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The creation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC-C) is just one of the many actions that the Canadian government has taken in an attempt to assist with healing the relationship between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people in Canada, in the wake of the Indian residential school system (IRS) and the legacy of contemporary injustices it has created. The TRC-C has the goals of creating a truthful historical record of events, as well as allowing survivors to begin healing—doing so through testimonies and story-telling by survivors. Though the TRC-C seems to have good intentions, its methods and results have been heavily criticized (Brady, 2013; Grey & James, 2016; Nagy, 2012; Reynaud, 2014; Stanton, 2011; Wakeham, 2012). Brady (2013) suggests that mediation of testimonies is thought to have “deeper implications”; those implications include an example of the colonial imperatives of the government. To shed light on such colonial imperatives, Nagy (2012) presents the idea of “settler denial”, which describes how governments are not taking responsibility for contemporary injustices experienced by victims and survivors, which are a result of historical abuses caused by the government. Grey and James (2016) build on Nagy’s idea of settler denial by introducing the concept of “double settler denial”, which is the idea that women experience “denial” twice: first, when the government denies responsibility for contemporary injustices, and second, when the government denies the fact that female experiences during colonization are different than experiences of males. Double settler denial can be seen within Canadian society, exemplified by the many contemporary injustices being faced by Aboriginal women and the minimal action being taken to rectify these injustices.

This presents a question: how effective has the TRC-C been in providing justice for women? Wakeham (2012) presents an interesting argument exploring the process of “reconciliation”, and
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how it is perhaps being used to favour the government and its colonial imperatives, rather than being used in favour of Aboriginal people to aid in their goals of healing and goals of justice. Stanton (2011) notes that in Canada “the government and the churches have acknowledged that abuses occurred and that the IRS system was harmful”, therefore, “the evidence that is presented to the [TRC-C] is not for the purposes of convincing the Commissioners that the abuses occurred” (p. 5), meaning that the truth as to whether or not survivor experiences occurred is not being questioned; thus, emphasis must be placed on the reconciliation aspect of the commission in order to resolve the IRS legacy and the injustices it has created. This paper will seek to understand the TRC-C and how it has possibly further entrenched systemic discrimination and settler denial into Canadian society and government. Along with that analysis, this paper will emphasize that the TRC-C must acknowledge settler denial and double settler denial, as well as acknowledge and fully understand the uniqueness of the female experience during colonization, in order to accomplish reconciliation and address contemporary systemic oppressions.

Women and the Indian Residential School System

To begin, this paper will provide historical information on the Indian Residential School system. In the 1870s, the IRS system was put into place, designed to “kill the Indian to save the man” (Stanton, 2011, p. 2), doing so through mandatory attendance, separating children from their families, and enforcing rules that excluded any practice of Aboriginal cultures (Nagy, 2012). Nagy (2012) continues this “snapshot” of history in Canada during colonization; she references the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), which is a commission established in 1992, designed to implement changes regarding injustices of Aboriginal people. RCAP’s final report describes how during colonization, “the Crown increasingly saw Indigenous peoples and
their way of life as obstacles to economic development” (Nagy, 2012, p. 353), which led to the implementation of the IRS as a method of assimilation, under the Indian Act of 1876. Nagy notes Regan’s (2010) view, which is that “government responsibilities of royal protection and fiduciary trust warped into the paternalistic regulation of Indigenous peoples” (Nagy, 2012, p. 353). Both genders experienced abuses; Nagy (2012) describes these: “many were housed in dilapidated buildings where they were underfed, underclothed, prone to disease, forced to labour, and subject to harsh discipline and neglect” (p. 353). However, girls and women had different experiences because of the shift from the matriarchy, with which they were familiar, to the Eurocentric patriarchy. The intent to assimilate women is alarmingly evident in a quotation from Isaac Baird from 1883, stating that “the girls will need the training more than the boys and they will wield a greater influence on the future. If we get the girls, we get the race” (Grey & James, 2016, p. 311). The focus on framing Aboriginal girls according to patriarchal assumptions caused an extreme shift in how Aboriginal girls were viewed by others, and how they were taught to view themselves. Miller (1996) is quoted through Grey and James (2016), explaining that “the schools practiced an obsessive segregation of the sexes which, coupled with an equally fanatical emphasis on sin, inculcated a damaging confusion about sexuality” (p. 312) and also that “Indigenous girls particularly had an ‘assumed lasciviousness’ that warranted increased surveillance and promoted ‘vicious insults about Native morality’” (p. 312). Grey and James also mention the idea of “sex as power” and of sexual coercion as “an expression of asymmetries of power between the genders” (p. 312), which is an element of assimilation that would have completely skewed the way Aboriginal women were and are viewed both by non-Aboriginal people and by those within their own communities. Grey and James (2016) refer to three types of discrimination within the IRS system: racism, sexism, and hypersexualism. Grey and James
explain that “[a]ll three overlapped in the schools, with Indigenous girls bearing the brunt of the horrifying violence that converged at the intersections” (p. 313). Because this sexual discrimination was intersectional, it was used as a powerful weapon in the processes of colonization and assimilation.

A. O. Harper (2006) explains how “the roles of Aboriginal women were vastly different from those of European women” (p. 34), emphasizing how shocking the shift to a patriarchy would have been to Aboriginal women. Harper continues, explaining that in their traditional societies, “Aboriginal women…headed the family line, exerted a great deal of power…and were a vital part of consensus decision-making” (p. 34), and the Indian Act effectively removed those political powers held by Aboriginal women. Grey and James (2016) note that traditionally, in women’s function “as leaders, teachers and mentors, they pass knowledge, norms, experiences, and skills to the upcoming generations” (p. 313) which emphasizes the traditional matriarchy within Aboriginal communities. On the other hand, European society treated women “as property—in their early lives, their father’s property, and later when they married, the property of their husbands” (Harper, 2006, p. 34), which again emphasizes the difference in how Aboriginal women were viewed and treated under colonialism. The implementation of the IRS as well as the legacy it has created, has structures that “disproportionately curb women’s healing strategies, coping responses, and overall resiliency” (Grey & James, 2016, p. 313).

**Raising Awareness**

To provide context, this paper will give a brief account of events and movements leading up to the creation of the TRC-C.
In 1990, Chief Phil Fontaine made his IRS experience public, which “open[ed] the door for other survivors to begin sharing their experiences” (Stanton, 2011, p. 2). RCAP was then established in 1991, and over the course of 178 days, survivors gave their testimonies in public hearings which brought even more attention to the IRS and its legacy (Stanton, 2011). The last residential school closed in 1996, and in the same year RCAP called for public inquiry into the IRS, but one was not initiated (Stanton, 2011; Nagy, 2012). Instead, the federal government “made what it called a Statement of Reconciliation” (Stanton, 2011, p. 2; see also Nagy, 2012; Wakeham, 2012).

Stanton explains that this statement was rejected by the Native Women’s Association of Canada (NWAC), as well as the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, because the statement seemed not to be an apology and was incomplete. Stanton notes that “the word ‘apology’ did not appear in the statement” (p. 2-3), and Nagy claims that the statement “apologized for the physical and sexual abuse, but not for the IRS system as a whole” (p. 354). The Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) was established in 2003 and was designed to humanize the process of reconciliation, but in 2004 the ADR was “criticized by the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) for its dehumanizing nature and its failure to recognize forced labour, emotional loss, loss of family life and loss of culture and language” (Nagy, 2012, p. 355). In 2007, the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) was established, which “provides for compensation, commemoration, and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission” (Nagy, 2012, p. 355).
The TRC-C and its Detractors

Stanton (2011) gives insight into how the TRC-C was called to action, and why the motivation behind its implementation causes it to be problematic. Stanton explains how “it is only in the last few years that the government has acknowledged that its assimilation policy was harmful” (p. 1) and that the government “has done so only in response to overwhelming legal pressure” (p. 1). Throughout her article, Stanton goes into depth about the legal action taken previous to the IRSSA, explaining how the Assembly of First Nations reached consensus in its 2004 report, “which called for a lump sum reparations payment, additional compensation for specific abuses, expedited payments for the sick and elderly, and a truth-sharing and reconciliation process” (p. 3). By the time the IRSSA became effective in 2007, 14,903 IRS survivors had filed claims against the government and 2,805 of those claims had been resolved, resulting in damage awards of around $110 million (Stanton, 2011). Stanton points out that the TRC-C “is distinctive in that it is the only truth commission to be created out of litigation”(p. 4) and her claim is that “were it not for the enormous financial cost to the government of continuing to defend against class actions, the [TRC-C] would not exist in Canada” (p. 4).

Stanton (2011) explains that the TRC-C “is like other truth and reconciliation commissions in that it is an official, temporary, non-judicial fact-finding body” (p. 4). The goals of the TRC-C, listed within its mandate, are to acknowledge Residential School experiences, impacts and consequences, to provide a safe setting for survivors to come forward, to promote awareness to the public, and to create an accurate and complete historical record of the IRS system and legacy (TRC, Schedule “N”, 2007). Though these goals seem appropriate and with good intentions, the TRC-C itself, its methods, and its results, have been analyzed and criticized (Brady, 2013; Grey
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& James, 2016; Nagy, 2012; Reynaud, 2014; Stanton, 2011; Wakeham, 2012). Discussed in this paper are examples of settler denial and double settler denial, and their implications for Aboriginal people and their goals of seeking justice and healing.

**Double Settler Denial in Canada**

The fact that the TRC-C "was created out of litigations (Stanton, 2011) emphasizes how the government is in a state of “settler denial” (Nagy, 2012), and how the government is acting in its own interest rather than truly understanding the past and present experiences of Aboriginal people in Canada and acting to assist Aboriginal people and communities. “Settler denial”, a term coined by Nagy (2012), is an idea that describes the way in which the government does not take responsibility for contemporary injustices that are a result of the society being built upon the colonization of others. As Nagy (2012) explains, settler denial can lead governments to "appropriate survivors’ pain in voyeuristic and colonizing ways" (p. 351), and she notes Regan’s observation that, while doing so, they overlook the responsibility of colonizers "to address the inequities and injustices from which they have profited" (as cited in Nagy, 2012, p. 351).

Wakeham (2012) shares Kamboureli’s idea of “sedative politics” which are politics that "attempt to recognize ethnic differences, but only in a contained fashion in order to quell minority dissent and maintain ‘the conventional articulation of the dominant Canadian society’, including its economic, cultural, and political capital” (p. 213). This idea of sedative politics is similar to the idea of settler denial; the former could be considered a result of the latter, and its definition helps to further the understanding of settler denial.
A. O. Harper (2006) states that for Aboriginal people in Canada, “the disparity in health, educational attainment, accumulation of wealth, life expectancy and standard of living is a noticeably wide gap in comparison with the life experiences of most Canadians” (p. 33) and that “Aboriginal women, in particular, suffer from inequality of status compared to both Aboriginal men and, especially, their non-Aboriginal counterparts” (p. 33). Harper further explains this situation, stating that “Aboriginal women in Canada are subject to high rates of violence in all forms” and that “racialized violence targeting Aboriginal women is especially disturbing because these experiences are passed on intergenerationally” (p. 33). Grey and James (2016) add that “[s]ystemic and structural discrimination puts Indigenous women at a greater risk for the many profound impacts all residential school survivors navigate” (p. 313). Grey and James describe this “system and structural discrimination”, when it applies to Aboriginal women, as “double settler denial”. Double settler denial builds on Nagy’s idea of settler denial, the addition being that double settler denial states that Aboriginal women experience denial due to both their race and gender. Though the phrase “double settler denial” had not yet been defined in 2006 when Harper wrote her article, she still explains its criteria: “Aboriginal people…are both discriminated against and suffer the consequences of racism… [but] because of the patriarchy of Canadian society, Aboriginal women are subject to even more inequality than Aboriginal men” (p. 34).

Double settler denial can be seen within the TRC-C, both within its mandate and its interim report (Grey & James, 2016, pp. 314-315). Grey and James (2016) reveal that the mandate “[c]ontain[s] no mention of ‘gender,’ ‘girl(s),’ ‘mother(s),’ ‘female,’ or ‘women,’” (p. 314), meaning that the TRC-C “universalized and flattened the Indigenous experience of residential
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schools” (p. 314). Grey and James also point out that “like the mandate, the TRC-C’s 40-page interim report also made no mention of gender” (p. 315) and that an “accompanying 124-page report…referenced women only in discussing staff at the schools, gender not at all, and girls appeared only as a gendered pronoun” (p. 315). Therefore, the TRC-C “failed to include the experiences of Indigenous women and girls as women and girls” (Grey & James, p. 315) which is an example of the denial of the unique female experience in the IRS system and its legacy. Ironically, while documents from RCAP and AFN—movements that sparked the TRC-C—“were deeply and thoughtfully gendered” (Grey & James, p. 316), both RCAP’s final report and the AFN’s critique of the IRS dispute resolution mechanism were ignored by the TRC-C, and its “governmental blindness…rings hypocritical in light of its own inattention to the gender issues highlighted by RCAP” (Grey & James, p. 316). Double settler denial can also be seen within Canadian society. Grey and James (2016) incorporate results from a 2014 Angus-Reid poll, which shows that “73% of Canadians voted in favour of a national inquiry into the issue of violence against Indigenous women and 81% described it as the most important Indigenous issue today—while the same poll showed that 87% of Canadians claimed ‘it’s time for the aboriginal community itself to assume more responsibility for their people’s well-being’” (p. 317). This poll implies that “[Aboriginal] women are both present in and absent from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada” (Grey & James, 2016, p. 317) as well as in the minds of Canadians.

Also ironic is that programs that aimed to assist Aboriginal communities were defunded during the TRC-C. Grey and James (2016) note statistics that state that “[a]lmost half of Canadians surveyed felt that counseling offered the greatest potential contribution to reconciliation between
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settlers and indigenous peoples” (p. 317). However, funding cuts were made to the Aboriginal Healing Foundation, Sisters in Spirit (SiS), and NWAC’s plan for working between Indigenous communities and police (Grey & James, 2016). SiS, as Grey and James explain, “is what drove the issue of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls into the public eye and onto the policy agenda in Canada” (p. 318), despite the existing double settler denial. NWAC’s plan for working between Indigenous communities and police was swapped for a $4.65 million government plan for violence prevention programs on Indigenous reserves, where SiS found that only 7% of Indigenous women went missing and where just 13% were murdered (Grey & James, 2016), meaning that the government blatantly ignored, or 'denied', these stats when making their cuts. Grey and James note this settler denial, stating that, “[i]n light of near-simultaneous governmental admission that this issue is understudied, defunding amounts to an official endorsement of a lethal status quo for Indigenous women in Canada” (p. 318). Another ironic and blatant example of double settler denial is that former Prime Minister Stephen Harper gave a formal apology in 2008 for the IRS system, but in 2014 stated that an official inquiry into missing and murdered and Indigenous women and girls was not high on his government’s “radar” (Grey & James, 2016, p. 318), meaning that the government has been denying the connection between the IRS system and how its legacy has led to such high amounts of violence and discrimination being directed at Aboriginal women.

Can Reconciliation Occur?

Settler denial and double settler denial continue in contemporary society as political actions such as the TRC-C place experiences of colonization and injustice in the past, by using phrases such as “close the book” or “turn the page”. Grey and James (2016) explain that “Canadians prefer to
view residential schools as a phenomenon discontinuous with colonialism as a structure, so that the violence of the former is ‘extraordinary,’ acute, and extrinsic to the ‘ordinary’ violence of the latter” (p. 317), and that the idea of “‘[t]urning the page’ is not only unjust in the sense of erasing the gendered history of colonialism and obscuring continuities in the colonial relationship, it is also profoundly unethical in its implicit invitation for…Indigenous women to join an indefensible status quo and a mainstream that pursues and permits their being harmed” (p. 323), which shows how Canada is guilty of double settler denial. The problem with phrases similar to “close the book” or “turn the page” is that they allude to a mentality that assumes injustices experienced by Aboriginal people involving racism, sexism, and contemporary colonial imperatives, no longer exist. Nagy (2012) explains that “drawing a line on the past denies continuities of violence and, in turn, colludes with understandings of reconciliation that seek to maintain the status quo” (p. 360).

Wakeham (2012) mentions James’s idea that the federal government views reconciliation through a “narrow heritage approach” which “focuses upon funding for commemorating past grievances with plaques, designated heritage sites, and museums, thereby emphasizing these grievances as ‘history’” (p. 219). Wakeham continues, stating that “the state’s program for reconciliation is framed as reparations for the past, meant to memorialize so-called historical injustices, precisely as ‘history,’ thereby foreclosing debate about ongoing injustices in the national present and future” (p. 222). “Closing the book” and “foreclosing debate” on historical injustices, causes the present society to 'deny' contemporary injustices of the same oppressive nature as colonialism in history; therefore, reconciliation cannot occur between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people. This point is emphasized by Nagy, who states that “[t]his
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isolationist approach to truth facilitates understandings of reconciliation as closure on the past despite the fact that…colonial violence [is] not just [a] memor[y] from the past but also part of ongoing, lived relationships” (p. 350).

When beginning my research into the TRC-C itself, I was of the opinion that the government was doing a “good job” at “righting its wrongs,” perhaps, because the public school system—the Alberta curriculum in particular—teaches students that the IRS was “bad” and that it caused harm to Aboriginal people. But, after reading the ideas of authors cited in this paper, I am able to say that the mentality embedded within the Alberta curriculum is my personal experience of another example of attempting to “close the book”—another example of both settler denial and double settler denial—as students are not educated on the depth of the abuses endured nor the extent to which resulting injustices still occur in present society. Because I was not even aware of current injustices, I had not put a thought to the relationship between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people needing reconciliation of any kind.

Stanton (2011) explains that other truth commissions are a result of a regime change or to end conflict, but because the TRC-C is a result of litigation, its implementation was not instigated by the government nor the general public. This is a problem because if the government and the general public are in denial of present-day injustices, these injustices cannot be properly reconciled (Stanton, 2011; Wakeham, 2012; Nagy, 2012; Quinn, 2011). Nagy explains reconciliation as a process “that involves not only a recognition of historic benefit and privilege but also concrete measures to rectify wrongs and to achieve equilibrium in current relations of power” (Nagy, 2012, p. 351).
Not achieving true reconciliation is a result of settler denial. This is emphasized in Quinn’s (2011) essay when she explains how Stanton points out that “the dominant community was never consulted” (Quinn, 2011, p. 3; Stanton, 2011), meaning that stories shared through the TRC-C—their being shared having a goal of reconciliation—“are simply not reaching the dominant community” (Quinn, 2011, p. 3). This means that Canadians will have to “take ownership of a process that they did not instigate” (Stanton, 2011, p. 4), which puts reconciliation in question—a point made by Quinn when she quotes Czyzewski: “if Indigenous peoples are opening up and sharing painful stories to inactive ears, or not being heard at all, who is doing the transforming?” (Quinn, 2011, p. 3). Nagy builds on this, stating that “the refusal to respond adequately, itself a form of structural violence, mutually reinforces settler denial and the narrow notion that residential schools were an unfortunate exception on an otherwise unblemished record” (Nagy, 2012, p. 361).

In a conversation with a peer, I found that their opinion on contemporary injustices regarding Aboriginal people in Canada is that Aboriginal people need to take action themselves, rather than “continue to take advantage” of what resources the Canadian government has already provided, an opinion that rings true to the statistics from the Angus-Reid poll shared by Grey and James (2016). I share this opinion not to attack my peer nor to offend Aboriginal people, but to emphasize how the non-Aboriginal population in Canada is ignorant to the legal action taken by Aboriginal people since the 1990s, as well as to the contemporary injustices suffered. I feel compelled to explain how this point of view is a perfect example of how settler denial is prevalent within society.
**Proposed Solutions**

Nagy mentions Regan’s argument “to consider residential schools as a *settler* problem and not an ‘Indian problem’” (Nagy, 2012, p. 351) in order to combat settler denial. Further, Grey and James state that “[a]ttention should have been paid to gendered structural inequalities and injustices stemming from…residential schools, revealed through survivor and intergenerational testimony” (p. 324), because without recognition of the connection between colonialism in history and contemporary injustices involving racism and sexism, the opportunity to “destabilize double settler denial” is foreclosed (Grey & James, 2016, p. 321).

In order to make the process of reconciliation more inclusive and just, Wakeham (2012) suggests that “a reckoning with the histories and presents of racist oppression and colonization calls for an effort to think beyond the hegemony of Eurocentric philosophical and political ideals” (p. 232), meaning that methods for reconciliation need to be created outside of the Eurocentric point of view. Wakeham suggests “trans-cultural forms of social justice and redress” (p. 232) that will “challenge Eurocentric epistemologies and work beyond their boundaries” (p. 232). She warns of “attempts by the state to co-opt trans-culturalism into its own hegemonic program of apology in ways that reinvigorate Eurocentric logics with the occasional ‘exotic’ Aboriginal garnish” (p. 232), and this paper is in agreement with this point, as well as Wakeham’s suggestion of re-thinking reconciliation. However, this paper questions how a trans-cultural system of government could be achieved without conflict; Wakeham does note that it “is nothing less than a profoundly challenging task” (p. 232), and extreme concern should be placed on how the
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present Eurocentric government system could make such a shift without appropriating Aboriginal cultures by means of “exotic garnishes”.

Emphasis must also be placed on the fact that the matriarchal dynamic within Aboriginal communities has been altered due to colonialism (Grey & James, 2016). Because Aboriginal communities have been influenced by Canada’s patriarchy, this paper expresses concern that a shift to the traditional matriarchy of Aboriginal cultures may be difficult as the norms within Aboriginal communities have changed. This is problematic because if a patriarchy remains within a trans-cultural form of government, Aboriginal women may no longer be victims of racism, but will still be victims of sexism. In the case that a shift to a matriarchy were to be made, the issue of “white feminism” must also be addressed (Ruparelia, 2014). White feminism results from White feminists denying that forms of oppression other than sexism, such as racism, have compounding effects on women. Ruparelia explains that there is a “need to complicate feminist understandings of gender oppression through an intersectional analysis” (p. 85), and that the oppressions of racialized women “cannot be divided into neat categories; rather, sexism and racism are inextricably linked” (p. 85). These unique experiences of oppression must be recognized and addressed, rather than oppressed once more by a narrow view on what constitutes “feminism” and being “feminist”.

In consideration of Wakeham’s proposal of a “trans-cultural” form of government, this paper expresses concern over the fact that Aboriginal cultures could be appropriated, thereby leaving settler denial intact. Also a concern is that, even with a shift to a matriarchy, white feminism may leave Aboriginal women in roughly the same oppressed position that they are currently in.
HAS THE TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION OF CANADA BEEN EFFECTIVE

However, the idea of a “trans-cultural” system and/or the idea of a matriarchy-patriarchy hybrid system, are compelling ideas that require more thought and research. A government system that could incorporate such ideas could be a breakthrough in terms of dismantling contemporary social issues such as racism and sexism.

Conclusion

Nagy quotes Huyse (2003) in stating that “peaceful coexistence, trust and empathy do not develop in a sustainable way if structural injustices in the political, legal and economic domains remain” (p. 351). After examining the criticism of and responses to the TRC-C, this paper agrees with this statement. As the examples brought forward in this paper have shown, settler denial and double settler denial have proven to be prevalent in present Canadian government and society (Nagy, 2012; Grey & James, 2016). Contemporary injustices within Canadian society are a continuity of colonialism, and if this relationship is “denied”, reconciliation cannot occur in a sustainable way. The TRC-C was implemented in order to address the legacy of injustices that colonialism and the IRS has left, but its methods and results are examples of settler denial and double settler denial. First, the fact that the implementation of the TRC-C is a result of litigation rather than a sort of societal or regime change, is settler denial because the government is denying responsibility for the IRS legacy. Second, the apparent attempt of the TRC-C to avoid the mention or recognition of a gendered experience during colonization is double settler denial. A third example of settler denial and double settler denial is the government defunding of organizations meant to assist Aboriginal people—ironically, defunding seemed to target women’s groups in particular. This defunding occurred during the TRC-C, which is a body that claims to be advocating for Aboriginal people seeking justice and reconciliation. These cases of
denial, make the option for true and sustainable reconciliation non-existent. The TRC-C was not enough to achieve reconciliation. Wakeham (2012)—promoting the idea that reconciliation cannot occur without a certain amount of systemic change—suggests that Aboriginal governmental practices should be adopted into Canadian governmental principles. Though this paper agrees with the fundamental aspect of the idea, it is a task that will have to be given much effort and thought in order to be implemented properly—and, first, settler denial must be overcome.
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