media’s reconciliation fram-
ings. As Nagy and Gillespie explain, although Indigenous individuals and organi-
izations brought a focus on political transformation, nation-to-nation relations, and
the reinvigoration of treaties to the TRC, the media coverage persisted in framing
reconciliation in the quietistic and often sentimental terms of forgiveness, healing, and understanding.

These studies thus provide us with a good sense of mainstream Canadian media discourse about truth, reconciliation, and residential schooling at the midpoint of the TRC. They show that the combination of survivor activism and the endeavours of the commission breached Canada’s wall of denial and indifference, promoting a growing recognition of the schools as sites of a generalized assault on Indigenous families and cultures with ongoing intergenerational effects; yet, they also show the almost total failure of mainstream discussions to grasp anything of the core reality that would prove so central to the TRC report: that residential schooling was part of a deliberate scheme of cultural genocide that aimed to further an agenda of land and sovereignty dispossession. Finally, the studies show us that the media framed reconciliation—and thus treated the question of what Canadians might do with their new-found residential schools knowledge—in terms that were primarily affective, sentimental, and voluntarist rather than substantive, material, or policy-oriented.

This article builds upon this prior research by asking, how did the mainstream print media discuss reconciliation before the TRC was established? How did it discuss reconciliation by the time of the conclusion of the TRC’s national events? Did representations of reconciliation change after the introduction or over the life of the TRC, and, if so, how? To what extent and in what ways can we link these representations to the conduct of the TRC? The research base for this study was a search of the ProQuest Canadian Newsstand Major Dailies Database, covering the period from 1 January 1995 to 15 April 2014, for news stories, editorials, or opinion pieces with titles containing the word reconciliation and with at least one use in the document text of the word Aboriginal. The search yielded 202 items, a number reduced to 149 after eliminating duplicate pieces and letters to the editor. By focusing on items only with reconciliation in the headline, a manageable number of entries was produced, allowing a time frame of study that spans the final year of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples to the close of the TRC’s national events.

The price paid for this longer-term view is a method less analytically ambitious and robust than the predecessor studies discussed above. Whereas Henderson (2015) and Nagy and Gillespie (2015) study media frames—the emplotments and below-the-surface relations of signification used to create meaning in texts—I look only at the immediate referents attached to reconciliation in specific individual instances of pieces by opinion writers or quoted sources using that term. These quotations and utterances were of course themselves selected and embedded in news frames; there can be no illusion about their unmediatedness (Hackett et al. 2000). My aim is to put in abeyance the work of studying framing strategies in favour of a more
restricted content analysis that tracks the apparent meaning of direct invocations of \textit{reconciliation} over time; the purpose in doing so is to situate the TRC historically in the context of the emergence and subsequent trajectory of Canadian representations of reconciliation and, in particular, to gauge the possible contributions of the TRC’s national events to the character of those representations.

This study is guided by a key tenet of critical discourse analysis; grasping meaning and significance in linguistic utterances requires locating utterances in relation to social practices and events \citep{fairclough2003}. The practices with which I am concerned are those of historical justice and reconciliation politics: the collective engagement of civic actors with claims for redress and acknowledgement of past wrongs. The events at the centre of this analysis are key moments over the past three decades when Canadian institutions mobilized historical justice and reconciliation practices to address Indigenous claims. These events include the 1996 report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP 1996); the 1998 Statement of Reconciliation \citep{ministerofindianaffairsandnortherndevelopment2000}, which was Ottawa’s initial response both to RCAP and to the early civil suits over residential schooling; the 2006 \textit{Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement}, which ended the residential schools litigation of the early 2000s and established the TRC; Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s 2008 residential schools apology; and the TRC’s national events of 2010–14.

Thus, my analysis historically tracks invocations of \textit{reconciliation} and attempts to grasp their meanings and significance by relating them to key moments in Canadian historical justice and Indigenous-settler relations. To this end, I coded each media item in the study by linking it to the major institutional prompt or political development that seemed responsible for its appearance. In what was doubtless a reflection of the well-documented tendency of the major media to report happenings relayed to them first by large organizations and that correspond with a fairly narrow range of newsworthiness imperatives \citep{hackettetal2000}, I found in most cases that it was quite easy to identify particular proximate events or institutional initiatives that seemed responsible for prompting the publication of the item in question. This procedure was useful for conducting a preliminary historical analysis of reconciliation representations because it allowed me to trace and distinguish how different glosses on that term developed in relation to such key developments as RCAP, the rise of residential school litigation, the creation of the TRC, the 2008 apology, and the TRC’s national events.

**Reconciliation Prior to the TRC, 1990–97**

\textit{Reconciliation} was not a prominent keyword in early discussions about the impact and legacy of residential schools. The first Indigenous calls for a residential schools
TRC emphasized the inquiry-like and educative roles of a commission and had almost nothing to say about reconciliation, per se (Bonner and James 2011). The first resolution from the Assembly of First Nations (1990) on residential schools spoke of compensation, an apology, and a national inquiry. It did not use the word reconciliation, although it did call the schools a cultural genocide—the same formulation used 25 years later in the TRC’s final report; neither did the important 1998 survey of former residential school students conducted for the Law Reform Commission of Canada (Claes and Clifton 1998) report any calls for reconciliation. This landscape changed significantly in the immediate lead-up to the TRC and over its life.

There were, however, discussions of Indigenous-settler relations before the advent of the TRC that referred to reconciliation and indeed that attached substantive connotations to that term. The 1996 RCAP report (see Turner 2013) adumbrated a substantive conception when it spoke of reconciliation as a 20-year project that would yield for First Nations’ significantly expanded land bases and major jurisdictional powers via a new treaty process grounded in the ideals of self-determination, mutual recognition, and consent. In a thinner neo-liberal form, reconciliation—but with at least some reference to returning lands, jurisdiction, and resources—was central to British Columbia’s ultimately failed New Relationship policy of 2003–2009 (Woolford 2005). Even the Canadian Supreme Court’s 1990s jurisprudence on reconciling the section 35 Aboriginal rights of the Constitution Act, 1982 with overarching Canadian sovereignty counts as a substantive conception, however neo-colonial it may be (Turner 2013); but it would seem that these early substantive notions received relatively little media attention. For example, only one item from the news search referenced the RCAP notion of reconciliation as a transformed relationship based on restitution, nation-to-nation relations, and consent—this was a 1997 opinion piece defending the RCAP recommendations as a “meaningful step towards reconciliation between Canada and its aboriginal peoples” (item 5.1).

The 1998 Statement of Reconciliation

Indeed, the first major cluster of reconciliation titles in the media search emerged not from RCAP but from the attempts of Jean Chrétien’s Liberal federal government to evade the Royal Commission’s recommendations. In 1998, Ottawa began to invoke reconciliation in ways that severed the concept from RCAP’s emphasis on land, powers, and governance, and that tethered it to residential school apologetics instead. Consider Ottawa’s response to RCAP, a document called Gathering Strength (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development 2000); the centrepiece was a “Statement of Reconciliation” presented by the Minister of Indian and Northern
Affairs, Jane Stewart. The statement offered a brief apology for the sexual and physical abuse endured by residential school students, contained some vague words of regret about Canada’s historic treatment of Indigenous peoples, and announced a $350 million “healing fund” to create the now defunct Aboriginal Healing Foundation. As the title “Statement of Reconciliation” might suggest, this approach amounted to a brazen redefinition that framed reconciliation as a state of affairs proclaimed unilaterally by government.

**Residential Schools Litigation, 1999–2000**

Canadian officialdom went on to pursue an approach to residential school abuse that proved to be anything but reconciliatory. Former students found themselves battling the Liberal federal government and the major Christian churches over the basic preliminary matter of who might legally be addressable for wrongs stemming from the operation of the schools (*Feldthuensen 2007*). These struggles over legal responsibility spawned the second major wave of reconciliation news items in the search. Four such articles appeared between 1999 and 2000 (items 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5); all involved church personnel proposing reconciliation as an alternative to abuse litigation.9

One piece featured a thoughtful call from the archdeacon of the Anglican Church for a comprehensive and holistic response to the residential schools legacy; another relayed the emphasis of an Indigenous bishop on “work[ing] together with white people” (items 2.3 and 2.4). The two other church calls for reconciliation seemed more disingenuous: one worried that there would be an anti-Native “backlash” unless the lawsuits could be stopped, while the other warned that the court cases would “derail reconciliation” by forcing the churches to spend money that might otherwise have been spent on good works in Indigenous communities (items 2.2 and 2.5).

**Residential Schools Litigation and the Idea of a TRC, 2000**

A subsequent third grouping of articles also promoted reconciliation as an alternative to conflict and litigation, and again the majority of the calls (three of four) came from non-Indigenous people. Distinguishing this group from their immediate church predecessors of 1999–2000 was their specific focus on the idea of a truth commission. Two opinion pieces and an editorial (items 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4), all appearing in 2000, and all written by non-Indigenous authors, decried the court battles over residential school abuse, promoted a truth commission as an alternative, and described reconciliation in terms of “harmony,” “understanding,” and “trust.” Some reconciliation advocates seemed particularly interested in securing Indigenous quiescence: one of two (items 3.1 and 3.4) opinion pieces complained that “taxpayers are angry about
paying huge sums, churches are going broke, and natives are still bitter”; the other proposed that “a public venting of grievances and acknowledgment of sins would be a mighty step towards putting this unsavoury history behind us.” The only direct reference to the views of an Indigenous person or organization came in a December 2000 news story (item 3.2) reporting on then Assembly of First Nations (AFN) Chief Matthew Coon Come’s advocacy of a commission, but it contained no insight into Coon Come’s thinking or indeed that of any other Indigenous person or entity.

We can draw two conclusions from these three clusters of initial reconciliation discussions, stemming from Ottawa’s RCAP response, the residential schools litigation, and early calls for a TRC, respectively. First, the weak, almost entirely affective, and sometimes objectionable visions promoted by government and church personnel received more attention than the substantive vision offered by RCAP, the most expensive royal commission in Canadian history (Cairns 2000, 121). Second, these visions, which were advanced by non-Native authorities seeking either to sideline the RCAP recommendations or to escape the penalties threatened by the first wave of residential school litigation, seemed to reflect the interests of their proponents in safeguarding existing stores of authority, land, money, and prestige.  


Before moving on to consider reconciliation articles linked directly to the TRC, an important outlier group must be discussed. Involving a longer time frame than the others, and spanning the years 1998–2010, but with the majority appearing between 2007 and 2009, the 20 items in this cluster were all products of land claim and treaty politics in British Columbia. The 1998 Nisga’a land claim and self-governance agreement (Blackburn 2007) spawned three opinion pieces with reconciliation in the title. Although prompted by a deal that transferred lands, powers, and resources to the Nisga’a nation, these items (6.2, 6.3, and 6.4), including one by the Nisga’a leader, Joseph Gosnell, all spoke identically of reconciliation in terms of future harmonious relations.

The other 17 pieces (items 6.1 and 6.5 through 6.20, inclusive) in the BC group stemmed from the Liberal provincial government’s proposed New Relationship policy and its centrepiece legislation, the ill-fated BC First Nations Recognition and Reconciliation Act (British Columbia Ministry of Aboriginal Reconciliation 2017). Their context was as follows: Coming to office in 2001 as a hard-line opponent of Indigenous rights, Liberal Premier Gordon Campbell soon decided to pursue a less confrontational approach after discovering the barriers to resource development in a province legally encumbered by unceded Aboriginal title. What became known as the New Relationship policy was first mooted in 2003. The policy recognized that British
Columbia’s historic *terra nullius* approach to Native claims was wrong-headed, that Indigenous peoples in BC had unaddressed rights to land and resources, and that the only way forward was to engage in treaty negotiations on the premise of pre-existing title and rights.

The limitations and ultimate failure of the New Relationship should be noted. Activist and scholarly critics argued that, British Columbia’s conversion to realism on constitutional law notwithstanding, the policy itself aimed not to recognize but to extinguish Native title and to neo-liberalize future treatyed First Nations (Woolford 2004). On the other hand, business leaders bristled at what they saw as an unduly concessionary approach. For their part, the province’s main Indigenous organizations condemned the act’s proposal to transform British Columbia’s 198 recognized First Nations into approximately 20 new amalgamated bodies (Hume 2008). British Columbia finally shelved the *First Nations Recognition and Reconciliation Act* in 2009.

Notwithstanding these difficulties and limitations, 11 of the 20 items in the BC cluster (6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.12, 6.13, 6.14, 6.15, 6.16, 6.17, 6.18, and 6.20) treated reconciliation as a long-term process involving government-to-government negotiations and the transfer of lands, powers, and resources. Three articles (items 6.9, 6.12, and 6.17) included Indigenous voices speaking clearly in these terms, while another eight (6.8, 6.10, 6.11, 6.13, 6.14, 6.15, 6.17, and 6.20) featured non-Indigenous authorities or observers following the same pattern. Settler society sources were certainly less adamant and more divided than First Nations ones in upholding substantive definitions of reconciliation. Nevertheless, representations of reconciliation in mainstream print media discussions of BC treaty politics, particularly between the years 2003 and 2009, tended to have at least minimally substantive connotations and referents.

**The Creation of the TRC, 2006–2009**

While BC debated the New Relationship, a more broadly based pan-Canadian reconciliation discourse began to emerge. It was the product of the 2006 *Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement*, the moves toward formally establishing the TRC in 2007–2008, and Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s residential schools apology of 2008. The key events cannot be recounted fully here (see Nagy 2014; Regan 2010), but a central factor was the certification in 2004 of what became known as the *Fontaine* residential schools class action suit, which threatened Ottawa and the churches with what would have probably been the largest civil damages rulings in Canadian history. Also crucial was the 2005 collapse of the Alternative Dispute Resolution program developed by Paul Martin’s Liberal government, which was castigated for its humiliating treatment of survivors.
The Settlement Agreement, TRC, and apology also coincided with the second AFN chieftainship of Phil Fontaine, who returned to that role for the years 2003–2009, after having served already from 1997 to 2000. Fontaine was virtually the only Indigenous person in the news items canvassed thus far who spoke of reconciliation in the peacemaking-and-comity terms preferred by non-Indigenous authorities. For example, a story on Ottawa’s 1998 Statement of Reconciliation, which observed that he had been elected Grand Chief “on a platform of reconciliation with the government,” quoted Fontaine as wanting to move beyond “an adversarial role with the government” and toward a “healing process” (item 1.3). This is not to gainsay Fontaine’s commitment to treaties and land claims or, still less, his courageous and long-standing advocacy on behalf of sexual abuse victims and residential school survivors; but it is to suggest that Fontaine’s emphasis on improved relations with Ottawa in the period that included the 2006 Settlement Agreement, the 2007 creation of the TRC, and the 2008 residential schools apology may have in some way contributed to the overall character of a nascent Canadian reconciliation discourse that emphasized comity and understanding. It is to these critical events that we now turn.

Eleven items with reconciliation in the title were spawned either by the 2006 Settlement Agreement or by reports between 2007 and 2008 on the establishment of the TRC. In many of these pieces, the reference to reconciliation was purely titular—that is, the article contained no discussion of reconciliation and was caught in the search only because its headline referred to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Those pieces that did discuss reconciliation tended to share the by-now familiar emphasis on friendlier, more co-operative relations.

The novel element among them is highlighted in Nagy and Gillespie’s (2015) analysis of media framings of the TRC: they emphasized public education as a contributor to reconciliation—a framing that was absent in the earlier, pre-Settlement Agreement news items. For example, in two early pieces about the creation of the TRC, although the first chief commissioner, Harry LaForme, treated reconciliation as a synonym for improved relations, he stressed also that this goal required Canadians to learn about residential schooling from survivors. Speaking of survivor testimony, LaForme suggested that “through their experiences, truth will be made known, healing will begin, and sincere reconciliation made possible” (item 8.6). He referred in a subsequent piece to the broader history of Indigenous-settler relations, suggesting that if Canadians knew more about “why this relationship exists, then people [would] understand these tensions better and what underlies them” (item 8.9).

Only two dissident notes were sounded in the articles prompted by the impending establishment of the TRC. Author Erna Paris criticized the absence of subpoena...
powers in the TRC mandate, wondering how reconciliation could arise from a process in which perpetrators and officials would not be compelled to participate (item 8.11). For her part, the Globe and Mail controversialist Margaret Wente feared that the TRC would be unable to effect reconciliation because an attachment to “victimization” made Indigenous people unable “to move on” (item 10.4).

The 2008 Apology

In June 2008, the prime ministerial apology prompted 14 items with reconciliation in the title, far more than any other single precipitating event in this study. An emphasis on public education and fence-mending predominated. Editorials and op-eds by non-Native commentators urged that “the true nature of reconciliation [was] an open and unconditional acceptance of the truth,” which required making “an effort to get to know aboriginal peoples in your communities and listen to their stories” (items 10.3 and 10.7). One story quoted a survivor speaking in apparently similar terms: “I believe in reconciliation ... I believe that mainstream Canadians don’t have a clue. It excites me to know that it’s finally out there for everybody to know” (item 10.5). Thus, the 2008 apology stands as a key moment in this study: it marks the point at which the discourse of reconciliation as truth-telling, healing, and fence-mending seemed to reach hegemony—before the TRC had held a single event.

The TRC and Its Controversies, 2008–2014

The years 2008–2009 brought major setbacks for the TRC, including serious disagreements among the first set of commissioners, their subsequent resignation and replacement, and further delays caused by the administrative requirements of the Settlement Agreement (Nagy 2012). Although the media coverage of these matters mentioned virtually nothing about reconciliation, items dealing with them were caught in the search simply because they contained titular references to the TRC. Much the same applies to another group of stories, which appeared between 2010 and 2014 and dealt with various battles stemming from the refusal of the federal government and bureaucracy to adhere to the provisions in the Settlement Agreement governing archival access and document provision.

The TRC’s National Events: Intensifying the Emphasis on Reconciliation, 2012–14

What about stories, opinion pieces, or editorials prompted by the national events of the TRC? The search yielded 38 such items, which were so consistent in their representations of reconciliation that we can dispense quickly with the business of
characterizing them as a whole. These items discussed reconciliation in the terms identified by Nagy and Gillespie (2015): as a state of increased harmony resulting from Native healing through truth-telling and non-Native understanding via public education. Reconciliation would require learning, bringing people together to talk, acknowledgement, forgiveness, and “shedding some tears, getting rid of a load” (item 19.2).

As one might expect, media coverage of TRC national events prompted more items featuring reconciliation in the title and discussion of Indigenous peoples in the text than did any other event or initiative addressed in this study. Of particular analytic interest, however, are the dynamics of this upward trajectory. The first three national events—in Winnipeg, Iqaluit, and Halifax—produced a total of nine relevant items. While the subsequent Saskatoon event yielded an additional two, the three following national events—in Montreal, Vancouver, and Edmonton—spawned 22 pieces, twice as many as the first four.

This growth in reconciliation coverage is particularly notable because at least one observer (Niezen 2013, 38) suggests that media interest in the TRC in fact declined after the high-profile inaugural event in Winnipeg. This conjunctural anomaly may be explained by something that Commissioner Wilton Littlechild noted at the Saskatoon National Event: the TRC had decided to focus the second half of its mandate on reconciliation (James, 2012). From Saskatoon onward, TRC national events featured more panels on reconciliation than their earlier counterparts; they also began showcasing Expressions of Reconciliation, which were announcements and gestures made by Canadian organizations and community leaders to demonstrate their commitment to improved relations. Thus, the TRC’s reconciliation push may well have been responsible for the significant increase in reconciliation-titled news items seen in the latter half of the commission’s mandate.

The 2006–2014 Rise of Reconciliation to Keyword Status and the TRC’s 2012–14 Reconciliation Push

Recall that my basic strategy in this article is to proceed historically, linking media discussions of reconciliation to the apparent institutional prompts or significant events precipitating them. The search found several items with reconciliation in the title and some discussion of Aboriginal peoples, but with no apparent connection to any of the prompts identified at the outset of the analysis. I found 29 such pieces; these are referred to as unlinked items. The vast majority of these unlinked items came after the 8 May 2006 Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement that paved the way for the TRC: 23 in the 8 years following the agreement, as compared with
6 in the 12 years preceding it. Particularly notable is that 14 of these 23 articles (items 7.16 through 7.29, inclusive)—appearing after the TRC’s creation yet not in any way directly related to it or to the other institutional prompts or historical events identified in this chapter—date from 2012 to 2014, the period of the TRC’s intensified reconciliation focus. This coincidence of timing suggests the possibility that the commission was also at least diffusely responsible for the growing application of reconciliation to an increasingly broad assortment of issues in Indigenous-settler relations.

Let us now probe the texture of these discussions, starting with the six unlinked items that discussed reconciliation in the years between 1995 and the 2006 Settlement Agreement. One reported on the controversy about low-level Canadian military training flights over Indigenous territories in Labrador (7.2); one advocated South Africa’s reconciliation process as a model for Canada (7.4); one discussed a historical re-enactment of a Native-settler conflict at Clayoquot Sound (7.5); one reported on the return of a totem pole from a Swedish museum to its rightful home (7.6); and a further two (7.1 and 7.3) addressed Native-settler relations in general. The majority of these early, pre-TRC, unlinked references (four of six) treated reconciliation in terms of harmony and goodwill. An opinion piece author preferred “reconciliation” over “dangerous, explosive extremism” (item 7.1); an event organizer hoped for “healing and reconciliation” (7.13); and the returned totem pole was a “symbol of reconciliation” (7.6).

Now we turn to the 23 unlinked reconciliation items that appeared after the Settlement Agreement. Four such items surfaced in 2007, and all followed the harmony-and-fence-mending model: two were on Native-settler relations in general (7.7 and 7.8), one reported on a “reconciliation walk” (7.10), and one was an op-ed advocating “remorse and the bearing of forgiveness” (7.9). Five more unlinked articles emerged in the period 2008–2011 (items 7.11 through 7.15, inclusive), and all except one cleaved to the template noted above; the outlier (7.15) advocated child care policies based on respect for Indigenous autonomy as contributions to reconciliation.

Finally, 14 more unlinked items (7.16 through 7.29, inclusive) appeared between the years 2012 and 2014, indicating that the period of the term’s most capacious spread coincided with the TRC’s own intensified reconciliation focus. Four pieces attached substantive connotations to reconciliation; three of the fourteen items (7.22, 7.25, and 7.28) linked reconciliation to matters of land, while a further article (7.27) criticized Canadian authorities for being disrespectful of Native voices and priorities. In terms of land, an op-ed piece described protecting Native territories from destruction as a reconciliatory contribution (item 7.22), while items on the visit to Canada of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and on the establishment of a new treaty research centre at Vancouver Island University (7.28 and 7.29) identified renewed treaty relations as a prerequisite of reconciliation.
The majority (11 of 14) of these unlinked pieces, however, equated reconciliation with harmonious relations engendered by improved public education and attitudes (items 7.16 through 7.24, inclusive, and items 7.26 and 7.27). These items addressed such matters as the resolution of a dispute about a community mural in Edmonton (7.20); “forgiveness ... harmony and cohabitation” in New Brunswick (7.19); community healing after a forest fire in Manitoba (7.26); the erection of a totem pole at Government House in British Columbia (7.21); and the contributions of BC’s former Sto:lo lieutenant-governor, Steven Point (7.23). Let us now explore further the possible role of the TRC’s reconciliation push in this continued overshadowing of substantive conceptions.

Reconciliation En Route to Vancouver and Beyond, 2012–14

Four national events featured a heightened stress on reconciliation: the 2012 Saskatoon National Event, the 2013 events in Montreal and Vancouver, and the 2014 event in Edmonton. Twenty-two stories dealing with these events had reconciliation in the title (items 20.1 through 20.6, inclusive; 21.1 through 21.9, inclusive; and 22.1 through 22.7, inclusive). In both their quotations and authorial claims, these pieces cleaved faithfully to the comity-and-learning discourse, with additional references to healing through truth-telling. Reconciliation meant “mutual respect” (20.1); “walking together, talking together” (21.3); “healing” (22.4); “restoring friendship and harmony” (21.7); and a “new society that embraces all of us” (21.8). Thus, we certainly see a correlation: as the TRC intensified its emphasis on reconciliation, more article authors employed this affective and often sentimental chain of meanings, both in pieces directly linked to post-Saskatoon national events and, as we saw in the previous section, in unlinked media items.

Suggestions of causation gain some credence when we explore the role of an organization established just a year prior to the 2013 Vancouver event: a non-governmental organization, funded in significant measure by banking interests, energy companies, and governments, called Reconciliation Canada (2017b). The TRC partnered with Reconciliation Canada to organize and host the Vancouver event, perhaps in part because the commission was short of funds in the closing years of its mandate (Nagy 2014). Also important is that the TRC had a longstanding relationship with a key Reconciliation Canada (2017a) figure: the Vancouver-based Chief Robert Joseph, a hereditary chief of the Gwawaenuk First Nation and residential school survivor who was also a TRC honorary witness, a former Executive Director of the Indian Residential Schools Survivors Society, and one of the most important leaders in the residential schools mobilization prior to the TRC.
Reconciliation Canada organized a series of high-profile reconciliation-themed initiatives coinciding with the Vancouver National Event, including the proclamation of Reconciliation Week, the holding of a Reconciliation Walk, and the recruitment of messages of reconciliation from schoolchildren. The partnership was successful in generating extensive media coverage and impressive levels of public participation. For example, the Reconciliation Walk on the final day of the Vancouver event attracted an estimated 50,000 to 70,000 participants, despite rains that, even by Vancouver standards, counted as torrential. The media coverage also contributed to the displacement of substantive reconciliation, however; indeed, no substantive references were found in any of the items linked to the Vancouver event. Instead, primarily affective and attitudinal conceptions dominated, ones largely reflective of Reconciliation Canada’s (2017c) core commitment: “To learn and grow together through sharing our knowledge and experiences.”

At times, representatives from organizations linked to Reconciliation Canada seemed almost to speak as de facto opponents of substantive reconciliation. For example, executive Linda Morris, whose VanCity bank donated $500,000 to Reconciliation Canada, hoped that “reconciliation [was] moving [us] beyond thinking about the politics of things” (item 21.3), while an executive from the non-governmental organization Tides Canada, also a significant Reconciliation Canada donor, opined that “the call for reconciliation transcends issues of left and right” (item 21.7) Of course, the very fact that entities such as VanCity, the Suncor Energy Foundation, and the BC Ministry of Aboriginal Relations were funding Reconciliation Canada (2017b) suggested not that reconciliation was beyond politics, but rather that the organization’s primarily affective and hortatory approach to reconciliation made it an attractive candidate for their support. The corporate interest in reconciliation had been signalled at the Edmonton National Event by David Langtry, then acting chief commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission. Speaking as an honorary TRC witness, Langtry quoted the late Jim Prentice, a former federal Conservative cabinet minister and special adviser to Enbridge, the corporate proponent of the Northern Gateway project: “There will be no pipelines to the West Coast … unless we strike meaningful economic partnerships with First Nations” (item 22.5).

This trend of displacement was by no means a simple function of TRC events, which were diverse and complex happenings that featured numerous individual speakers and panels addressing reconciliation in substantive terms (Nagy and Gillespie 2015); neither did the TRC set out to displace substantive conceptions. Indeed, commissioners emphasized the importance of treaty relations at every TRC event I attended; however, none of the news items caught by the parameters for
this article’s search included statements from TRC commissioners referencing substantive conceptions, either. Given the basic biases and interests of the Canadian print media, corporations, and governments, countering the displacement processes charted in this article would have required a well co-ordinated and energetically executed strategy from the outset. The evidence presented in this article suggests that the commission did not successfully employ such a strategy.

Conclusion

Primarily affective conceptions of reconciliation were evident long before the advent of the TRC. As we have seen, they were promoted by the Canadian federal government in response to RCAP’s unwelcomely substantive conception; by the Christian churches in response to civil litigation from survivors; and by an increasingly wide array of voices in the years following the 2006 Settlement Agreement. By the time of Canada’s June 2008 apology, which occurred before the TRC’s public events began, reconciliation was already a Canadian keyword referring to harmonious relations achieved by a combination of survivor healing through truth-telling and settler knowledge acquisition through learning.

These affective and attitudinal glosses were not necessarily worthless, and still less were they inherently harmful. Most of the instances explored in this study were clear that the burden of the reconciliatory effort lay with the settler society. Sometimes they were used as bridges to more substantive conceptions emphasizing the return of land, jurisdiction, and resources. This bridging work is pervasive in the TRC (2015a) report.

But there are certainly dangers in equating reconciliation with listening and healing (Henderson and Wakeham 2009). Reducing the responsibilities of publics to listening can obscure the ethical need for them to understand and to act (Simon 2005). The presentation of healing as an outcome of sharing trauma narratives can lead to an emphasis on fixing the individuals harmed by colonialism rather than on addressing the continued Canadian sources of that harm (Million 2013), such as land dispossession, structural poverty, and overincarceration. At its worst, conjoining healing and learning as reconciliation may shrink the idea of historical justice to the bare act of providing atrocity survivors with the opportunity to speak.

A veritable academic industry (e.g., Hirsch 2011; Schaap 2008; Short 2012) has shown how unduly quiescent notions of reconciliation can be replaced, at least at the level of scholarly writing, with more ambitious and substantive conceptions. Although the evidence provided in this article suggests that such a result is considerably more
difficult to effect in practice, the TRC (2015b) report is an impressive contribution to the battle. It explains the residential schools system as part of a scheme of cultural genocide aimed at removing Indigenous peoples from their land; eradicating Indigenous cultures, languages, and governance systems; and evading Canadian treaty responsibilities. It responds to these injustices by insisting on a substantive conception of reconciliation (Regan forthcoming; TRC 2015a), one based on respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, upholding treaty rights, and recommitting to the nation-to-nation partnerships promised in Canada's first constitution, the Royal Proclamation of 1763. The report's reconciliatory vision (TRC 2015c, 6) demands that "we restore what must be restored, repair what must be repaired, and return what must be returned."

Because it departs from the approach to reconciliation that the TRC seemed to promote during the course of its public events, however, the report leaves Canadians with an important question to consider: How might the second vision of reconciliation be brought to at least co-ordinate status with the first? The obvious answer would be for the country to implement the report's 94 calls to action, as the present government at the time of writing has indeed promised to do; this would be substantive reconciliation in practice. 30

A slightly more fulsome answer would recognize that governments backtrack on promises, seemingly never more so than when Indigenous peoples are concerned; material struggle (Piven and Cloward 1977) is required, political will must constantly be reforged, and public opinion needs to be shaped and moved. We have seen already in this article that the federal government's 2008 residential schools apology played a significant role in promoting media discussions of reconciliation. Now that the TRC has established, officially, what residential schooling really involved, perhaps a new apology—one squarely addressing the cultural genocide finding and its implications for land, sovereignty, and resources—could play some role in moving Canada closer to a substantive understanding of what reconciliation might demand.
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1. For an important critique, see Million (2013).
2. For the mandate, see TRC (2006).
3. National events were held in Winnipeg, Manitoba; Inuvik, Northwest Territories; Halifax, Nova Scotia; Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Montreal, Quebec; Vancouver, British Columbia; and Edmonton, Alberta, respectively.
4. See Regan (forthcoming) for an indispensable guide to the commission’s treatment of reconciliation.
5. Aboriginal was chosen because it was the dominant referent in the mainstream Canadian media for Indigenous peoples during the time frame of this study.
6. At closing events held in Ottawa from 31 May to 3 June 2015, the TRC unveiled the final summary report and concluded ceremonially its mandate, but this was not a national event revolving around the reconciliatory practices addressed in this article; neither is it included in the TRC’s (2017) list of national events.
7. For a good discussion of media frame analysis in specific reference to Indigenous-settler relations, see McMahon and Chow-White (2011).
8. The Appendix to this article contains bibliographic information for each of the news items in the study and codes each item with a one-decimal point number: the first number refers to the category indicating the major event or prompt to which the item is linked, and the second number refers chronologically to the place of the item in the list corresponding to its category.
9. Three other items in this category made similar calls but came from parties other than churches.
10. Another group of items (four pieces appearing between 1999 and 2002, designated in the Appendix as category 4) also proposed reconciliation as a litigation alternative. Revolving around discussions of restorative justice for Aboriginal offenders, this group highlights the basic pre-TRC common sense of reconciliation as an extra-legal alternative to conflict and sanction.
11. Category 6 in the Appendix.
12. For Gosnell specifically, see item 6.2.
13. A further item, 6.11, quoted British Columbia’s then lieutenant-governor, the Sto:lo leader Steven Point, calling for “reconciliation … amongst all British Columbians.”
14. For Fontaine, see items 1.3, 7.11, 10.1, 10.11, and 12.4. The other Native voices were the Native bishop in item 2.4, Gordon Beardy, who preferred “work[ing] together with white people” over litigation, and Joseph Gosnell speaking in defence of the Nisga’a Agreement in item 6.2.
15. See the items in category 8.
16. See the items in category 10.
17. This is not to dismiss the apology.
18. One piece, item 11.7, did describe the commission as responsible for “encouraging reconciliation within Canadian society over [this] dark chapter in the country’s history.”
19. See the items in category 13. One item, 13.2, featured then Minister of Aboriginal Affairs John Duncan proclaiming Ottawa’s commitment “to fostering reconciliation between aboriginals and all Canadians.”
20. See the items in categories 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22.
21. These comprise categories 12, 15, and 16, respectively.
22. See category 19 for the Saskatoon event; see categories 20, 21, and 22, respectively, for the Montreal, Vancouver, and Edmonton events.
23. These items are grouped in category 7.
24. The unlinked items appearing prior to the Settlement Agreement are items 7.1 through 7.6, inclusive; the ones appearing after are items 7.7 through 7.29, inclusive.
25. A fourth item (7.24), about the Oppal inquiry into the notorious Robert Pickton mass murders, argued that reconciliation was being impeded by the inquiry’s poor treatment of Indigenous participants.
26. For example, the Vancouver event generated nine reconciliation stories that were caught in this search, while, by comparison, Edmonton generated seven, Montreal six, and Saskatoon two. See categories 21, 22, 20, and 19, respectively.
27. See item 21.8.
28. I attended the Halifax, Saskatoon, and Vancouver national events, the regional event in Victoria, BC, and the closing ceremonies in Ottawa.
29. This concern may explain why the tenor of references to reconciliation in Indigenous media during the life of the commission was predominantly critical (Borsa 2016).
30. For an excellent analysis of post-TRC reconciliation and the calls to action, see Green (2017).
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APPENDIX
News Items on Reconciliation and Indigenous Peoples in Canada, 1995–2014
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