Self-Determination in mine site transitions and mine closure governance across Indigenous nations

Sarah Holcombe [a 1]

Rebecca Hall [b]

Arn Keeling [c]

[a] University of Queensland, Australia

[b] Queen's University, Canada

[c] Memorial University, Canada

Abstract

This introductory article provides a synthesises of and a conceptual framing for, the five contributing articles in the special Section "Self-determination in mine closure and mine site transition across nations". These articles explore the intersections of mineral extraction, environmental legacies, and Indigenous post-mining futures in the context of mine site transitions. The articles provide a series of Indigenous-authored and collaborative contributions offering a deeper exploration of community perspectives, engagements and governance practices at extractive sites in Australia and Canada. Written from diverse ecological, social and political contexts, taken together the articles elevate Indigenous voices and experiences in mine closure governance. This addresses the significant gap in the literature on the social aspects of mine closure, which is particularly glaring in relation to Indigenous peoples' rights and interests. The mines that are the focus of consideration in this Special Section cover various commodities including gold, diamonds, nickel, zinc, lead, silver and copper. Many of them were, and in some cases still are, long-lived mines. Though they all have particular histories and contexts, all the Indigenous commentators reflect on mining as an expression of the continuity of settler colonialism and environmental injustice.

Key words: Indigenous peoples, mining, mine closure, reclamation, environmental justice, reconciliation

Résumé

Cet article introductif présente une synthèse et un cadre conceptuel pour les cinq articles de la section spéciale "Autodétermination dans la fermeture des mines et la transition des sites miniers à travers les nations". Ces articles explorent les intersections entre l'extraction minière, les dommages environnementaux et l'avenir des peuples autochtones après la fin de l'exploitation minière dans le contexte de la transition des sites miniers. Les articles présentent une série de contributions collaboratives et écrites par des auteurs autochtones, offrant une exploration plus approfondie des perspectives, des intéractions et des pratiques de gouvernance des communautés sur les sites d'extraction en Australie et au Canada. Rédigés dans des contextes écologiques, sociaux et politiques différents, ces articles mettent en valeur les voix et les expériences autochtones en matière de gouvernance des fermetures de mines. Ils comblent ainsi une lacune importante dans la littérature sur les aspects sociaux de la fermeture des mines, particulièrement flagrante en ce qui concerne les droits et les intérêts des peuples autochtones. Les mines qui font l'objet de cette section spéciale couvrent diverses matières de base, notamment l'or, les diamants, le nickel, le zinc, le plomb, l'argent et le cuivre. Nombre d'entre elles étaient, et

---

[1] Dr Sarah Holcombe is a Principal Research Fellow, University of Queensland, Australia. Email: s.holcombe@uq.edu.au. Dr Rebecca Hall is Associate Professor at Queens University, Canada. Email: Rh116@queensu.ca. Arn Keeling is Professor of Geography at Memorial University Newfoundland, Canada. Email: akeeling@mun.ca. Acknowledgements: Funding is acknowledged from a five-year initiative on community consultation and consent supported by the BHP Foundation and implemented by Landesa in partnership with RESOLVE, Conservation International and the University of Queensland. Thanks also to Simon Batterbury for his detailed editorial eye for this article and all of those in the Special Section. In Sarah Holcombe, Arn Keeling & Rebecca Hall (eds.). 2025. Special Section on "Self-determination in mine closure and mine site transition across nations." *Journal of Political Ecology*, 32.

dans certains cas sont encore, des opérations de longue durée. Bien qu'elles aient toutes des histoires et des contextes particuliers, tous les commentateurs autochtones considèrent l'exploitation minière comme une expression de la continuité du colonialisme et de l'injustice environnementale.

Mots clés: Peuples autochtones, exploitation minière, fermeture de mines, remise en état, justice environnementale, réconciliation

Resumen

Este artículo introductorio ofrece una síntesis y un marco conceptual de los cinco artículos de la sección especial «La autodeterminación en el cierre de minas y la transición de los emplazamientos mineros entre naciones». Estos artículos exploran las intersecciones entre la extracción de minerales, los legados medioambientales y el futuro indígena posterior a la minería en el contexto de la transición de los emplazamientos mineros. Los artículos ofrecen una serie de contribuciones de colaboración y de autoría indígena que proporcionan una exploración más profunda de las perspectivas de la comunidad, el relacionamiento y las prácticas de gobernanza en los sitios extractivos en Australia y Canadá. Escritos desde diversos contextos ecológicos, sociales y políticos, en conjunto los artículos elevan las voces y experiencias indígenas en la gobernanza del cierre de minas. Con ello se aborda la significativa brecha existente en la bibliografía sobre los aspectos sociales del cierre de minas, que es particularmente evidente en relación con los derechos e intereses de los pueblos indígenas. Las minas que son objeto de estudio en esta Sección Especial abarcan diversas materias primas, como oro, diamantes, níquel, zinc, plomo, plata y cobre. Muchas de ellas eran, y en algunos casos siguen siendo, minas de larga vida. Aunque todas tienen historias y contextos particulares, todos los comentaristas indígenas reflexionan sobre la minería como expresión de la continuidad del colonialismo de los colonos y de la injusticia medioambiental.

Palabras clave: Pueblos indígenas, minería, cierre de minas, recuperación, justicia medioambiental, reconciliación

1. Introduction

> The mining companies call it closure but I don't think our people would call it closure at all. We would still see what is left behind, the changes to the landscape and the people, and years of monitoring to continue. So I wouldn't call it closure, it would be the beginning of something, maybe it's our time to rejuvenate... (Grace Mackenzie in Holcombe *et al*. 2022, 48)

This Special Section of the *Journal of Political Ecology* ("Self-determination in mine closure and mine site transition across nations", edited by the authors, see vol. 32 of the journal online) explores the intersections of mineral extraction, environmental legacies, and Indigenous post-mining futures in the context of mine site transitions. In many jurisdictions around the world, mining and extractive industries are closely associated with environmental degradation, injustice, and colonial dispossession (Horowitz *et al*., 2024, Kirsch, 2014). Less frequently considered in the scholarship on mining and injustice are the impacts of mine closure and mining's long-term social and environmental legacies (Keeling & Sandlos, 2009). Mine closure and remediation is often the longest and most complex phase of the mining cycle, yet it receives the least attention during project assessment and approval (Bainton & Holcombe, 2018). The long-term, even perpetual, nature of post-mining impacts is a major socio-ecological challenge and contributes to cumulative impacts in extractive regions, particularly for local and Indigenous communities whose lands host large-scale mining, but who are often excluded or marginalized in discussions of mine closure and remediation (Beckett & Keeling, 2019).

This Special Section brings together a series of Indigenous-authored and collaborative articles offering a deeper exploration of community perspectives, engagements and governance practices at extractive sites in Australia and Canada.[2] Written from diverse ecological, social and political contexts, taken together the articles elevate Indigenous voices and experiences in mine closure governance. This addresses the significant gap in

[2] We use the term "Indigenous" in this article to include Aboriginal Australians, and Inuit and First Nations in Canada.

the literature on the social aspects of mine closure, which is particularly glaring in relation to Indigenous peoples' rights and interests (Bainton & Holcombe, 2018; O'Faircheallaigh & Lawrence, 2019). The importance of community engagement and strong working partnerships during operations and inevitable mine closure cannot be overstated, a point that is continually reinforced across the literature (Monosky & Keeling, 2021b).

The mines that are the focus of consideration in this Special Section cover various commodities including gold, diamonds, nickel, zinc, lead, silver and copper. Many of them were, and in some cases still are, long-lived mines. Though they all have particular histories and contexts, all the Indigenous commentators reflect on mining as an expression of the continuity of settler colonialism and environmental injustice. With the exception of one mine, free prior and informed consent (FPIC) was not provided by the customary landowners for these industrial scale mines. In the Northern Canadian context, for instance, European settlement was closely tied to extractive ventures. In the Northwest Territories, diamond mining follows a long line of extractive activities, which are, themselves, part of a larger process of settler imposition, with dramatic impacts on Indigenous lands and livelihoods. As a result, the contributors tend not to speak about mines as discrete developments, but as connected with broader processes of settler colonial dispossession. In both Canada and Australia, the settler state favoured exploitation of mineral resources, embodied in the principle of 'free entry', introduced to European colonies by the settlers. The free entry principle endows mining companies with the rights to gain unrestricted access to territory with mining potential, to acquire a claim to this territory (St-Laurent & Le Billon 2015).

Indigenous communities take a long view of mining and associated infrastructure as part of the cumulative impacts of settler invasion on their lands. A subset of this ongoing colonialism is the disregard for the pre-existing values and meanings, tangible and intangible, that the land holds for Indigenous peoples. This is exemplified by the still-active memories of community displacement and the destruction of places or sites of significance by the construction of the mine and the development of associated infrastructure (such as roads, railways, and towns). Thus, for Indigenous communities, mine closure and environmental remediation raise questions around cultural reclamation and reparative justice.

This long view also shapes discussions of mine remediation as a relational process of mitigation and healing, not as a discrete event or "impact" (Beckett & Keeling 2019). As a result, reclamation of mine sites has very different meanings for the Indigenous landowners than it does for industry. As Yaqui legal scholar Rebecca Tsosie argues, an Indigenous ethics of environmental remediation includes reparation, rooted in "a discussion of how the past, present, and future are co-joined and interdependent" (Tsosie 2015, 253). Beyond the technical environmental challenges of cleaning up former mine sites, new sorts of issues emerge for Indigenous peoples who remain attached to the land, and who hold customary obligations and responsibilities toward reclaiming and healing the land that will long outlive mining developments (Cohen 2017). These commitments articulate relational responsibilities (Coulthard & Simpson 2016) and caring commitments (Bauhardt & Harcourt 2018) that, grounded in Indigenous ontologies, deepen, expand and reshape the parameters of mine closure. Yet Indigenous engagement and participation in mine closure planning is typically limited, and often not explicitly required by state regulation around reclamation requirements (Alonzo *et al*. 2024; Monosky & Keeling 2021a). As such, closure planning and remediation may reproduce the experiences of marginalization from resource governance that characterized the establishment of mining itself.

Increasingly, Indigenous communities and governments are challenging this state of affairs, demanding meaningful consultation in closure and reclamation planning. Through negotiated agreements with companies and pressure on regulators, Indigenous priorities and values related to post-mining restoration and land use are gaining recognition—though not without struggle (Cohen 2017; Hall & Ascough 2023). This resurgence and advocacy is, in many ways, what inspired the research collaborations and dialogues at the heart of this Special Section, exploring Indigenous perspectives on mine closure and transitions. In what follows, we detail the methods and ethical commitments that shaped the collaborations underpinning this Special Section. We then turn to emergent themes weaving through the contributions. These are: the politics of time/temporality; repair, reclamation and reconciliation; negotiated agreements and consent; and socio-economic transitions.

2. Our methods of partnership and collaboration

This Special Section is the result of several years' research collaboration within and between mining-affected communities. The editors and authors of the Special Section first came together in 2021; our meetings were necessarily virtual, as we were gathering in the middle of a pandemic from communities in Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada. Recognizing a need to promote direct dialogue and exchange between Indigenous communities with experiences of mine closure, for seven months, university and community researchers/leaders met in order to develop an agenda and collaborative intent for a virtual meeting. Led by Holcombe and Vanessa Elliott from Australia, the group included three researchers from Canada (including Keeling and Hall) and five from Aotearoa. Collectively, we developed the objectives of the Forum, which were:

- To provide an independent and culturally safe space to facilitate the connection between First Nations peoples, whose customary lands have been impacted by mining
- To position First Nations voices individually and collectively in a shared learning journey full of experiences and lessons learned through online network exchange
- To facilitate knowledge exchange and elevate the connectivity between Canadian, Australian, and Aotearoa/New Zealand First Nations regarding impacts, issues, and innovative ideas and practices in response to mine site transitions and mine closure (Holcombe *et al*. 2022).

The event itself, *The Indigenous exchange forum: Transitions in mine closure*, while hosted in Australia, took place virtually over two days in November 2021, bringing together more than 40 participants—even with the challenges of gathering across multiple countries and time zones. While not all participants were involved in this Special Section, their voices and stories have informed and enriched our thinking, and we acknowledge their teachings here, with gratitude. The Forum included Māori researchers from the University of Waikato led by Mere Berryman, and community members from multiple Māori *iwi* (customary land-holding family groups) from Aotearoa/ New Zealand, who have rights and interests over two OceanaGold mines: Macraes mine (South Island), and Waihi mine (North Island); a Gija Traditional Owner (Dowell) in relation to the Argyle diamond mine (Kimberley region of Western Australia), and Waanyi Traditional Owners, in relation to the Century lead, zinc, and silver mine (Gulf of Carpentaria, QLD, Australia); and from Canada, representatives from Inuit communities, in relation to the Raglan nickel mine (Nunavik, Northern Quebec), the Ross River Dena, in relation to the legacy Faro lead-zinc mine (Yukon), and the Tłı̨chǫ First Nation, in relation to the Diavik, Ekati, and Gahcho Kue diamond mines (Northwest Territories).

Led by an Indigenous facilitator (Elliott), the Forum was based on an ethics of care and reciprocity for which we developed a cultural safety protocol.[3] The philosophy underpinning the Protocol was informed by our monthly online gatherings and learnings leading up to the two-day Forum. The cultural parameters that we needed to establish for the Forum evolved as the exchanges developed over the year prior. Emerging out of our two days together, participants named the need for ongoing knowledge sharing. So often, Indigenous communities face the socio-ecological impacts of mining *as isolated groups*, negotiating bilaterally with mining companies, while communities near and far do the same, sometimes with the very same company.

[3] The Protocol is as follows: To ensure that the Forum is a decolonising experience, we will not engage in haste or reduce the process to an outcome. The process of coming together and being mindful of what each individual brings to the moment, is itself an important outcome. Though our synchronous sharing may be limited due to the time zones – we will ensure that the integrity of the sharing that occurs is not diminished by the strictures of timing or format. We will ensure that each participant comes away from the Forum not only wiser from sharing experience and expertise, but also empowered from enabling the truth of Indigenous methodologies. We each have a responsibility to the knowledge holders who have shared their knowledge with us as we "Walk backwards to the future with our eyes on the past" (Māori expression) (Holcombe, *et al*. 2022).

Participants saw the need for—and, indeed, the power in—articulating shared mining experiences and Indigenous visions for mine site transitions and closure.

The exchanges during the Forum sowed the seeds for this Special Section. In developing it, we were guided, first, by a commitment to a foundation of respect for Indigenous knowledges, perspectives and experiences of mine site transitions and mine closure. All of the articles in this issue feature Indigenous authors and participants, and they are driven by their communities' experiences of mining and mine closure. In some cases, these authors were supported by non-Indigenous, university-based researchers, including the editors of the Special Section. The method of authorial collaboration includes curation (wherein the affiliated researcher recorded interviews as basis for the article manuscript), as well as collaborative reflection, analysis and writing (for other examples of this mode of authorship, see, for example, Scottie *et al*. 2022 and Zoe, Simpson & King 2019).

The role of the academics in this process is as facilitators or enablers in a decolonial method that de-centres the academic as the so-called site of 'expertise.' The intent here is not to 'disappear' the non-Indigenous academics into an erroneously omniscient neutrality, but rather to produce knowledge relationally, through our unique social locations and through the lessons learned and shared across communities and First Nations. This methodology is informed by Indigenous scholarship that challenges the colonial division between First Nation story and (academic) theory by acknowledging and honouring story *as* theory (Tuck & McKenzie 2014; Starblanket & Kiiwetineipinesiik Stark 2018). Further, the approach has a strong foundation of reciprocity and mutual trust.

In putting together both the Forum and this Special Section, we write through the ongoing structures of colonial dispossession and the particular violence of their articulation at extractive sites (Jobin 2023; Hall 2022; Coulthard 2014; Laboucan-Massimo 2014). However, in centring Indigenous agency and voice in mine site transitions and closure, we also aim to write against the academic and non-Indigenous tendencies to reproduce damage-centred narratives (Tuck 2009). As the Forum participants reflected, mine closure, in some ways, reproduces the same power relations of mine operations (see Dowell & Holcombe 2025; Tu Łidlini Dena Elders, Tufts & Beckett 2025; Zoe, Hall & Lim 2025); but, as a stage of mine operations, it is qualitatively distinct. As Grace Mackenzie, Mine Liaison Coordinator for the Tlicho Government, said at the Forum, "mine closure offers possibilities of rejuvenation." The possibilities of repair for relationships with land and between people inform the orientation of this Special Section (Hall & Ascough 2023, Joly 2021, Beckett & Keeling 2019). These possibilities – or openings – are made visible in our emphasis on the social aspects of closure (Bainton & Holcombe 2018). We take this approach informed by theories of Indigenous resurgence, ontologies, and ethics (Starblanket & Kiiwetineipinesiik Stark 2018; Coulthard & Simpson 2016; Coulthard 2014), and an expansive approach to closure that recognizes the tight weaving of past, present and future (Gaudry 2015; Tsosie 2015).

3. Mine closure and the politics of time and temporality

An important theme running through these interventions is their focus on what anthropologist Stuart Kirsch calls "the politics of time" in mining encounters. This concept refers to, on the one hand, "the contradiction between the short-term interests of capital and corporations and the longue durée of industrial impacts on the environment," but also to the myriad strategies and tactics employed by those resisting these impacts (Kirsch, 2014, 191-192). Indigenous contributors to this Special Section particularly emphasized how mine closure must account for mining's place within the *longue durée* of colonial encounters: as John B. Zoe (Tłı̨chǫ) explains, "…when you think about mine closure from within its greater context of dispossession, it becomes clear that mine operators must not simply walk away when the mine has closed" (Zoe, Hall & Lim, 2025, 6). That is, the impacts of any given industrial development are best understood when set within the larger historical processes of settler colonization and the decolonial aspirations of Indigenous communities. Indeed, in both the Australian and Canadian examples, Indigenous communities experienced historical mineral development as a profound deepening of colonial relations at these sites, through settler invasion, land theft and displacement of traditional land uses, negative cultural and social impacts, and environmental degradation.

As Tu Łidlini Dena Elders from Ross River, Yukon, highlight in their testimony, starting in the 1960s mining brought settlers, townsite and road development, and increasing state presence to their territory, amplifying and intensifying the assimilationist policies of the Canadian state.

The politics of time are also evident in the multiple temporalities of mining activities and impacts. Exploiting a finite resource, mining is invariably a temporary land use—inherent to the so-called "mining cycle" is the cessation of mining, whether due to declining ore grades, market forces, or other factors. As several articles in this collection illustrate, mines may also go through periods of brief or extended pauses in extraction (known as "care and maintenance"), causing temporary or even longer-term disruptions to local economies and populations. Shifts in ownership and production levels create instability and force communities into constant renegotiation of relationships, exemplified by Century Mine's six owners in 15 years (Doomadgee & Holcombe, 2025). When a mine finally ceases extraction, mining regions may experience "whiplash declines," raising concerns about corporate commitments to community transition and land reclamation (Rodon *et al*. 2025; Keeling 2010). In many cases, operators have simply abandoned their mine sites, leaving open wounds, environmental hazards, and financial liabilities for local communities and public governments to contend with.

By contrast, while mines may operate for periods of a few decades, their social impacts and environmental legacies may reverberate across generations, *or indeed in perpetuity*. Contributors to this Special Section note how abandoned sites such as the Asbestos Hill Mine in Northern Quebec, Canada, or the Faro Mine in Yukon continue to threaten local communities and ecologies, and present ongoing pollution mitigation challenges long after the end of mining (Tu Łidlini Dena Elders, Tufts & Beckett 2025). Such "zombie mines" represent mining's malevolent afterlife through long-term pollution and landscape scarring, as well as the landscapes of exposure and fear they create (Keeling & Sandlos, 2016). Massive open pits, tailings dams and waste piles, acid mine drainage, and chemical contaminants present enduring environmental legacies at mine sites, offering complex reclamation challenges that require extended periods of environmental monitoring, even in the best circumstances (Hudson-Edwards & Dold, 2015). In an important sense, post-mining sites also represent the haunting effects of historical colonialism and intergenerational trauma experienced by communities alienated from traditional resources and sacred spaces, as Kia Dowell's account in this issue of Western Australia's Argyle Mine powerfully illustrates (Dowell & Holcombe 2025). Echoing Tsosie's observation above (2015) about the interdependence of past, present, and future at closed mine sites, the contributors powerfully illustrate how these histories are intertwined with local community efforts to reclaim culture, identity, and political autonomy.

4. Repair, reclamation, and reconciliation

As the contributing articles show, confronting the legacies of abandoned mines, or planning the closure of operating sites, requires not merely technical expertise and scientific knowledge, but an attunement to the history, knowledge, and experiences of local and Indigenous communities. In most jurisdictions around the world, mine site reclamation remains a practice dominated by technical experts and regulatory authorities and is often undertaken with little engagement with local communities (Alonzo *et al*. 2024; Measham *et al*. 2024). Nor has reclamation traditionally addressed social aspects of closure, such as economic impacts, cultural values, or Indigenous knowledge (Bainton & Holcombe 2018). As several of these articles demonstrate, Indigenous communities often have to "push back" to gain a seat at the table and ensure their values and interests are incorporated into reclamation and future land use planning. The governance of mine reclamation remains, in many cases, closed to local communities, Indigenous governments, and the general public as it is "rendered technical" (Li 2011). Ultimately, in all cases, with the notable exception of the Raglan mine as articulated in the Keeling and Potvin contribution (2025), the lack of control and visibility over the operations of closure planning and the approach taken is a deeply disenfranchising structural limitation for Indigenous landowners.

Key to challenging this approach is the acknowledgement and integration of Indigenous knowledge and values. This includes respecting cultural knowledge around sacred sites and protocols (such as the Barramundi Dreaming site at Argyle Mine (Dowell & Holcombe 2025); integrating Indigenous ecological knowledge

around appropriate species selection and restoration objectives (Cisse *et al*. 2023, Smith 2009); and incorporating local cultural values around both the aesthetic and practical aspects of post-mining land use. Such an approach might in turn support efforts for the preservation of local place names, Indigenous languages, and traditional skills, as the Inuit and Tłı̨chǫ examples show. Shifting reclamation practices towards these objectives is no simple check-box activity: as the example of the Raglan Mine in Nunavik illustrates (Keeling & Potvin 2025), it requires respectful relations and a commitment to 'follow through' by all parties with long-term planning processes. On the other hand (as other cases in this Section recount), poor company-community relations may be further strained by failures to meaningfully incorporate Indigenous priorities into closure planning (O'Faircheallaigh 2023).

Ultimately, a relational approach (Wildcat & Voth 2023) to mine closure and reclamation is "a process of rebuilding respectful and reciprocal relationships" with Indigenous land and people, as Tu Łidlini Dena Elders *et al.* (Tu Łidlini Dena Elders, Tufts & Beckett 2025) assert in their article. Beyond technical objectives for mine reclamation and ecological restoration, this approach demands acknowledgement and/or compensation for past harms; meaningful engagement and participation in setting and achieving reclamation objectives; and steps towards the rematriation of Land through the restoration of Indigenous cultural authority and stewardship (Cohen 2017). The creation of the Waanyi Ranger group who hope to one day take responsibility for healing the land affected by Century Mine (Doomadgee & Holcombe 2025) provides an evocative and practical example. "In outlining a Tłı̨chǫ approach to mine closure," Tłı̨chǫ Elder John B. Zoe (Zoe, J. B., Simpson, J., & King, 2025) writes,

> [w]e have integrated attention to the land, attention to the people (workers and their communities), and attention to community development. These are all informed by the traditional knowledge held in our place names, and guided by the pillars of land, language, culture and way of life. This knowledge is found in our history, both pre-contact history, which offers a bar to which we can measure our activities that heal the land and our relations, and our history of colonialism and colonial transitions, which offer lessons in moving through mine closure in a good way.

5. Negotiated consent and agreements

The dynamics of past and present consent processes are often evidenced in agreement-making and are key to shaping the issues and challenges during the life of mine and at mine closure. With the exception of the Faro mine (Tu Łidlini Dena Elders, Tufts & Beckett 2025), all of the groups who shared their experiences in this Special Section have established negotiated agreements to the mine(s) on their lands. Such agreements are variously referred to as Impact and Benefit Agreements (IBAs), mining land use agreements and Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUAs). However, the variation between the processes of agreement making and the outcomes between these different mine sites is significant. For instance, the two Australian mine site agreements – Century and Argyle – and two of the Tłı̨chǫ agreements from the NWT, including for the Ekati mine (O'Faircheallaigh 2016) were negotiated prior to the finalisation of the land claim settlement processes for the negotiating groups.[4] For the two Australian mines discussed in this Special Section this has meant a lack of clarity over decision making rights within the Traditional Owner group (Dowell & Holcombe, 2025) and ongoing disputation within the Traditional Owner group (Doomadgee & Holcombe, 2025). Furthermore, in the Canadian context, mines often occupy lands for which multiple Indigenous communities have overlapping relations: in these cases, bilateral agreements between company and community can exclude or obscure the relations to extractive-affected lands of other communities.

Likewise, a negotiated agreement is rarely an indicator of free prior and informed consent or FPIC (per the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples of 2007). Such FPIC rights (including the right of refusal) are extremely uncommon and, in fact, agreement making can act as a coercive mechanism to enforce

[4] O'Faircheallaigh provides a case study of an Ekai diamond mine Agreement in the NWT, see chapter 8 (2016).

engagement with the extractive development project and manage risks of community opposition. This was the case for the agreements negotiated for both the Argyle and Century mines in Australia. Yet, industry often espouses that negotiated agreements are evidence of their 'social licence to operate' – as the term draws on the cognate themes of consent, trust and approval. This industry term however, is far from benign as the language "fails to make corporate interests and motivators (sic) sufficiently explicit," illustrating instead the distance between "terminology and operational realities" (Owen 2016, 102-104, see also Benson & Kirsch 2010; Papillon & Rodon 2017). When signing an agreement, the Indigenous communities are generally expected to give their consent or support to the mining project, thereby reducing legal uncertainty and restricting resistance (St-Laurent & Billon 2015). As John B. Zoe articulates for the Tlicho agreements:

> We negotiated agreements with all four diamond mines. This was a process developed by the federal minister, where you consent…These agreements are mostly designed for the western side, because that the way business is done in that area. (Zoe, Hall & Lim 2025)

The negotiation of local agreements for extractive projects is extremely common in Australia and Canada.[5] The benefits and opportunities they provide are important, as all of the mines and their associated agreements discussed in this Special Section are in remote areas, far from major population centres and associated employment and training opportunities. As a result, mining employment offers high salaries and access to the market economy for the regional Indigenous beneficiaries. For instance, as Doomadgee and Holcombe discuss (2025), during its early period of operation the Century mine was one of the largest employers of Indigenous people of any Australian mine, accounting for 15% to 20% of the total workforce. Likewise, for the four diamond mines in the NWT – on average throughout the mines lives, northern Indigenous people made up approximately 25% of the workforce, as Zoe, Hall and Lim discuss (2025). As we see in the contributions, these closer forms of participation create new challenges for mine closure.

In some cases, Indigenous-company agreements can also provide a more robust platform for engagement around closure and Indigenous post-mining land use than state-based regulations, as illustrated by two of the Canadian cases discussed in this Special Section (Keeling & Potvin 2025, and Zoe, Hall & Lim 2025; see also Monosky & Keeling 2021a). Indeed, in these cases agreements seem to supersede or even replace effective regulation around the social aspects of mining – including closure and community engagement. As the government is usually absent from the negotiations and from having any role in agreement implementation, the ongoing social impacts of projects – including closure – remains overlooked by the state. This absent state can be clearly seen in the case of the Argyle mine (Dowell & Holcombe, 2025). And even when the state is a party to agreements, as was the case for the Century mine, their role is limited as Doomadgee stated, "Since the GCA [Gulf Communities Agreement] has been signed the government hasn't followed through any of their promises" (Doomadgee & Holcombe, 2025, 9).

The limitations and risks of negotiated agreements for their Indigenous beneficiaries came to national, and international, attention in 2020 with the destruction of the extremely ancient Juukan Gorge caves in the Pilbara mining region of Western Australia by Rio Tinto, to make way for an iron-ore mine expansion. The destruction did not breach the Agreement that had been negotiated between Rio Tinto and the local Indigenous group, the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura (PKKP) people. This Agreement guaranteed them financial benefits, but also included so called 'gag clauses' limiting them from objecting to specific actions in relation to heritage protection, and preventing them from publicly disparaging the company, with financial penalties for

[5] This is not the case in Aotearoa New Zealand.

a breach (Kemp *et al.* 2023, 385, see also Storey 2023).[6] The subsequent public outcry led to a Parliamentary Inquiry over 16 months and the findings highlighted the

> …folly of assuming that these [Agreements] offer a solution to the problems of inequality, given the unequal bargaining power between negotiating parties in the absence of state protections…Likewise, the inquiry highlighted that the application of United Nations (UN) instruments will fail at the local level when states themselves fail to uphold their commitments and obligations... (Kemp *et al.* 2023, 382)

The lack of consideration of mine closure within these agreements is also a very common issue, with the focus of negotiations typically being on the 'front-end' of construction and operations. In their analysis of 50 Australian mining land use agreements, O'Faircheallaigh & Lawrence (2019, 76) found that

> …have failed to address issues around mine closure in any depth or detail. Thirty of the 50 agreements…make no reference at all to closure, except by stating that benefits payable to the Aboriginal parties will be suspended or terminated if and when production is suspended or a project is closed... Only seven of the 50 agreements could be regarded as addressing closure in a direct and substantive sense.

This lack of consideration of closure is clearly evident in both of the Australian Agreements discussed in this Special Section. By contrast, the example of the Raglan mine provided by Keeling & Potvin (2025) offers an exemplar case of a proactive approach to closure planning. Although the original Raglan Agreement between Inuit and the mine operator included few closure provisions, through the collaboration committee it established a Closure Plan Subcommittee (CPSC). This recently created committee is over 20 years in advance of projected mine closure, with the purpose of establishing and maintaining a dialogue between the company and the mine's Inuit partners about closure and to integrate Inuit knowledge. Important lessons can be learnt from this innovative approach.

For historical mines developed prior to modern agreement making, such as the Faro mine (Tu Łidlini Dena Elders, Tufts & Beckett 2025) and the Giant mine (Keeling & Sandlos 2016), offering part of the work of closure and reclamation offers the opportunity for redress.

6. Socio-economic transitions

All of the contributions to this Special Section tell a story of dispossession: lands and modes of life (Coulthard 2014) stolen in the pursuit of mining wealth. These losses, as John B. Zoe reminds us, did not begin with the specific mines discussed in these papers; rather, they are in continuity with longer processes of colonial accumulation and structural racism (Zoe, Hall & Lim 2025; Doomadgee & Holcombe, 2025). Some communities, like the Tłı̨chǫ First Nation and Nunavik Inuit, face contemporary closure as part of a longer history of mining booms and busts, while for others, like the Tu Łidlini Dena, the mines in question were the community's first experience of settler development on their territory. While mines are known for bringing jobs to communities, these jobs are characterized by racial and gendered exclusions: Indigenous communities experience the full socio-ecological harms of mines on their land, often without accessing the benefits of steady or high-paid work (Holcombe & Kemp 2020). The Tu Łidlini Dena (Tu Łidlini Dena Elders, Tufts & Beckett 2025) describe their limited access to work at Faro Mine, as well as the proliferation of auxiliary businesses that benefitted settlers. John B. Zoe, reflecting on the history of mines on Dene territory, writes "we were just

[6] And likewise, it was authorised under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA)* which was in operation at that time. The PKKP Aboriginal Corporation did release a media statement – see PKKPAC, 'Ancient deep-time rock shelters believed destroyed in pilbara mining blast, calls for greater flexibility to retain sites' (PKKPAC 2020).

seen as migrant workers going to the mines to hold a shovel" (Zoe, Hall & Lim 2025, 11). In cases where community members did work in the mines, the benefits tended to accrue unequally (Doomadgee & Holcombe 2025; see also Taylor 2018). And though negotiated agreements may specify targets for employment and training, in the case of the Australian Century mine each new company had a different approach to engagement and thus agreement implementation. As a result, over the life of mine there have been vastly disparate Indigenous employment opportunities available at Century.

Dowell and Holcombe (2025) reveal the gendered structure of this inequality, noting the masculinist characteristics and culture of mining work that excluded Indigenous women. Mine closure has provided an opportunity to reset this marginalisation of women from the key decision-making roles they should have played at the outset. This is an opportunity that has been taken in both hands by Dowell and senior female leaders, and transitional governance structures have been established to push for culturally informed closure. These governance structures include a Cultural Heritage Advisory Group and a Women's Underground Advisory Group to act as the appropriate decision-making bodies.

In some cases, in more recent mining operations and their accompanying negotiations, there have been guarantees for Indigenous and local employment, and for some – albeit limited – disbursements and revenue sharing (see Dowell & Holcombe 2025, Keeling & Potvin 2025). Ironically, these "positive" developments mean that, as Indigenous communities prepare for mine closure, they may face higher levels of job loss (Hall & Pryce 2024) and loss of revenue within their governments. For example, "…for the past 20 years, approximately 25% of all Tłı̨chǫ Government (TG) revenue came from the mining economy (Firelight Research 2022). Over the next 15 years, however, mining revenues are predicted to eventually account for less than 5% of TG revenues, and employment of Tłı̨chǫ citizens in the mining sector will decline significantly" (Zoe, Hall & Lim 2025, 12). Alongside revenue losses, communities must reckon with the "remains" of the mine and consider the repurposing of infrastructure, like access roads and power generators, that can help to facilitate both transitions and future development (Dowell & Holcombe 2025, Keeling & Potvin 2025). Thus, in various phases of mine transition and closure, Indigenous communities must plan for lost jobs and resources, while ensuring that, as Keeling & Potvin note, the political economy of mine closure does not reproduce the economic marginalization of the mining operations. For example, Alec Doomadgee explains that employment in the closure activities of Century Mine has often been foreclosed to the Traditional Owners of that territory, ostensibly because of the highly technical nature of the rehabilitation processes. Doomadgee is unconvinced. He asks, "They've been doing tailings now for almost four or five years and in that time, they couldn't train up First Nations people?" (Doomadgee & Holcombe, 2025, 14).

To ensure socio-economic benefits and the mitigation of impacts from closure, rather than simply participation, these examples demonstrate that Indigenous leadership is crucial in mine transitions and closure. Not only is Indigenous leadership a necessary acknowledgment of relationship to territory and past harms (Tu Łidlini Dena, Tufts & Beckett 2025), but it is a crucial step in expanding and deepening mine reclamation towards the healing of the land. This is because the ecological elements of closure cannot be divorced from the economic elements. The need for repair and reclamation, discussed above, is directly linked to the material, social and spiritual well-being of mining-affected communities, and to their capacities to build the futures they want to see. For many Indigenous communities, land is livelihood. As Kaska Elder John Atkinson puts it, "It's just like our store... that's where we get everything. Right down to the berries, right down to the sweets. Moose, sheep, beaver, salmon... right there… used to be a lot of people drying salmon during the salmon run" (Tu Łidlini Dena, Tufts & Beckett, 2025).

These socio-economic considerations intersect with the cultural dimensions of mine closure and land reclamation. Both Century Mine and Argyle Mine are spiritually significant Dreaming sites, the latter a sacred site specific to Gija women. This co-location of significant spiritual sites and places with major ore bodies is a challenge to local Traditional Owners and also for the mining company executives. Just as these sites must be restored, so, too must the knowledge of land and place that can help to reproduce Indigenous modes of life. As John B. Zoe notes, there is a difference between the *skills* needed for mining and the intergenerational *knowledge* needed to live with the land. Such knowledge includes reproducing livelihood practices and protecting or, in other cases, reestablishing customary governance processes.

7. Conclusion

The contributions in this Special Section articulate and exemplify Indigenous community relationships between the restoration of the environment and the restoration of social relations and well-being, and thus the inextricable connection between environmental and social justice. As such this Special Section sits squarely within the *Journal of Political Ecology*'s attention to the policy and politics of sustainability planning, through our empirical focus on mine closure and the nexus of equity, justice and the local environment. Our approach to drawing together the multiple voices in this Special Section also reflects an approach to knowledge co-production that respects relationality, through our unique social locations and through the lessons learned and shared across communities and Indigenous Nations.

As advocates and scholars have written, Indigenous communities are not passively affected by extraction (Jobin 2023). Rather, through multiple scales, timelines and means – as workers, stewards of the land, caregivers, politicians and negotiators – Indigenous Peoples shape the political ecologies of extraction, though not often through conditions and histories of their own making. The articles in this Special Section share experiences of extraction-via-dispossession, and of negotiation and participation dictated by state and corporate terms over long time periods. In some ways, contemporary mine site transitions and closures face these same dynamics of settler containment: remediation measures and benchmarks usually dictated by those outside of community, and articulated through technical, rather than relational, ontologies.

At the same time, mine transitions and closure are a distinct phase of mine life, in their temporality and in the quality and purpose of associated agreements and labours. Closure, as the longest phase of mine life, is tightly bound to the past and the future; as such, contributors approach closure – both in their writing and community practice – as a process of learning from the teachings of generations past and reckoning with past settler harms, on the one hand, while envisioning closure through the lens of community aspirations and commitments to future generations on the other. The contributors to this Special Section advance Indigenous-led approaches to closure, grounded in relationships to land and the non-human world and the responsibility and reciprocity attached to these relations. These approaches are shaped by the colonial continuities of past and present processes of dispossession and the need to engage closure as a process of reparation, as well as the hope that mine closure offers an opening to better ways of doing things and better relations, between people and with the land.

References

Alonzo, D., Tabelin, C. B., Dalona, I. M., Abril, J. M. V., Beltran, A., Orbecido, A., ... & Herrington, R. (2024). Working with the community for the rehabilitation of legacy mines: Approaches and lessons learned from the literature. *Resources Policy*, 98, 105351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2024.105351

Australian Government. (2022). Australian Government's response to the Joint Standing Committee on Northern Australia's: *A way forward: Final Report into the destruction of Indigenous heritage sites at Juukan Gorge*. Australian Government. https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Former_Committees/Northern_Australia_46P/CavesatJuukanGorge/Report/section?id=committees%2freportjnt%2f024757%2f77701

Bainton, N. & Holcombe, S. (2018). A critical review of the literature on the social aspects of mine closure. *Resources Policy* 59, 468-478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2018.08.020

Bainton. N. & Skrzypek, E. E. (Eds). (2021) *Absent presence: Resource extraction and the state in Papua New Guinea and Australia.* ANU Press. http://doi.org/10.22459/AP.2021

Bauhardt, C., & Harcourt, W. (Eds.). (2018). *Feminist political ecology and the economics of care*. Routledge.

Beckett, C. & Keeling, A. (2019). Rethinking remediation: Mine reclamation, environmental justice and relations of care. *Local Environment*, 24(3), 216-230. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2018.1557127

Benson, P. & Kirsch, S. (2010). Corporate oxymorons. *Dialectical Anthropology* 34, 45-48. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10624-009-9112-y

Cameron, E. & T. Levitan. (2014). Impact and Benefit Agreements and the neoliberalization of resource governance and indigenous–state relations in Northern Canada. *Studies in Political Economy* 93, 25–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.2014.11674963

Cissé, M. K., Keeling, A., Guittonny, M., & Bussière, B. (2023). Integration of Cree traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) into the revegetation process of the Eleonore mine tailings storage facility. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, *14*, 101263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2023.101263

Cohen, T. (2017). Bringing Country Back? Indigenous aspirations and ecological values in Australian mine-site rehabilitation. In Jalbert, K., Willow, A., Casadrande, D. & Paladino, S. (Eds.). *ExtrACTION*: *Impacts, engagements and alternative futures*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315225579

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. Minnesota University Press.

Coulthard, G. S., & Simpson, L. B. (2016). Grounded normativity/place-based solidarity. *American Quarterly*, *68*(2), 249-255. https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2016.0038

Doomadgee, A. & Holcombe, S. E., (2025) "What does closure even mean?" at Century Mine: Multiple companies, mine closure trajectories and disputation. *Journal of Political Ecology* 32, 6200. https://doi.org/10.2458/jpe.6200

Dowell, K. & Holcombe, S. E., (2025) Reasserting Gija women's role in mine site reclamation: A perspective from the Argyle Diamond Mine. *Journal of Political Ecology* 32, 6219. https://doi.org/10.2458/jpe.6219

Firelight Research. (2022). *Tłı̨chǫ and the mining economy*. Commissioned report. Behchoko: NT.

Gaudry, A. (2015). Researching the resurgence: Insurgent research and community-engaged methodologies in 21st-century academic inquiry. In S. Strega & L. Brown (Eds.), *Research as Resistance: Revisiting critical, Indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*. (pp. 243–265). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Hall, R. J. (2022). *Refracted economies: Diamond mining and social reproduction in the North*. University of Toronto Press.

Hall, R. J., & Ascough, H. (2023). Care through closure: Mine transitions in the mixed economy of the Northwest Territories, Canada. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *30*(10), 1415-1436. https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2023.2178392

Hall, R., & Pryce, B. (2024). Colonial continuities in closure: Indigenous mine labour and the Canadian State. *Antipode*, *56*(1), 93-114. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12968

Holcombe, S. (2021). The state's selective absence: Extractive capitalism, mining juniors and Indigenous interests in the Northern Territory. In Bainton, N. & Skrzypek, E. E. (Eds.). *Absent presence: Resource extraction and the state in Papua New Guinea and Australia.* ANU Press. http://doi.org/10.22459/AP.2021

Holcombe, S., Elliott, V., Keeling, A., Berryman, M., Hall, R. J., Ngaamo, R., Beckett, C., Moon,W., Hudson, M., Kusab, N. & Ross River Lands Office. (2022). *Indigenous Exchange Forum: Transitions in mine closure*. Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining, University of Queensland. https://www.csrm.uq.edu.au/publications/the-indigenous-exchange-forum-transitions-in-mine-closure

Holcombe, S., & Kemp, D. (2020). From pay-out to participation: Indigenous mining employment as local development? *Sustainable Development*, *28*(5), 1122-1135. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2063

Horowitz, L. S., Keeling, A., Lévesque, F., Rodon, T., Schott, S., & Thériault, S. (2024). Indigenous Peoples' relationships to large-scale mining in post/colonial contexts. In T. Rodon, S. Thériault, A. Keeling, S. Bouard, & A. Taylor, *Mining and Indigenous livelihoods* (pp. 109–136). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003406433-8

Hudson-Edwards, K. A., & Dold, B. (2015). Mine waste characterization, management and remediation. *Minerals*, *5*(1), 82-85. https://doi.org/10.3390/min5010082

Jobin, S. W. (2023). *Upholding Indigenous economic relationships: Nehiyawak narratives*. UBC Press.

Joly, T. L. (2021). Growing (with) Muskeg: Oil Sands reclamation and healing in Northern Alberta. *Anthropologica*, *63*(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.18357/anthropologica6312021278

Keeling, A. (2010). 'Born in an atomic test tube': Landscapes of cyclonic development at Uranium City, Saskatchewan. *Canadian Geographer*, *54*(2), 228–252

Keeling, A. & Potvin, V. (2025) Nunavik Inuit and Raglan Mine: New approaches to closure planning (*isulinnisanganut parnasimautiit*). *Journal of Political Ecology* 32(1): 7586. https://doi.org/10.2458/jpe.7586

Keeling, A., Sandlos, J., (2009). Environmental justice goes underground? historical notes from Canada's northern mining frontier. *Environmental Justice* 2, 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2009.0009

Keeling, A., Sandlos, J., (2016). Toxic legacies, slow violence, and environmental injustice at Giant Mine, Northwest Territories. *The Northern Review 42*, 7–21. https://doi.org/10.22584/nr42.2016.002

Kemp, D. Kochan, K & Burton, J. (2023). Critical reflections on the Juukan Gorge parliamentary inquiry and prospects for industry change. *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*, 41(4), 379–402. https://doi.org/10.1080/02646811.2022.2156202

Kirsch, S. (2014). *Mining Capitalism: The relation between corporations and their critics*. University of California Press.

Laboucan-Massimo, M. (2014). Awaiting justice: The ceaseless struggle of the Lubicon Cree. In Black, T., D'Arcy, S., Weis, T. & Kahn Russell, J. (Eds.). *A line in the tar sands: Struggles for environmental justice* (pp. 113-117). PM Press.

Li, T. M. (2011). Rendering society technical: Government through community and the ethnographic turn at the World Bank in Indonesia. In Mosse, D. (Ed). *Adventures in Aidland: The anthropology of professionals in international development*. (Pp. 57-80). Berghahn.

Measham, T., Walker, J., Haslam McKenzie, F., Kirby, J., Williams, C., D'Urso, J., Littleboy, A., Samper, A., Rey, R., Maybee, B., Brereton, D., & Boggs, G. (2024). Beyond closure: A literature review and research agenda for post-mining transitions. *Resources Policy* 90, 104859. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2024.104859

Monosky, M. & Keeling, A. (2021a). Planning for social and community-engaged closure: A comparison of mine closure plans from Canada's territorial and provincial North. *Journal of Environmental Management* 277, 111324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111324

Monosky, M. & Keeling, A. (2021b). Social considerations in mine closure: Exploring policy and practice in Nunavik, Quebec. *Northern Review* 52, 29-60. https://doi.org/10.22584/nr52.2021.002

O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2016). *Negotiations in the Indigenous world: Aboriginal peoples and the extractive industry in Australia and Canada*. Routledge.

O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2023). *Indigenous peoples and mining: A global perspective*. Oxford University Press.

O'Faircheallaigh, C. & Lawrence, R. (2019). Mine closure and the Aboriginal estate. *Australian Journal of Aboriginal Studies* 2019/1, 65-81.

Owen, J. (2016). Social licence and the fear of Mineras Intreruptus. *Geoforum* 77, 102-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.10.014

Papillon, M., & Rodon, T. (2017). Proponent-Indigenous agreements and the implementation of the right to free, prior, and informed consent in Canada. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *62*, 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2016.06.009

Parliament of Australia, (2021). Joint Standing Committee on Northern Australia (JSCNA), Inquiry into the destruction of 46,000 year old caves at Juukan Gorge in the Pilbara Region of Western Australia. https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Former_Committees/Northern_Australia_46P/CavesatJuukanGorge

PKKPAC. (2020). Media release May 25. Ancient deep-time rock shelters believed destroyed in Pilbara mining blast, calls for greater flexibility to retain sites. PKKPAC. https://pkkp.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/PKKP-20200525-FINAL-Media-Release-Rio-Tinto-Juukan-Gorge-blasts.pdf

Rodon, T., Thériault, S., Keeling, A., Bouard, S. & Taylor, A. (Eds.). (2025). *Mining and Indigenous livelihoods: Rights, revenues, and resistance.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003406433

Scottie, J., Bernauer, W., & Hicks, J. (2022). *I will live for both of us: A history of colonialism, uranium mining, and Inuit Resistance*. University of Manitoba Press.

Smith, H. D. (2009). Strangers in a foreign land — developing cultural closure criteria for mines in Australia's Northern Territory. In A. B. Fourie & M. Tibbett (Eds.), *Mine Closure 2009: Proceedings of the fourth international conference on mine closure*. (pp. 3-11). Australian Centre for Geomechanics. https://doi.org/10.36487/ACG_repo/908_Smith

Starblanket, G. & Kiiwetineipinesiik Stark, H. (2018). Towards a relational paradigm–four points for consideration: Knowledge, gender, land, and modernity. In Asch, T., Borrows, J. & Tully, J. (Eds.) *Resurgence and reconciliation: Indigenous-settler relations and Earth teachings.* (pp. 175-208). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487519926-007

Storey, M. (2023). In the shadow of Juukan Gorge: The parliamentary inquiry and the progress of Indigenous cultural heritage legislative reform. *Australian Resources and Energy Law Journal* 42, 25-44.

St-Laurent, G. P. & Billon, P. (2015). Staking claims and shaking hands: Impact and Benefit agreements as a technology of government in the mining sector. *The Extractive Industries and Society 2,* 590-602. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.06.001

Tu Łidlini Dena Elders, Tufts. B. & Beckett, C. (2025). The reclamation and rematriation of Tsē Zūl: the Tū Łidlini Dena's story of the Faro Mine. *Journal of Political Ecology* 32, 8094. http://doi.org/10.2458/jpe.8094

Taylor. J. (2018). *The RIC Report: Change in wellbeing indicators of Pilbara Aboriginal people: 2001 – 2016: A report to the Regional Implementation Committee (RIC)*. Rio Tinto Iron Ore.

Tsosie, R. (2015). Indigenous peoples and the ethics of remediation: Redressing the legacy of radioactive contamination for native peoples and native lands. *Santa Clara Journal of International Law, 13*, 203.

Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*(3), 409-428. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15

Tuck, E., & McKenzie, M. (2014). *Place in research: Theory, methodology, and methods*. Routledge.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf

Wildcat, M., & Voth, D. (2023). Indigenous relationality: Definitions and methods. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *19*(2), 475-483. https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801231168380

Zoe, J. B., Hall, R. J. & Lim, T. W. (2025). Reading mine closure through Tłı̨chǫ self-determination. *Journal of Political Ecology* 32, 7585.

Zoe, J. B., Simpson, J., & King, H. (2019). Gowhaedo Gonàowo (Ancestral ways): Mapping modern treaty implementation. *Northern Public Affairs.* 6(2), 18-22.