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ABSTRACT

Through use of a revelatory case study, as discussed by Yin in 1984, this researcher introspectively explores the university experience of a female student enrolled in graduate studies. Questions related to her post-secondary experiences as a novice researcher and as a student were asked in four broad areas: emotional, physical, cognitive, and spiritual. The interview questions, largely unstructured and open-ended, intended to probe the possible need for self- and institutional awareness about certain, identifiable, mitigating factors which affect the nature of the post-secondary student experience. The answers reveal a degree of disjuncture between the subject and the experience of being "schooled" in this post-secondary setting; however, the limited sample size of one – and the idiosyncratic nature of the informant’s experience – cannot allow conclusive generalizations or recommendations to be firmly supported.

The primary focus question for this research was: Do we need to (re)consider the research process? The pronoun - we - refers to anyone interested in the nature of quantitative and/or qualitative or other research methods, and may include those traditionally considered ‘inside’ the institution and those located ‘outside’ due to reasons of heritage, cultural capital, economic wealth, legislated disbarment or for other reasons of access disablement. Similarly, this question may be of interest to those who are themselves considered peripheral or outside ‘mainstream’ society. This question may also attract particular attention as increasing numbers of students from different ethnocultural, gender, class, religious and other variables of ‘disadvantaged’ backgrounds choose to attend post-secondary institutions, traditionally the preserve of children of European descent.

The subjective probing indicates that this student experienced disjuncture between her worldview, as related to the nature of cognition, research, canon and secularization. - and the
Weltanshung presented through the curricula of this postsecondary institution. Highlights of the findings include her perceptions that: (a) the nature of the research process she is introduced to is one where rationality is privileged, denuded of any emotional (or other) bases; (b) research processes are more invasive than friendly; (c) the canon does not include those she might cite authorities; and (d) the post-secondary experience is secularized.

In conclusion, this research suggests that although a particular homogenization process, which may be characterised as Western scientific, may appear to be in place at post-secondary levels, particular students are able to resist overt and hidden curricular intentions. However, further study is suggested to discover the nature of such resistance and the potential value for (de)(post)colonialising curricula.
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Research, from the French recherché, meaning "to find again," is an all too human activity. We are curiosity thrill-seekers poking about, counting, observing, asking, prodding, analyzing, measuring, concluding and engaging in related activities. Often all of these activities are quite satisfying; even more so, if funded. Thus, to ask: "Do we still need research?" is, perhaps, too obviously easy to answer. There are conditions like Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) and cancer to cure, holes larger than Texas in the protective chamber of ozone surrounding the earth to refill, increasing numbers of unfed children in 'First' World Countries stuffed with wealth to nutritiously feed, and a hometown team basketball club slumped lower than a pair of puppy beagle's ears to support. With so many available puzzles, I agree that research is needed.

However, if a second question is posed: "How do we research these puzzles and problems?", then there might be difficulties constructing an answer satisfactory to all. Whose knowledge counts may complicate the acceptance of possible answers in terms of the normative standards of objectivity, precision, verification, simplicity and adequacy of evidence. This second query suggests a third: "Do we need to (re)consider the research process?".

The 'Nay-sayers'

Do we reconsider? Some might understand this as straightforward. A resounding, "No, we do not," might well swell. No; just foolish, time-consuming, politically-sensitive impudence. No, just philosophical nit-picking. Good reasons can be constructed, extrinsic or intrinsic to the research process, to dissuade (re)examination and to leave well enough alone. For example, one reason which might be given is that rationality is understood as a staple of epistemological
breakthrough. Rationality is the high(er)(est) state of consciousness, a state which is separate from or above that of emotional or spiritual states of apprehension. This high(er)(est) state of consciousness is the best approach to 'make' or 'discover' knowledge. Arguments in favour of rationality also favour the sterilization of subjectivity(ies) which may originate from emotional, gender, ethnocultural, spiritual, or other sources. Passions must be kept at bay in order not to overwhelm observations, not to sully data, and not to contaminate conclusions.

As well, the 'nay-sayers' might argue, asserting propositions both logically and sequentially, that surveying and interviewing techniques, with a little politically-sensitive jigging for these politically-sensitive times, are still our best methods to conduct necessary research to insure certainty, particularly in the social sciences. There still exists the need to get out there to the people and find out this time! We just need more accurate instrumentation to insure the findings on which decisions, derived and enacted, are established. How poor are the poor? What are the Nisga’a really like? Why can’t that Kenny read yet? Don’t we spend enough money on teacher education? There might be encountered the sense that the promise of empirical, anthropological, scientific or other forms of non-First Nations instrumentation and procedures, imported into such fields as education, may still be fulfilled.

Another argument might be made that findings derived from Euroderivative methodology lends itself well to eurotheorizing; that is, interpretive analysis of findings requires a parade of known experts. These theoretical templates, themselves devised from painstakingly thorough Euroresearch, explain 'the' 'world' quite well enough. Alternative paradigms must, well, remain alternative. A final argument might be made that research, in addition to being rational, objective and anemotional, must also remain devoutly, religiously secular; that spirituality and 'science', – or faith and reason or belief and Truth – must remain divorced from any sensibility of God. Our concepts of God and spiritus (do)(can)not belong in the hypothesis-testing rigor of the laboratory; the theologian cannot work as scientist.
Fair enough, all good reasons to not waste time in reconsideration of the research process, for aren't these questions of procedure and not questions of justice?

A 'Yay-sayer'

However, I am not a 'nay-sayer'. I intend no offense. I do not suggest that research enterprises be discarded altogether. But, if asked, then I will answer, "Yes, please reconsider."

While studying at a EuroCanadian university, situated on the traditional territory of the Musqueam, I initially became, and quite unintentionally, a researcher of the research process. I meant to do my research and exit. I did not intend to philosophically reconsider so many aspects of the research assignment expected. However, my emotional, gendered, "Indian," spiritual, (ir)rational, working-class-rooted messy self kept intruding into this research process and prompted further philosophical self-questioning. Through this questioning, I developed my intuitive qualms about graduate study post-secondary research into some articulate reasons to support reconsideration.

The focus on rationality leaves me in despair, frustrated, unfulfilled, saddened, amused, anxious, frightened and intrigued. I, in short, found myself feeling emotional. I see-believe there is emotion in cognition and cognition in emotion. I also see myself in cognition; try as I have, I am unable to leave my multiply-layered subjectivit(y)(ies) at the door of the lab. I have tried stifling these intrusions, but! then! they! bubble! up! like! a! plate! of! fried! liver! and! onions!!

Besides, if we are to be anemotional makers of knowledge - solely rational epistemological pioneers - in our communal quest to engineer a socially-constructed reality, then I'm sure God wouldn't have given us all these great emotions and punctuation marks! As well, I've read just about all the valorized researched products I can stomach about myself and my people (known, legally and legislatively in Canada as "Indians"). With few exceptions, anthropology and
education-dressed-up-as-anthropology or education-dressed-up-as-science must stop if a starting point for researched investigation continues to be based on the query: "I wonder how the Indians do it." Racism is passé and a violation of Canada's Constitution Act, Section 15(1) (R.S.C. En. Canada Act, 1982 (U.K.), 1982, c.11; See: Imai & Hawley, 1995, p. 270). Enough hypothesizing that if x is "Indian," then it will follow that y. "Indian" is not a species independent of all two-leggeds.

Thirdly, for those who require quantification, if we are to break the theoretic bonds of culturally reproductive frameworks, then, perhaps, there is need for some new theory-lenses to look at all these keen findings. Intellectually rigorous analysis might be fashioned from non-patriarchal or non-Euro or non-secular theories. I have reservations about the usefulness of unquestioned authority of any canon used to fashion and support the answers to troubling questions.

Finally, I was raised Catholic. I identify myself as a lapsed Catholic for I do not practice regularly the rituals and responsibilities required; yet, my faith does not disappear. I accept that God/Creator or THE BIGHOLYMANIFESTING is an all-determining reality. My spiritus-soul lives as part of my integrity within a very humbling, interconnected, living, finely spun energy of relationships. Reverence, love, compassion are elements which must be in my research process. And don't offer to put me in a theology department. After all, Descartes (1596-1650), quoted often in the literature I have been instructed to inspect, conceded humbly that "For there is no doubt that God is capable of creating everything that I am capable of perceiving" (Descartes, 1641/1988; 1641, Sixth Meditation, p. 50, para. 72). At this location known as University, one is almost obligated to knowledgeably repeat the Cartesian dualism, that mind and body are split (Ibid., Second Meditation, pp. 16-23). There is, however, in my seminars much silence about the (pres)(exist)ence of 'God' in Descartes' Meditations. This material world is also a spiritual world for me. I need always to remember and to deepen my reverence for the
These Good Reasons

Are My Good Reasons

I view good reasons as just that: good reasons, that is, plausible expressions of grounds for or grounds against support of a position. In fact, well enough argued good reasons for or against a position might firm into belief; and, action(s) follows belief. I do not presume that our beliefs are always overtly and intentionally dissected before each action; that is, sometimes I live life habitually or unconsciously. Therefore, expression of my affirmation that there is need to reconsider the research process is neither to slither along some moral high ground nor to convince one ‘nay-sayer’ to decamp. I speak-write for myself, believing that I cannot speak for anyone else. In speaking-writing I do, perhaps, offer an alternate perspective, but this alternative is an offering – not a constructed argument to persuade. I have no aspirations to rally the undecided nor to liven up a paradigm shift. I believe, and, have no difficulty with, the fact that everyone finds the venue to express autonomously his or her own preferences, opinions, arguments in a socially-believed world. My extremely limited knowledge of biodiversity informs me of the necessity of diversity for species survival; and, thus, I believe epistemological diversity is of equal importance to our shared survival as a species. I consider epistemological diversity like an antidote to the weight of homogeneous, massified opinion-thought warned of by Ortega de Gasset in 1932 or to the fearful conformity dramatized by George Orwell in 1949.

What follows are my good reasons, which are not based on research directed in traditional lab-like or ethno-life-lab-like settings. I did not count survey responses nor analytically code interview transcripts to generate these findings. This is my philosophical examination of
some of the assumptions of the research process I encountered as a graduate student. My findings, which can be described as personally-generated data, are provided in a, perhaps, unusual rendering for presentation of the dissertation genre. In fact, I not going to present the findings of this philosophical investigation at all. However, the members of my Ph.D. Committee saw promise in this data and believed this case study/story to be worthy of public recording and dissemination.

These findings are presented in four larger sections, which include:

1) Anemotional co(gni)(ndi)tioning (SOUTH - Emotional Realm),
2) The socioospirituemotscopoliticocultural white noise of researching (WEST - Physical Realm),
3) Canonicity: Euroheritageizationing (NORTH - Cognitive Realm), and,
4) Acculturative Secularizing (EAST - Spiritual Realm).

At times, these findings sound-read like garage tapes wherein a musician records some hacking around' before taking idea motes into a studio for full production. As with such sessions, there appear moments of creative insight and instances of inevitable self-indulgence. The products of creative inspiration and self-indulgence almost always generate some good-natured humour. This product is no exception. Within these pages the scholarly underlay is overlaid with humour. If there's one thing I've kept and, perhaps, sharpened while in residence as a graduate student, this is my sense of humor. Not that I ever intended to come here to be humourist.

So let us go then you and I.
INTRODUCTION

Get back, get back.

Get back to where you once belonged.

Get back [Sharilyn]. Go home.

(Lennon & McCartney, 1969)

Of Dissertations & Expectations

Beware, Beware Of Committee Members

Bearing Homemade Christmas Cake

I am a female of First Nations Ancestry, born April 24, 1953. I left the middle-class profession of classroom teaching in June of 1989 to return to university in January of 1990 to pursue graduate studies. This should be a simple story to tell; after all, returning to graduate school is not a unique experience. Yet, this is a troublesome story to tell as I articulate my thoughts-intuitions-feelings-sensations about being 'schooled' -- again. The story does not unfold as neatly and sequentially as did the writing of my Master's thesis. Anyway, I was deftly forgetting an initial conception of my dissertation project and beginning to write my way into a new area of interest, which I deemed to be much more 'academic'. I resisted the encouraging invitations of my Ph.D. committee members to risk self-exposure and talk about my personal journey through graduate studies. I wished to retreat into tidy, scholarly, third-person, academic composition by constructing through language an alternate history of First Nations education and schooling. I guess I'll get to that someday.
One December day, I wandered over to my neighbour's house to receive her reactions to my newest version of the dissertation proposal. Lately, I jokingly call myself the 'Picasso' of writing styles as I adopt and abort so many forms of dissertation-like text. The response from this Ph.D. committee member left me understanding that an original dissertation proposal could not be easily abandoned. Welcoming me with coffee and homemade Christmas cake, Dr. A., formerly, Dr. W., surprisingly, stood up to my protests that the autobiographical account of my schooling was best left shelved! I resisted her challenges that writing about this post-secondary experience was worthwhile. Not often is someone so bravely resolute in the face of my stubbornness.

**Strong Motivation**

A battle of wills ensued. I recognized that my reasons for dropping the research project were ineffectual in light of her threats to resign from my committee. Actually, she conveyed that two members of my committee would resign if I continued to retreat into a less unique the history of schooling for Persons of First Nations Ancestry [herein: PFNA]. The potential of being committeeless left me breathless. That's strong motivation to reconsider seriously.

I trudged the weary, long, three blocks northward to my basement apartment. I am convinced that Dr. A. loves me; however, I did contemplate the disequilibrium in power between student and committee member. I let the rain announce the martyrdom of a student powerless in the equation of Ph.D. committee. Once home, I reconsidered. I fretted. I fumed. I fussed. I did not know what she desired. I could not outguess her intentions. I did not see-understand the merit(s) of what Dr. A. had located. Somewhat angered and confused, I began to write that afternoon. While proofreading the first draft, I smiled, because, er, perhaps, Dr. A. saw something I missed sitting right under my nose. I did, as requested, tell the story of
what Dr. A. calls my "personal journey" as a graduate student. The resultant story, somewhat like a case study focus on this one part of my educational journey, forced me to articulate some of the qualms I have felt as a graduate student pondering and questioning the nature of research -- especially as related to a signifier related to one part of my planetary identity kit.

Rattle-rattle-rattle-rattle

Resistance and Uncertainty

This is an uncertainly told story. I did not intend to write a dissertation like this. I like to write in my journal but I do not admit people to those pages. I think some thoughts-feelings are best kept private and protected. I did not intend to be so personal wherein I leap from flights of angry, (il)logical polemic to poetic images and from dogged analysis to logical (persuas)(argumentation). I resist(ed) self-exposure. I am uncertain of the lesson(s) here to share with others and I was uncertain about the form of sharing required. The intuitions seemed trapped in a subconsciousness and I did not know how to make the fluid thoughts solid enough for potential readers to follow.

Also, my story of dissertation construction ruggedly (un)(en)folds as a struggle to be taken thoughtfully as an academic voice while articulating my experiences as a post-secondary student voice in pursuit of three letters signifying academic credentialling. To tell this my story meant that I had to confront my constructions of 'what' is academic and what is not; where I inherited these constr(uc)(ic)tions; and my resistance to simply speaking as who I am -- who I am for now. When I began writing this dissertation, I was not yet as brave-knowing as Emma LaRocque (1990) who states that

[t]here is tremendous pressure to read and write scholarly articles, theses, and dissertations. Unfortunately, too many scholars apparently assume scholarly
writing must, by definition, be pedantic, stifling, and soul-less! But I am Métis – I refuse to let conventional dictates of Western scholarship bury me in dry dust (p. 143).

I feared and desired erasing the conventions which have erased me. In composing these words, I come to understand the sensibility that academic writing need not suffer from gravity.

My resistance is also connected to my desire to NOT (re)invent the "Indian" for display, strewn across these pages like a specimen prepped by a microtome. I am positioned at the computer; not in the cupboard or at a blockade. I did not come here to write an "Indian’s" story. Initially, I came here to complete a scholarly conceptual analysis about community-based curricula (Calliou, 1992). Then, with one graduate degree in hand, I chose to continue academic studies. Why not? I (can) look the part: I wear thick glasses and talk to myself although I do not yet own an elbow-patched tweed jacket. I rationalised that once I wrote this paper and I proved my academic legwork, then I would possess the freedom to tell my story with my voice; that is, speaking from within my own locational subjectivity(ies). This story came like a gift; and in the end I feel the freedom of Emma LaRoque’s (1990) advice that there is no "necessary distinction between being a scholar and a poetic writer, or a poet" (p. 143). I think I understand-feel that now.

Not to the Manor Born

LeRoy Little Bear (personal communication, December, 1994), says that "Ph.D. stands for Post Hole Digger, and that my parents will be happy to learn that I’ll be able to get a real job when this is all over." I think-feel that, when this is complete, I will embrace the Zen-like solitude of such physical toil. Thinking, theorising and testing assumptions about print text is arduous labouring; and perhaps, at times, risky ex(ertion)(posure); especially, if one is not to the
University born. According to Canada's Indian Act, I am an "Indian," that is "a person who pursuant to this Act is registered as an Indian or is entitled to be registered as an Indian" (R.S.C., 1985, c. 1-5, 2(1); see Imai & Hawley, 1995, p. 4). In fact, 120 year ago, I could not be at a Canadian university as an "Indian" (Ibid.,). Canada's Indian Act (1876) states in Section 86(1) that any "Indian"

who may be admitted to the degree of Doctor of Medicine, or to any other degree by any University of Learning, or who may be admitted in any Province of the Dominion to practice law either as an Advocate or as a Barrister or Counsellor or Solicitor or Attorney or to be a Notary Public, or who may enter Holy Orders or who may be licensed by any denomination of Christians as a Minister of the Gospel, shall ipso facto become enfranchised [that is, be removed of all aboriginal rights] under this Act (see Venne, 1981, p. 47).

This proviso stands with the Indian Acts (1880, Sect. 99(1); 1884, Sect. 99(4); 1886; Sect. 86; 1906, Sect. 111; see Venne, 1981, pp. 83, 99, 146, 217). The elimination clause 'disappears' with amendments to the 1927 version of Canada's Indian Act.

So, I'm here freely and without fear of punitive action for attendance at the Academy. I am not positioned or located within the Academy by virtue of birth or inheritance. I am the 'Other' whose identity is "registered" on a "Band List," that is, "registered as an Indian in the Indian Register" on "a list of persons that is maintained under section 8 [of the Indian Act] by a band or in the Department [of Indian Affairs] (R.S.C., 1985, c. 1-5, 2(1); see Imai & Hawley, 1995, pp. 5, 3, respectively). I am the 'Other', much theorised about in researched and published academic studies. I am the 'Other' whose presence so far in the intellectual or academic world has been a token one, a component in ritual references to gender, race and class. . . . Not found in
numbers as authors of critical texts, or in refereed journals, lacking 'scholarly' respectability, defying established norms and forms (Bannerji, 1993, p. xiv).

I can now concur with Bannerji. Yet, before I find Bannerji (and others like her), I am learning about the enormity of this observation. I learn at this place of brick, stone, glass and cement sprawling in a forest-like setting. I learn to look for myself in bibliographies and indexes at entries like: marginalised, Indian, victimised, Canadian Native, oppressed, (in)visible minority et cetera. Imagine looking for yourself in an entry like "victim/victimizer" or "oppressed" (see, for example, Rosenau, 1992, pp. 228, 223). My mother and my father didn't teach me to think of myself like that. As I have interactively processed miles of text, that is, signs encoded by auth(or)(esse)(itie)s, with the intention of conveying meaning to audiences, I witness the numerous labels used to identify and locate me. In reading I have discovered a Europalimpsestic narrative written over mine again and again.

Interactive, however, does not mean control. I only (re)(inter)act. I come to discern that there are specific reasons for the exclusion of "Indians" from this milieu; and that "Indians" are quite a research industry. I grow uncomfortable decoding and repulse some aspects of this physically textual environment as I begin to understand that texts are not just designs on paper but meaningfully believed signs which have effects (legislative, educational, emotive, material) on the readers in their capacity as legislative enforcer, classroom teacher or curious bystander. I also come to understand that these signs have direct effect on those who may have never participated in the construction of the signs or never read the text.

BUT! I did not come here to discover or to analyse how "Indians" (R.S.C., 1970, c.l-6, s.5.) are 'talked about', that is, to stride the circumference of a boundaried discourse extant about a particular population, variously identified as Native, First Peoples, Amerindian, Savage, Illiterate, Indians (Status, non-Status or otherwise), Primitive, (Un)Civili(s)(z)ed, Canadian Native, Aboriginal, First Nations or otherwise. I did not come here to become (dis)located. I did not
come here to explore the tropological significance, to dissect the legal and legislative reality of "Indians," or to (re)experience the disjuncture of being "Indian" (R.S.C., 1970, c.l-6, s.5.) in Canadian society. I did not come here to have the ‘world’ stop making sense. In fact, I did not come here to be the "Indian." My post-secondary schooling experience is conflicted with the politics of identity and my resolve to study and to resist is also strengthened by these politics of identity.

Looking for an out in a world closing in
Trying to be as real as I could be
Confused by definitions of being free
(Trudell, 1992, bootleg tape, no bibliographic reference.)

I struggle.
I struggle to remember.
I struggle to keep remembering.
I struggle to keep remembering who I am.

we don’t have time/ for more mind wasting lies
whatever it is you’re going/we’re not going to buy it
it’s time to say something/not a time to be quiet
Rant and roll
heartspeak from the spirit  say it loud
so everyone can hear it
(Trudell, rant and roll, 1994, n.p.)
The struggle (en)unfolds and I am alternately learning how to drown and learning how to swim.

And, reality is in how you swim.

(Trudell, 1992, bootleg tape, no bibliographic reference.)

**Four Areas to Contemplate**

Although there are many areas of angst, an omnipresent existential nausea, I name four. These are:

1. Anemotional Co(gni)(ndi)tioning;
2. The sociospirituemoecopoliticocultural White Noise of Researching;
3. Canononicity: Euroheritageizationing; and

**Stay Awake, Stay Awake**

Existential in the sense that I find that the free(dom)(will), autonomy as it were, I believe I have is not. My choices are limited; my options of my own making. Of course. I could quit graduate studies. I see that as cowardly. Jaspers (1941) says I can and must remember to put up an interior resistance to the social-world imposing on me: "Do not lose yourself in what is merely known!" (p. 204). I suspect that Jaspers was not writing directly to me when he invoked individuals to be aware. Besides, what could Jaspers know of the pain of our People, in words spoken like the words of Buffalo Bird Woman of the Hidatsa Nation. In her winter years, she remembers, with some disbelief and self-doubt, the times of buffalo and deer, (fear)(feel)ing "our Indian ways are almost gone" (in Nabokov, 1991, p. 182). Her son "grew up in the white man's
school" and is "helping them [the Hidatsa people] to follow the white man's road" while she sees the Hidatsa life in the shadows at sunset (Ibid.). What/how can existentialists speak of the long, lonely sadness like that of an anonymous Omaha? She, who knows in her heart-mind that now the face of all the land is changed and sad. The living creatures are gone. I see the land desolate and I suffer an unspeakable sadness. Sometimes I wake in the night, and I feel as though I should suffocate from the pressure of this awful feeling of loneliness (Nabokov, 1991, p. 184).

Existentialists write-wrote from the comfort of their own countries; would that their words could ever convey the enormity of the bleakness speaking when one is made to forget one's Self-Land over and over again.

Because of those who do remember, I can remember too.

I fight feeling tranquilised up here, struggling against accepting particular understandings about a number of topics. Eventually, I find that some Red Alert [bad pun, mea culpa] consciousness seizes hold of me nearly each time I pick up a text(book) or enter a classroom (as student or lecturer). I am paralysed, enraged, saddened or animated with the erroneous, enlightened or accurate content of certain textual (pre)(as)sumptions. In my "personal journey" here, as Dr. A. refers to it, I am now too wide awake -- like someone who finally pulls over to the shoulder of the asphalt highway after driving 14 hours across the prairies, high on coffee and cigarettes, only to find S/HE CANNOT GET TO SLEEP.
I am awake. AWAKE

I am disquietingly awake.

I don’t want to sleep anymore.

I would welcome the restful sleep of ignorance.

How to stay awake Sockajuwu?

How to stay here?

How to stay awake here?

And, there is my people sleeping

since a long time

but aren’t just dreams

the old cars without engine

parking in front of the house

or angry words ordering peace of mind

or who steals from you for your good

and doesn’t wanna remember what he owes you

sometimes I’d like to fall asleep too.

close my eyes on everything

But I can’t

I can’t.

I did not know I was waking up again. I did not know I was sleeping. I did not know waking again (c)(w)ould be so painful. I did not know. Like a woman sleepwalking in a snowstorm, I do know the importance of not falling asleep inside the cold.

Keep
Keep
Keep
Keep
walking
walking
walking
wa

I am proud of my ethnocultural identity. I am proud to be IndianNativeAboriginalMohawkCreeSiouxStoneyMichelBand heritage. I do not willingly self-identify as "Indian." Yet, in this context "Indian" seems to have meaning. Many labels related to my ancestry seem to have meaning. Am I awake now? Or, am I only dreaming. BUT! I am more than "Indian." I am also right-handed, heterosexual, lapsed Catholic, working class poor. However, whereas I could stop being right-handed, the status of "Indian" seems indelibly etched in the consciousness of 'Others'. However, pride in heritage and skillfully manipulating a few parallel rows of beads here & there are not the same as methodically analysing the depths of the psychopolitco-militarYSocioecologisspiritual violence and other carnage strengthening the resistance of The People, my ancestors, to enable the pride of my survivance. In the basement of the Main and Law libraries, where the "Indian" books are, I come to truly respect the meaning of 'survival'. I am, at times, grateful to be here, surprised to be here, proud.

Wake-up Calls

My wakefulness is fed by disparate events and conditions: post-modernism, Eber Hampton (1988), critical pedagogy, deconstructionism, Oneida scholar Dr. Chrisjohn’s humour
and knowledgableness, structuralism (and what comes after), neo- and post-colonialism, the First Nations House of Learning, discourse theory, post-Columbus consciousness (for example, Gerald Vizenor, 1994), Dr. Kirkness, revisionist history, my cousin, et cetera. Teaching two senior-level "Indian" courses at the post-secondary level hasn't helped me sleep well nights either. I had no idea that the price of admission to this post-secondary institution was to be a persistent case of Four Realm (that is, feelings, actions, thoughts, spiritus) insomnia.

**Ignorance is Bliss(ful)?**

Not Really.

Not really. No.

No.

No ignorance is only ignorance.

what we can't face looks for us anyway

(Trudell, 1994, n.p.)

**But what happens when I think-feel too much?**

When I begin to think-feel, 'Gee, maybe, Calliou you are a Prisoner of War' (see, for example, Black Elk, 1990 in Trudell, 1994, n.p.) and that makes sense. When I consider that Jesus! God! In! Heaven!, there's an allout "shameful, secret war" between Native and non-Native peoples (see Charleston, 1994, p. 15), and that makes sense too.

When I study-think-sift-feel serious, academic print-text about myself and my presumed learning style (see, for example, Walker, Dodd & Bogelow, 1989), my right-hemispheric
brain-mind activity (see, for example, Ross, 1982), my linguistic integrity lost to foreign linguistic imperialism (see, for examples, Battiste, 1987; or Johnston in New, 1991), my schooling as internal colonialism – not, ah, academic excellence (see, for examples, Altbach & Kelly, 1978; Perley, 1993), I hurt\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\textasciitilde some more.

When I begin to deconstruct the (il)logic of (pre)(as)sumptions about myself, my mom and dad, my grandfathers and grandmothers, my brothers, my sisters and my cousins, our Land-Mother and BIGHOLYMANIFESTING, I laugh at the absurdity. Then I stop abruptly because all of these (pre)(as)sumptions are an ideological materiality affecting me.

When I begin to locate other (il)logical subsets of textuality about The People and my dignity, my resistance, my intelligence, my strength, my technology, my epistemology, my values, my very present since time immemorial, I hoot\&whoop because We/I survive.

"Hey," I'd say aloud while interpreting a stretch(y) (of) text about us, "That's me, my mom, my dad, my brother, my PEOPLE, written and writhing about inside those polished, published words-statements-paragraphs-texts. You better justify that with more than a footnote or cross-reference citation to some 'research'."

And, eventually,

I hear,

I hear the sounds of rattles.

Rattles startle, awaken, heal, vanquish, calm, protect,
& sing with deep memories.
I have deep memories which breathe-reside-in-me. In one dream, I am out on the prairies, running; a coolish, low-sun impact kinda day. I am loping purposefully. I am obviously on a discovery patrol. I am black. I have a grey companion. I am somewhat anxious. I am coming to the crest of hills and I see an enclosed structure. I dislike the presence, the presence of permanence. So I run some more. I am a Black Wolf. I run to another crest. I see another structure. Another crest. Another structure. Another&another. I am running hard now. I am beginning to panic. I sense the compassion of my companion running with me, running without judgement to view-feel what I view-feel. I feel I must find someplace they are not. I run to a final crest and look long at the wooden, square structure. I agonise with the understanding that they are here everywhere. I turn my head and retreat. I comprehend that I can’t get back to where I once belonged. Now I am awake and I sense-see them here -- everywhere; their buildings, highways and shopping malls sunk into the blood, dust, bones and ashes of my people. Sunk deep. I must learn to accept that they are here. I must learn to accept change. I must learn to accept change with compassion.
Statement of Interest: Whose?

I think-feel-know now that some of my committee members desire that I articulate some of the sounds of these beautiful, soothing, alarming, startling rattles I hear; the meanings therein; and the effects of such meanings on me as I pursue a Doctorate of Philosophy in a Faculty of Education at a EuroCanadian university. Frankly, their dogged prodding to make me produce this self-reflexive, autobiographical excursion eludes me. I no longer have my enthusiasm(s) for post-modern juxtapositional authority; wherein, as Lather (1991) – and others – recommend that "to write 'postmodern' is to write paradoxically aware of one's complicity in that which one critiques" in order to "at once" inscribe and subvert (p. 10). I feel compelled to move on into unpioneered territory, to deconstruct further the language construction related to the his/herstory of my schooling. I am unconcerned about complicity and self-conscious subversion. Not yet, though. I am encouraged-instructed to write about this journey as a female, graduate student of First Nations Ancestry. Would the study be as popular if instructed to write about this journey as a First Nations graduate student of a Catholic upbringing.

In fact,

one committee member states that I am not writing about schooling or education or even "Indian education." 'Terrific,' I mutter silently to myself, 'A little late to get into a Ph.D. candidacy in political science or law'.

I talk often to myself up here.

Although I once wrote, "I was the research," (Calliou, 1994, February, p. 73), I am not comfortable with making that public. I want to and I don't want to expose these events and conditions of violence and elation, depression and laughter, animation and paralysis. I did not come here with any "foreshadowed problems" (see, Malinowski, 1922, pp. 8-9) about my institutionalised schooling voyage or about "Indians." I did not come here to be a performance
art case study of one who is "nouveau statused . . . in transition from one position to another where the tensions of new experience are vivid" (see, Dean, Eichorn & Dean, 1967, p. 285 re.: typology of informants). I did not come here to write about myself. Even if I agreed, how would I do this? Suppose I put my freshly sprouted enthusiasm on hold and shelve my examination of selected, published, print passages (16xx-1994) [to expose] my reactions to the (re)presentations of a particular phenomenon of schooling for a population diversely identified as, for examples, Savages, Amerindian (Calliou, 1995, November, p. 1, unfinished.) et ceteras? Suppose I get back rather than move on? How would I do this?

Research Needs Data

I have not kept descriptive or interpretive field notes. Do I flick on a tape recorder and interrogate myself, using different 'voices' for interviewer and interviewee? Why don't I trust myself to (re)tell this pilgrimage of post-secondary education? Well, there are issues of design credibility and reliability (for example, triangulation; see, for example, McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, pp. 187-196, re. credibility, internal and external validity, etc.). One does not desire, as Dr. M. cautioned in my EDUC508 (Introduction to Educational Research Methods class) to "create an artificial picture of a situation" (Calliou, Journal Entry, 25-01-1991). How credible is my eyewitness testimony? I am awfully opinionated. I am prone to hyperbole. Of course, I could 'lie my head off'. What a curious colloquialism. The image created is deliciously absurd. Just as one tells one lie too many, does one's head just plop off at the neck just below the ears? I could be all of this. However, 'trained' ethnographers are invited by some (for example, Dean & Whyte, 1958) to look beyond the truthfulness of the informant and observe rather
what the informant’s statements reveal about his or her feelings and perceptions, and what inferences can be made from these about the actual environment or events he or she has experienced (cited in Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, p. 112).

O.K., O.K., so even lies have interpretive value.

Self-given eyewitness testimony is not my understanding of the usual basis of credible research. But who may I go to and ask for such personal data? Usually, the researcher ventures afield (usually off-campus) and carefully collects testimony (that is, data) from eyewitnesses (that is, informants) to the point of saturation (that is, enough already); and then performs something "scientific" and "disciplined" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, pp. 6-7). The researcher quests to verify known information or to generate different data; perhaps, even to verify, to falsify or to generate theory (Ibid., p. 7). Additionally, interviewing myself, is not exactly a typical example of ethnographic, multimethod corroboration (See, McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, pp. 397, 399).

After almost five years on-campus, I did not come here to intentionally select myself -- or, "Indians" -- as "unit(s) of analysis" of a "phenomenon which the researcher selects to understand in depth regardless of the number of sites, participants, or documents for a study" (Ibid., p. 180). As well, data collection (with precision) and theory generation are not usually described as fun-filled activities.

This is serious and hard (read: scholarly) Puritan Work Ethicism, which Weaver (in Tokarcyzk & Fay, 1993), herself a "Mennonite Hard Worker," describes as more about "individual achievement" than "community building" (p. 119). As someone with workaholic tendencies, I thought-felt I did not perceive engaged 'scholarly' endeavour as play. Yet, I confess that writing is, for me, mostly good fun. Is it serious investigation to sit in my study (Ah, too grandiose, try back corner of my bedroom), (mis)(dis)comprehending signifiers of (en)(de)coded text? I did not come here to play and have fun. That is not scholarly.
I came here to,

here to

hear/not hear

here to...?
PART I: EMOTION IN COGNITION; COGNITION IN EMOTION

what we can't face looks for us anyway

(Trudell, 1994, n.p.)

rattle-RATTLE-rattle-RATTLE

Who Knows Where & When These Things

Begin Really --

[The research setting: A basement room. Sound of chairs scraping. Well, not exactly scraping because the floor is carpeted with the ugliest, orange, shag rug this side of Texas. Each shag is about 1.5 inches long. Sound of questions muttered aloud. "Like, so how do you want us to begin?" and "How did you find me?" Sound of phone cord being yanked out of the wall. Sound of John Trudell singing somewhere in the room. Sound of digital clock numbers clacking. Sound of eager pens snapping. Sound of cigarette smoke rising.]

**Interviewer:** This is from a paper you wrote throughout 1994-95 wherein you wanted to clarify that curriculum itself may be quite benign, but Intentionality holds more clues about overt outcomes (Calliou, 1994-95, December-February). Is this a place to begin the interview?

[Pause while awaiting assent. Slightly agitated movements with spiral of a coil notebook.]

I thought this might be an appropriate place to begin the, ah, our interview.

**Interviewee:** Hhhmmm, never considered text a locational place before, ah, I like that. I've probably spent more time in books than in the bush.
I tend, lately, to begin stories at the south as I believe most stories and teaching and learning have emotional content, currents and undertows brought through this Great Wind of interspecies contact. The emotional realm is symbolized through the element of water. Without water, there is no life. Without emotions, there is also no life. Emotions, like water, can flow in rivulets or oceans. Emotions denied become frozen, like water solidified, which is still in motion at a slowed molecular level. Frozen water is still water. Even frozen emotions are still emotions.

The season of summer suggests that our emotional realm needs to be nurtured and that our emotions fertilize action, thought and spiritus. A symbolic association with adolescence suggests that over-identification with intense feelings can result in actions of turbulent impetuosity. However, without our emotional world, we are lost for one cannot cognate joy nor intellectualize tears to fall at the death of a loved one nor feel satisfaction in our actions. Our emotions are always evident, but I find that my emotions are often buried in an intellectual life. Yet the emotions are there as subverted text, a motivation to articulate a statement (Calliou, 1994-95, pp. 12-13).
I thought-felt South, with the Emotional Realm, might be a place to begin the interview and then to proceed West (Physical), North (Cognitive) and East (Spiritual).

[Interviewer hesitates. Waits for response from the interviewee about the delineation of the Four Directions of the interview. None forthcoming. More 'thick' silence, which is difficult to describe. Interviewer wonders if this would be a time to write a field note, that is a written personal account (usually considered a private document) of the event from the point-of-view of the ethnographer who is interviewering (see, for example, Pratt in Clifford, 1990, pp. 47-70). Interviewer wonders how long one should decently wait for a response.]

**Interviewee:** Not certain, I'm comfortable with that. I caution in that piece that this linearity is dangerous, because starting at the Southern Realm may seem to privilege emotion and artificialize "feelings as a pre-cognitive phase in an attempt to isolate the affective from the cognitive realm" (Calliou, 1994-95, p. 23). There is also a, er, or, the tendency to begin a linear recitation: "Here an emotion, there a thought, and over there a sensation" [Interviewee's emphasis].

There is, I believe, emotion in cognition; cognition in spiritus; action in emotion; spiritus in action, sensation in action et cetera. And, these four key terms -- emotional, physical, cognitive, spiritual -- are umbrella terms for subsets; for example, intuition inside of cognition. I do not recognize where I inherited, constructed, discovered or otherwise acquired this belief.

[Interviewee continues speaking, reciting from the unpublished paper under discussion.]
These realms are connected, in simultaneous operation, and thus, such particularization contradicts my understanding of the non-linear sense of the Medicine Wheel teachings. Therefore, this four-part construction I have begun to use for papers becomes, perhaps, a dangerous sequential reductionism where: ‘First, we look at the emotional, then we look at the physical, etc.’. For convenience, however, I use this step-by-step process because I understand the underlying wholistic relationality as foundation (Calliou, 1994-95, p. 23).

[Interviewee stops reading. Pause on tape again. Participant continues speaking.]

If we go South, then we must pioneer West and so on. I want it understood that I, er, that I be aware that this is an organisational device. I don’t desire that this use of directions be immortalized like Novak and Gowan’s Vee (1984, pp. 55-75). Besides, the Medicine Wheel is not ‘mine’ and I was not raised in this tradition. I’ve adopted the Medicine Wheel as a means to re(turn)(place) some integ(rit)y(ration) into myself, which became very disconnected at this university, located on the traditional territory of the Musqueam. The directions are like natural terms, a kind of coding perhaps?

Integration, integrity, integrate are stimulating words. The root is Latin, integer; that is, in, equal to "before" and tangere, meaning "touch" (see Hawkins & Allen, 1991, pp. 737, 476). There suggests to me that within this definition related to wholeness, to a completeness, that entirety exists preexistent to touch. Perhaps, when we begin to touch, we begin to discern and feel individu(al)(ated) parts. Awareness of separate pieces emerges. How to reconnect? I find that when I begin to speak-write of this heuristic, then I get agitated because I begin the dismantling and I worry about that.
So, Medicine Wheel thinking-feeling-sensing-spirit-ing reminds me to address more than the cognitive realm of research I do, that, ah, within the Wheel, emotional (or, affective), physical, cognitive (or, mental, intellectual) and spiritual realms are all of one piece, which can be symbolised as one circle. And, a circle is, itself, an abstraction. A circle is not a three-dimensional curve so drawn that all 'points' (not solid) are equidistant from a center. In this construct, which represents egalitarianism, no point is privileged. So, if we begin here, I get agitated; because I want to avert the trading of a linear sequential format for a circular sequential organisation. I think-feel-believe-worry that circularity becomes a constriction which may force too literal a linearity. Thus, I believe that I am viewing, er, and, also comprehending a multi-dimensionally interconnected tension of events connected with the energies of relat(ionality)(tionships) in a continuum of past-present-future. Or, at, least, I try to see that.

[Pause.]

So easy to speak so idealistically. I constantly remind myself that I can't abuse the Medicine Wheel as some experimental methodology; the Medicine Wheel is Sacred, given to the two-leggeds by the Creator/THEBIGHOLYMANIFESTINC. I have to reverence that, learn-remember how to reverence this sacredness.

**Interviewer:**

[Unexpectedly finding a moment for a question.]

Ah, so, is this some form of cultural (re)appropriation? That is, adopting as yours something which is not?

**Interviewee:** I have (re)considered that. Wendy Rose (1992) writes some hard hitting, honest words in a chapter "The Great Pretenders, Further Reflections on Whiteshamanism." She opens with this quotation from Margo Thunderbird (1988):
They came for our land, for what grew or could be grown on it, for the resources in it, and for our clean air and pure water. They stole these things from us, and in the taking they also stole our free ways and the best of our leaders, killed in battle or assassinated. And now, after all that, they've come for the very last of our possessions; now they want our pride, our history, our spiritual traditions. They want to rewrite and remake these things, to claim them for themselves. The lies and thefts just never end (Thunderbird cited in Rose, 1992, p. 403).

On what/whose author(ity) do I adopt this heuristic approach to consider the integr(ity)(ation) of observations or findings or understandings? My book teachings are extremely limited (Pepper & Henry, 1986; Sunbear, Wind & Mulligan, 1991). I also had a conversation with Floy Pepper (1993), and, later with Cy Eagleheart, at a Medicine Wheel gathering in August of 1994. Since then I have attended two other Medicine Wheel gatherings. Each Wheel was different. I continue to listen-watch hard and learn; more, like meditate-absorb.

I do not adopt with disrespect. I do not adopt for gain. In appropriation, there is the sense of exploitation, particularly, for financial gain. You can't eat money though.

[Laughter on tape. Pause.]

The integrative potential of the Medicine Wheel makes sense to me. Not to adopt the Medicine Wheel because I am not of that culture assumes a certain essentialism that only those born to an ideology may be of that persuasion. Therefore, only born Catholics can be(gat) Catholics. Also assumed is that one is in stasis, frozen inside what one is born to in this life. This is becoming a poor 'rationalisation' too close to fabrication to give an interviewer a satisfactory answer.

I always identify myself as not a Medicine Wheel 'expert'. Until I am told I am trained, I would not go out and set up a Medicine Wheel. I do use the most basic of the teachings of integration and the need to pay attention to the Four Directions-Realms to organize my
feeling-doing-thinking-spiritusing. Is this cultural appropriation? I have come to believe that The Medicine Wheel is powerful enough to protect itself from my consciously deliberate or carelessly unconscious (mis)appropriation.

Adoption of Constructs. Whose?

Interviewee:

[Nods. Shrugs. Rolls a cigarette.]

Ironically, earlier in my research career, I never felt that I had trespassed into cultural appropriation when I adopted or appropriated the well-argued thoughts of other philosophers, theorists, social critics, whatever. For example, Antonio Gramsci’s (1891-1937) explanatory concept is known as hegemony, wherein classes are persuaded to accept-self-adopt-support the system of beliefs (moral, cultural, social, etc.) held by those in power (see, for example, Gramsci, trans. by Hoare & Nowell-Smith, 1995, pp. 12-13). Later in my teaching career here, I do question my attribution of this understanding "of the ‘spontaneous’ consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group" to Gramsci (trans. by Hoare & Nowell-Smith, 1995, p. 12). He is the published author(ity), but I feel I am participating in the (re)marginalisation of indigenous thought by citing this authority over an indigenous author(ity) even if they don’t use the same four-syllable word. That’s just one moment of the existential nausea I experience; the sense that be-ing-ness is limited with prevalent forms of thought, which here are born of the ‘Master&Mistress’ house, er, laboratory.

Interviewer: So you use Gramsci (1995) cautiously, but don’t consider that Sacred?

Interviewee: Initially, I didn’t think of his words as Sacred. Yet I do respect his thinking-feeling to look, to wake up, to say to others, “Wake Up and Look!” So now I use his
words by saying his name. Hegemony, for now, functions as a sign I give meaning to when I need to represent actions-thoughts-feelings which maintain an irreverent imbalance. All words have power. I feel the responsibility of trying to communicate his insightfulness respectfully and responsibly to undergraduates. In a way, I’ve come to see these oral and print bibliographic citations as an act of respect for exemplary thinking. However, the (re)enactment of citation to only one author(ity) creates a monocultural textuality. This monolithism is what concerns me, unnerves me.

[Pause on tape. Interviewer checks equipment. Mutters aloud, "Look’s like everything’s taping." Shuffles through sheets of paper while trying to reassemble an interior understanding of the sequence of the interview.]

Interview Layout

**Interviewer:** Yes, well, appropriation, that was interesting. Ah, to return to the beginning of this interview. I located the four areas of ‘existential nausea’ you mentioned earlier and these appear to ‘fit into’ the Four Directions/Realms of the Medicine Wheel. For example:

1) Part I: Anemotional Co(gni)(ondi)tioning

   (SOUTH - EMOTIONAL),

2) Part II: The sociospiritueocopoliticocultural 'White' Noise of Researching

   (WEST - PHYSICAL),

3) Part III: Canonicity: Euroheritageizationing

   (NORTH - COGNITIVE), and

4) Part IV: Acculturative Secularizing (EAST - SPIRITUAL)
Of course, I understand that you mention that four is a significant number, **but not the** [Interviewer’s emphasis.] number. For example, Hampton (1988) uses Six directions to construct a foundational model for education for PFNA. In reviewing his interview data, the textual (inter)connections led to his search for a non-Euro ‘model’, "metaphor or a pattern" to illustrate the subsets of relations. He includes two additional directions -- above and below -- to represent Sky Father and Earth Mother. Some others include a Seventh direction, this being for the Ancestors (Hampton, 1988, pp. 15-16).

**Interviewee:** Yes, Four. Don’t you think-feel your segments fit almost too neatly?

[Laughter.] I wonder how that happened? [More chortles.] The parallelism is already askew [Even more chuckles] because I do not arrive here at this campus in the summer, associated with the south. But in some ways the story does begin with me being somewhat of an emotionally naive adolescent.

Now is that fair? I’m not exactly **une tabula adolescent rasa** when I arrive on this luxuriously forested campus, with flora in full-force bloom at the most unlikely times of the year. I’m from Alberta where we do not plant gardens until after Queen Victoria’s birthday. Even that’s a little risk-taking because it can snow in July. I have some rather strong opinions, emotions and beliefs when I arrive here to study with Dr. A.

I am not unaware, for examples, of feminism or the civil rights movement or ethnocultural oppression or or genocide. What I am, maybe, more naive about is the whole privileging of rationality (‘the mind’, purportedly located in the ‘brain’ or ‘head area’ somewhere). So, I am naive, but certainly not inexperienced. Anyway, what were you asking?

**Interviewer:** Should we run through the directional associations now?

**Interviewee:** No. Let’s position them with each focus area of discussion as these directional powers are encountered.

**Interviewer:** O.K.
[Interviewer shuffles through papers, looking for appropriate question. Interviewee sits quietly waiting.]

**Snowstorms**

**Stories**

**Interviewer:** You've been here since January of 1991 now? What do you remember about the start of this graduate student career? Ah, maybe, we should start with your arrival.

[Coaxing]

Would that be someplace to begin?

**Interviewee:** Usually, when I lead a (read)(decode)er south, I begin with a story.

[Light Aside: highly manipulative indication that this research quest begins where I direct.]

These are sometimes humorous or sorrowful or sad or elated or amused. Through the storytelling I desire to (re)establish some sense of and/or response from the affective domain. Such introductions might be considered manipulative hooks; however, for me, the stories are attempted prompts to communicate some of my intuited subtext of a topic. As I explore some of those human intangibles or ineffables that illustrate that there is emotion in cognition; that emotion and cognition are not divorced, I am bewildered as to how to communicate such findings. And, these feelings – if not numbed-out by cognitive-based primacy – are also part of the active part of (ap)(com)prehension. I believe that part of re(cogniz)(coup)ling justice is feeling justice [Interviewee’s emphasis], with emotional and physical certainty. For example, I think justice can also be experienced kinesthetically. There is a Four Realm ‘Good’ Feeling inside and around us.
And stories assist and accompany the mental gymnastics. The Medicine Wheel reverses a traditional (O.K., patriarchal, perhaps) derogation of emotional (teach)(learn)ings as suspect, not serious or concocted by a silly heart.

So, let’s start with a story. Hhhmmm, am I becoming too predictable?

VIA Snowstorms

In January of 1991, I arrive in a freakish snowstorm silencing the cosmopolitan noise of a city I consider a second home. I love the ocean. Normally, the train ride is about 18 hours; however, the snowfall elongated the trip to approximately 57 hours. As usual, my life is tinged with irony. I had imagined myself taking my first long-distance train trip with a goodly amount of dignity and decorum (that is, leisurely meals served in style, cigarettes in the smoking lounge, the penning of ‘scholarly’, descriptive and potentially publishable letters about the ‘Canadian’ landscape, etc.). Instead, the train trek became a nightmarish overturning of expectations, as I illustrate in this letter I wrote 07-01-91.

Dearest M --: We are at a standstill again! Sided with another split rail.

This romance with trains may be short-lived. The train departed 4.5 hrs. late from Edmonton. We did not arrive in Jasper [Alberta] until 9:00 P.M. - which is normally a 5.5 hr. car ride on wintery highways. Then we sat in Jasper for ages. The train was only @ Blue River when I awoke this morning, not even to Kamloops [British Columbia] which we did not get to until 1030 this AM. There has been a grease fire in the kitchen and numerous 'situations'. The train is now low on water and unable to get
water at Boston Bar because the lines were frozen. This train is now 9.5 hrs. off schedule. Every minute regained seems to get lost again & again. Meals have been complementary today. Shee! I spent my first day, my first official day, as a graduate student on VIA Rail. I am beginning to wonder if I will get to talk with you ever...again...or wonder when I will begin graduate studies. I am just now beginning to weary of the whole nonsense. . . . Dinner is now delayed due to water shortage & they are rationing coffee. They are talking about bringing up the buses as the train is running out of H₂O and steam is an essential component of the energy system here. Winds have been gusting up to 70 MPH (Calliou to Alexander, personal communication, January 7, 1991, p. 1).

[Note to researcher/interviewer: "Personal communications may be letters, memos, telephone conversations and the like. Because they do not provide recoverable data, personal communications are not included in the reference list. Cite personal communications in the text only (American Psychological Association, 1991, p. 110).].

[Interviewee continues speaking.]

In retrospect, the disparity between the expectations and experience of the train trek mirrors the ensuing disjuncture between my anticipation of graduate school and the realit(y)(ies). Fits. I'm very nearsighted. Maybe, my nearsightedness sets me up with expectations which get quickly overturned when I actually encounter what I only see in a blur in the distance.

Expectations Overturned
The Very Idea of Being A Researcher

**Interviewer:** Oh, overturned? How so?

**Interviewee:** Well, I don’t think—feel I came here to be a researcher. Actually, to be very truthful, I had no expectation whatsoever of coming here to do research and to become a researcher [Interviewee’s emphasis]; or to initiate a “continuing fascination with the research process itself” (Calliou, 1994, February, p. 72). At that time, research is for me the realm of stereotypical white lab coats, mice-for-hire, the reek of formaldehyde, the click of pens and the snap of clipboards. I am here because, as I state in a letter, that

I want to explore ideas and thoughts to take ‘Awareness’ with me to my next life for as you know I believe that only my physical body will someday die and that the ‘spiritus’ of Sharilyn is on quite a lengthy, extended journey (Calliou to Alexander, personal communication, February 25, 1991, p. II).

Anyway, I’m sorry; I think I am wandering from your question. Smoke?

[Interviewee jabs an open package at the interviewer.]

Well, then, do you mind if I smoke?

[Interviewee doesn’t wait for a response from the Interviewer. She lights up anyway.]

I came to study with Dr. A. (formerly, Dr. W.), much experienced in community education practice. I came with, I think, a rather elegantly simple question. My primary research question was: ‘When is a field trip just a field trip; and when does it exhibit intentions of curriculum for community making?’ [Interviewee’s emphasis](Calliou, 1992, June, p. 14). I won’t bore you with the details of that particular theoretical study (see Calliou, 1992, July, for a
rather overqualified answer to that question.). I believe I thought-felt I would stop here a bit, do some thinking, answer my question and go back into a classroom somewhere in the universe.

The idea of even being a researcher is introduced to me on the first day of my Magistral studies. I write in a letter:

_\textit{I enclose a photocopy of Day 1's [i.e. UBC: Faculty of Education: EDUC508] handout in research. I feel like a peasant because I don't know any of this. The Director of this program came in and stressed the need that all UBC grad[s] in the Faculty of Education be exemplary researchers. The recommendation is that the Grad complete another course in a specialized area of research once the teacher-researcher has chosen the design methodology s/he will choose to do thesis work. . . . As the 3 hour lecture progressed I felt overwhelmed. . . . Much of the discussion seemed to me to be a rehash of the classical scientific method (Calliou to Alexander, personal communication, January 12, 1991, pp. 1,2,3).}_

Although I do not understand exactly what is entailed, I liked the sound of that phrase: "exemplary researcher." I am uncertain about my origin of a belief that university is a place where individuals just 'thought' deep 'thoughts' about their beliefs, mind puzzles and questions. For me, University is this rather private place to retreat to make sense; not a public forum of researched findings constructed from formulaic investigation designs. Boy was I wrong!

[Laughter on tape. Well more like guffaws, except guaffaws makes interviewee sound too raucous.] I guess, previously, I hadn't really considered who makes [Interviewee's emphatic aside: \textit{ah-hem}, for whom], or how, or where or when knowledge is made; and the implications and/or
consequences of knowledge production as the legitimation of privileged narratology (see, for example, Lyotard, 1993a, pp. 31-37). Now because I’ve been introduced to Lyotard’s (1993a) thought I can’t remember how I thought-believed the world was working. He observes that in postindustrial society and post-modern culture that the question of the legitimation of knowledge is formulated in different terms. The grand narrative has lost its credibility, regardless of what mode of unification it uses, regardless of whether it is speculative narrative or a narrative of emancipation (Lyotard, 1993a, p. 37).

I didn’t even know really that somebody or somebodies had been working towards a Grand Narrative – perhaps, trying to regain wholeness after the Tower of Babel business. I am startled that there has been – is – this dogmatic side to the knowledge industry. This dogmatism contradicts my sense of lifelong learning.

Anyway, I was unaccustomed to this kind of talk out there in the field while I supervised recess or taught Grade 5 art or helped Grade 2s set up a terrarium. Odd, because I had worked at a University Research Station as a Research Assistant. That would have been about 1976ish, I guess. Somewhere in the foothills, male scientists tracked Peromyscus maniculatus – that is, deer mice – in winter; retrofitted buildings to reduce gigajoule (that is, a measurement of heat) loss; and measured fecal bacteria counts in a sewage water recharge station. I guess, then, I did not really consider that these researchers were making discoveries with immediate consequence to the materiality of daily living – even into textbooks and classrooms. But if I think of it now! What did I think was happening?

**Interviewer:** So, you’re not yet at Michael Young’s (1971) “notion of knowledge being socially organized or constructed” (p. 19)?

**Interviewee:** Yes, exactly. I mean if I really search my memory banks, while I was at that research station, there was lots of talk about the discoveries, but there wasn’t any kind of
philosophical, er, ethical debate about the uses and abuses of knowledge making. These guys were pretty practical. There might have been some, but I wasn’t there for that kind of talk. Yet. I don’t shouldn’t make myself sound too naive because through observation I could see that the ‘men’ did the science at the research station and the women raised the children or worked in adjunct positions. I am observant enough to tabulate the number of males versus female ‘scientists’. However, I am not yet like Dorothy Smith (1987) in terms of considering research, theory, er, insights as a popularized patriarchal interpretation of what we are all supposed to know. She states that the templates of the thoughts and images which we do use are those which do not arise directly or spontaneously out of people’s everyday lived relationships.

Rather they are the product of the work of specialists occupying influential positions in the ideological apparatus . . . Our culture does not arise spontaneously; it is ‘manufactured’ " (p. 19).

Later, Julia Penelope’s (1990) P.U.D. (that is, Patriarchal Universe of Discourse) (see pp. xxvi-xxx) is really going to extend my sensibility and anxiety about patriarchal exclusion wherein certain ‘voices’ are considered inadmissable.

My awareness of knowledge, er, doctrine production becomes crucial; crystallised as I deconstruct published text related to myself as a laminated-card-carrying PFNA. This knowledge-making and knowledge-reification dexterity becomes quite emotionally disturbing, disabling and empowering for me as I continue in this epistemological-affective-spiritus odyssey. And, here I am not naive. I grasp, somehow, that this whole perform(ance)(ativity) of ‘knowledge’ (see Lyotard, 1993a, pp. 41-47) is about language -- words sequenced in certain order, logic -- and about genocide. The language thing connects quickly.

I think-feel-intuit this comes, partially, from my experience as a teacher using a Whole Language Approach as described in a British study called Language-for Life, originally published
in 1976. This study investigated "language skills within the context of teaching the use of English" (p. xxxi). As a teacher I then accepted the role – not the primary role – that "language plays in generating knowledge and producing new forms of behaviour that typifies human existence and distinguishes it from that of all other creatures" [Their italics.](Bullock, 1976, p. 47). However, I don't enter university archaeologizing (Foucault, 1972) knowledge-language-power and such. I enter here thinking that discursive is an adjective meaning 'roaming', 'rambling' or 'roundabout'.

[Laughter. Subject laughs readily at herself.]

Took me awhile to drink in, understand, the depthful meaning of the term, discourse, and Foucault's (1972) insights into discourse as a reoccuring presence of signs, unified by rules-relationships in interplay, which are, for him, too often "accepted without question" (Foucault, 1972, p. 25). Language becomes like a corral. The acceptance hegemony-like. If you're inside that corral, you better speak-accept like somebody inside that corral. If you're gonna question how you speak-write-accept-(ap)(com)prehend inside that corral – well, watch out! He recommends that we must define "in what conditions and in view of which analyses certain of them are legitimate; and we must indicate which of them can never be accepted in any circumstances" (Ibid., p. 26). So, his concept-insight is a little bit more than just jargon, specialized tech talk within or indicative of a field. Or, that's how I understand his idea.

What I am encountering and decoding in and out of the libraries here has me longing to rethink some of those years I was teaching reading comprehension, because this is supracomprehension. For me, to discern this discourse formation is to see language as an instrument of desire, an expression of will as a weapon of violence, as a form of imprisonment, et cetera. Whose will? Who wants to be violent? How is this violence justified? Why violence rather than compassion? Very powerful stuff for me. Any way – where were we here?
Ah, yes. In retrospect, I see how this belief about University as truly an 'Ivory Tower' think tank, led me into a clash [rattle-rattle-rattle-rattle] about having to justify my sense of thinking-feeling-intuiting-as-research, as valid a methodology as quantitative or qualitative templates. I am only speculating, but I think this belief is based on a childhood classist belief that wealthy people go to university. Hhhmmm...so only wealthy people have the luxury of time to think? No, that also almost sounds like wealthy people are smarter whereas socioeconomically impoverished individuals neither have time nor the ability.

[Pause on tape. Sounds of papers rustling.]

In fact, further in that same letter, I remark, that "I got into a dither trying to think about which research methodology I could use to answer questions" (Calliou to Alexander, personal communication, January 12, 1991, p. 3).

**Tracking an Unexpected Line of Inquiry**

["Non-directive questions, then, are relatively open-ended, rather than requiring the interviewee to provide a specific piece of information or, at the extreme, simply to reply 'yes' or 'no' " (Spradley, 1979 in Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, p. 113). In this case, the interviewer has located a 'key' term, that is, 'dither', allowing the subject-client-informant to expand the response about this confusion about locating an acceptable procedural form and sequence to conduct research.]

**Interviewee:** Ah, yes, a dither. By January 17, 1995, I am writing about the course requirement to create a hypothesis, to identify variables (dependent, independent, intervening, organic, plastic-fantastic et cetera), to frame hypotheses in 'testable' form, and generally to match a 'do-able' topic with 'do-able' design instruments (survey, closed-form questions, Lickert scales,
ethnographic interview questions, etc.). I try earnestly to use these qualitative and quantitative frameworks. Again, I'm a 'babe in the forest' because I did not expect to arrive here and be snowed in under jargon and technique. I did not see myself trying to self-educate myself to be a researcher. I also encounter, or, collide sickeningly into, unexpectedly into the W.W.S.

Introduction to the 'West'

Interviewer: The W.W.S.?

Interviewee: Yes, the Wall of Western Science, the W.W.S. In a journal entry, I write, at "Day 6 of Grad Studies:"

This whole narrowing and specifying made me feel that I was becoming too scientific. [Respondent's parenthetical aside: At Day 6 no less!] I felt some angry resentment that the wording and selection of topic would become almost too obscure to satisfy the requirements of the textbook requirements. I fairly howled with laughter and with rage when I read the statement: 'Certain philosophic and theological questions, which perhaps important to the individuals who consider them, cannot be tested empirically and are thus of no interest to science or the scientist' (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 20, quoted in Calliou, 1991), (Calliou, Journal entry, January 17, 1991, p. 2).

Interviewer: Ah, where would the West be for you?

Interviewee:

[Interviewee begins to speak and interrupts herself with laughter.]

Good question.
Everybody's west of somebody. I guess for me, 'Western' refers to one of those discourse things Foucault is insightful enough to locate. I don't refer to any specific geographic location - like Europe, per se; but more a mode of thought-feeling-believing, which seems to originate in Europe and this Westernized mode of thinking-feeling-believing becomes-is a colonizing agen(t)(cy).

Interviewer: Oh. So, even though you had worked at a 'scientific' research station, you had not really questioned the basis of science; ah, or, linked science with certain critiques related to patriarchal or dominant or ecocidic critiques?

Interviewee: Of course, Europe isn't really a continent physically. It's not surrounded by water like other continents. Anyway, ah, yes, your question. No, not really. I mean I kept getting hints. For example, I attended a bioregional congress (Maine, 1990) and really fell 'in love' with the idea of the deeply reverential belief structure for all lifeforms held in deep ecology, as described by Devall and Sessions (1985). I think-feel I do that – fall in love with ideas. I am aware of the (eco-)feminist rumblings about Francis Bacon (1561-1626) being considered an off-Continent progenitor of a plan to discover more authentic explanations of nature, explicated as a 'scientific' method.

I even went and hunted up and bought Novum Organum – a 1947 version, not an original 1620 copy – to locate passages where he expresses his desire "to open a new way of understanding, a way by them The Off- untried and unknown" (p. 76) which he details as the scientific method (Section LXXII, pp. 115-116). Bacon's "them" refers to off-continent ancients. Their Elders I guess. I have no desire to roast Bacon. However, emotionally, I start to get both agitated and satisfied because the critique starts to explain – if, explanation is ever possible – some of the insensitive and ecocidal activities I had witnessed while working on a seismic crew in Alberta (1974ish). I mean I am naive. I must have watched trucks running up and down
roads in the foothills for weeks before I asked our Party Manager [Aside: That's the nickname for the Assistant Crew Boss.] what they were hauling. I was told that they were filled with chemicals to pour into the ‘hole’ to make drilling easier. I wept when I really understood what chemicals and the dynamite meant as damage to our Earth-Mother. So, I come to university with practical experience, life his/herstory.

The encounters with the (de)constructive critique fleshes out some theoretical understanding of these experiences. I feel satisfied that I am learning to articulate some of my misgivings; but I also always seem to feel uneasy. I don’t then give enough credit to the materiality of ideas or ideology. Working seismic and collecting the paycheque is a human, a two-legged, decision. I collected some of those paycheques. So much for my ethics? These paycheques pay for the completion of my B.Ed. Tears, in retrospect, were probably not enough to repair the disrespectful, unethical behaviour coded as oil exploration or resource development or making a living. If self-editting becl worry that what I describe next may be considered very, very New Age cliche. That’s a problem, lately, for me. I fear sloganization. Insight gets sloganized. Slogans are too glib. We know the slogans, but the self-discipline of action is where there seems to be less success. However, I do believe that what we do to Earth-Mother, we do to ourselves. Amazing, how children of ‘God’ or THEBIGHOLYMANIFESTING (my translation of the Sioux, Wankan Takan) self-rationalize behaviour which is not reverent. And, no one up here in this forest of cement & brick & stone buildings is talking about how our (dis)(un)(re)covered knowledge production process might be considered firstly as reverential; that, the BIGHOLYMANIFESTING is influenced by each word, thought, action, feeling that is performed, wherein even thought is performance and has consequence production.

**Interviewer:** [Interrupting]. Well, it is a relativist positioned world. People do get to make their own decisions, make up their own minds. There’s no overarching dogma. I mean you are not suggesting shutting down the entire oil industry? What about jobs?
Interviewer stops speaking abruptly. Looks to interviewee, who does not respond in any manner. Abandoning the spontaneous spiel, interviewer continues with another spontaneous interview question.

Yes, you mentioned once that you were told that you belonged in the theology department of this campus?

**Interviewee:** Oh, how did you hear that? I was. Yes, at this campus, located on the traditional territory of the Musqueam, I was told this. No witnesses, but true. Should I comment upon this theology business now? Later as you demarcated in Part IV?

[Long pause on the tape saturated with the smells of a grilled cheese sandwich.]

Interviewee is thumbing through old copies of research texts. Muttering, interviewee continues.

We should go back and check that Kerlinger (1973) reference as I did not note title, place of publication and publisher in the journal entry. Your committee will be on you for that. Now -- ah, yes, now where were we? By the sixth day of graduate school, I am howling with laughter and rage and feeling frightened and writing imaginary responses to scientists.

[Respondent-informant-subject-interviewee reads verbatim from a journal.]

[While the respondent is reading, interviewer makes a quick note: Question: I wonder if I could ask if I could make photocopies of the journal entries and provide the documentation needed for the relentless committee questions re. sources. Do all these photocopies go into some massive appendix? Help this thing will end up weighing 2.4 kilograms.]

*I find the frightening tone of this dismissive statement to be a bit scary and a confirmation of the criticisms of science. This statement exemplifies trying to shut out the human (& most intriguing) side of who we are. But this is somehow not measurable and can't exist ...how sad; how*
shortsightedly dogmatic. The blase and definiteness of the assertion that these are question of 'no interest' really made me want to cry out 'But hold on Dr. Kerlinger... (Calliou, Journal entry, January 17, 1991, p. 2).

[Informant stops. Stretching, she reaches for a thesaurus.]

these are important questions: especially to educators - community or otherwise - where the technique, art or science is fraught with all manner of difficult, ethical questions.

As I reread this journal entry, I am surprised at the powerful emotive words there - angry, frightening, sad, resentful - at this early day of graduate studies. I am already struggling with the epidemic prohibition of certain ways of (observe)(comprehend)ing and the legitimation of certain topics of investigation, the despiritualisation of knowledge-making and the privileging of certain voices. This surprises me. I am disconcerted as I reread about that sixth day of graduate studies. I do not imagine that I will become a detective to delegitimate accepted boundaries or ways of understanding. Eventually, it's books like Foucault's (1972) The Archaeology of Knowledge which confirm my need to question, which invites that, [w]e must also question those divisions or groupings with which we have become so familiar. Can one accept, as such, the distinction between dis(courses)(ciiplines) like philosophy, science, religion (p. 22)?

I extend this inquiry into the 'political' realm while studying articles to background myself for teaching EDUC442, critical issues in schooling for PFNA. I continue to wander about the emergence of a discipline sanct(ion)(ifi)ed as Native Studies, to consider the formulation of this dis(cipline)(course).

How Stories Are Encoded:

An Example
For example, McShane (1984) recounts the horror-filled tale of a second grade Ojibwe child who was recommended for treatment after his daydreaming was diagnosed as mildly psychotic. 'Observation' indicated more than this and he was diagnosed as having behavioural and emotional problems. "School personnel had often observed him staring vacantly off into space; often he was so slow completing his work and he told 'wild' stories at times saying they were true" (p. 81). However, when a Social Worker of FNA became involved, she found the boy and grandparents in strong relationships. The grandfather "encouraged his daydreaming" and had instructed him to follow this impulse whenever it happened — to strengthen that gift; another avenue of awareness. The grandfather mentors and guides in discussion of these dreams with his grandson. Thus, the perception of another way of apprehension is not even considered by the school personnel.

The schooling experience here is, perhaps, unintentional in that a belief sustains ignorance of this curricular-instructional experience occurring between child and grandparent. There are those Foucauldian language rules in operation about how situations are labelled, encoded, diagnosed and the language entails consequence production in addition to determining whom shall be classified as ill, unwell, unbalanced — marginalised — and who shall not.

And, I don't even think the primary emphasis here should be on "Indian" grandparent and "Indian" child because that coding reifies, ah, mystifies, "Indians." In the process of mysticalizing the 'visionary' "Indian" this venue of what is called dream(ing) is safely anomalised, delegitimated. Yet, again not considered seriously as a valid, credible, legitimate form of (ap)prehension. Certainly not a behaviour or set of behaviours (physical, mental et cetera) to be nurtured in classrooms. Help, where's the textbook on vision questing?

Who would take seriously a vision quest as a research paradigm? This is a highly self-reflexive methodology with as much protocol as setting up an experimental design with selection of variables, stratified random sampling and appropriate instrumentation. When these
potentialities of epistemological creation-discovery-insight are considered, they appear to be exotic, magical and/or sorcery. These ways of (ap)(com)prehending become marginalised, not a part of the explicit (regular, traditional) curriculum by making them exotic - somehow not necessary for everyday living in the late 20th century. I am aware that prejudice is extended beyond simple physical acts of exclusion (for example, "Indians" not allowed in alcohol-serving establishments) or spiritual acts of 'Otherisation' (for example, coding "Indian" worship as pagan). There is also the denial of methods of coming to know – I like that original Latin meaning of cognition, cognisere equals 'coming to know'. There is in that word a sense of continuous coming - ing - to know; no finality, an ambiguity, capturing a sense of motion.

I remember now that I fiercely applied myself to skimming and studying about research - anything on the shelf in the old Curriculum Library. Mmm, miss the comfort of that garden behind Scarfe. You could catch some great sunshine there and people had brought in all these plants for their own reasons and you could feel the energy of that little garden. Anyway – I'd just sit and decipher this strange (toy)(beast)(puzzle). Sometimes, I make notes, but, generally, I don't. I'm a lousy note maker and I seldom refer to them anyway. I just go back to the book and (re)digest a chunk of text. In the (re)reading, I sometimes forget why I returned to that 'place'.

[Pause on tape, punctuated with the crinkle of the foil of a cigarette package.]

[Interviewer's note: Question: How do I tactfully discuss the dangers of second-hand smoke?]

Obviously, I had been constructing the wrong bibliographies before I hit Kerlinger (1973). For example, Scheffler's (1967) praise of philosophers of education and the analysis of their value. He states, (and I leave the passage with his original use of the male pronoun):

[Reading from Scheffler's text. Remarkably, she locates the passage, from the shelves of a modestly-stocked at-home library, without referring to notes.]
Such an analysis, indeed, exemplifies the contribution the philosopher of education can make when he conceives his function to be neither the spinning out of implications from general doctrines nor the authoritative pronouncement of basic and intermediate values for the guidance of schools [Interviewee adds the parenthetical aside -- and field trips, I suppose. Punctuation of light giggling.]. He can try to clarify our fundamental ways of thinking about education: the concepts we employ, the inferences we make, and the choices we express. He can render explicit the criteria of judgment we use in reaching educational decision. He can test our common assumptions indirectly by striving for a systematic picture that will embrace them all. He can analyze the major positions taken on issues of educational policy by exposing their premises, consequences and alternatives. In sum, he can improve our understanding of educational contexts and the problems they generate [His italics.] (Scheffler, 1967, p. 5).

Of course, no one dare construct that all-embracing "systematic picture" anymore in light of the POMO fear of grotesque narratology. There are other texts. One of my favourites is The Logic of Education (Hirst & Peters, 1979; Orig. 1970). Yes, yes, these are all men. Scary, because it's just like Code's (1991) observation that womyn in 'Western' society inhabit this male-thoughtform-constructed exterior 'reality' wherein the structures and limits of their knowledge are derived from the experiences of a select, intellectually and socially privileged group of men: the philosophical system builders. This suggestion affords a partial explanation of the cognitive dissonance many female and feminist philosophers experience with the ontological divisions embedded in mainstream epistemology (p. 61) his/herstoriically and currently.
I should cite a womyn. How about Roland Martin’s *Changing the Educational Landscape, Philosophy, Women, and Curriculum* (1994)? Of course, womyn in philosophy is contentious. Do you recall that scene, er, where Martin weaves in Woolf’s thesis regarding her desire for requiring a room of one’s own to describe Martin’s trip to “the philosophy of education shelves” (p. 125).

’Where is the book on gender and education by Dr. X, that woman who was a candidate last year for a position in this university?’ I asked the librarian once I found my way through the catacombs? ’I do not see it on your shelves.’ ’We have been advised that it is sociology and not philosophy,’ she said. ’What about the treatise on past women philosophers of education by Dr. Y who was on the short list the year before? On loan?’ ’For that one, you will have to go to the history library,’ she told me. ’May I venture to inquire as to the whereabouts of the slim volume on the education of girls and women by Professor Z, the women whose tenure decision is still in limbo?’ This query seemed to stump her but gaining confidence from a short computer search she announced, as if she had seen just about enough of me, that for this one you will have to go to the women’s studies shelves. Feeling a good deal less exhilarated than I had when I walked in, I muttered that it looked as if women doing philosophy of education were not doing philosophy of education. ’We put the books where we are told,’ she protested as I stomped out (p. 125).

What a feel she has for scenes, eh? Anyway, I retell Jane’s story because as I enter this research-process-business I forget all about the D.O.M.
Interviewer: The D.O.M.?

Interviewer: Yes, the Domain Of Men. "Oh! Oh!" here comes this womyn (& an "Indian" too) who is contemplating doing philosophy.

[Interviewee pauses and looks out the window. Mutters to herself: 'I keep forgetting gender, sexual preference, age and all that seem to matter so terribly to some people.]

Excuse me a minute.

[Pause. The sound of rather thick coffee being poured into a Royal Dalton coffee mug; saucer absent. No, I made that part up. Actually, it's a plastic travel mug from Motomaster, "...an environmentally considerate motor oil" (Motomaster, date unknown).]

Interviewee: [Continuing.] Like Roland-Martin, I observe the obligatory placement of text authored by PFNA placed in the specialized book ghettos on- and off-campus. I remember once I ransacked a Seattle bookstore looking for another copy of Exiled in The Land of The Free (Lyons, Mohawk, Deloria, Jr., Hauptman, Berman, Grinde, Jr., Berkey & Venables, 1992). I'd lent mine to someone and needed another copy to check a page number reference. Disappointed, I notified my spousal unit that I could not locate the text ANYWHERE! He advised that I seek in the Native American section of the bookstore. Sure enough, there the edition solidly sat. But this is a political science text chronicling the embedded discourse of PFNA on the formation of U.S. democracy – not quite in the same league as Laubins' (1975; Orig. 1957), The Indian Tipi, Its History, Construction and Use! Of course, his/herstorically PFNA are stereotyped as unlettered and unschooled savages who are not astute historians, philosophers or political commentators.
[Pause on tape. Interviewer’s note to herself: When these pauses occur, how long should I let them go on? Maybe I should ask another question to keep the momentum?]

Interviewee: Remember that pioneer researcher George Catlin?

Interviewer: Ah, researcher? Catlin? I think he was a painter.

Interviewee: I like to think of him as a researcher. Look again at Catlin’s (1989) purpose in this passage, written in 1832, where he exposes his devotion to documenting PFNA with a light heart, inspired with an enthusiastic hope and reliance that I could meet and overcome all the hazards and privations of a life devoted to the production of a literal and graphic delineation of the living manners, customs, and character of an interesting race of people, who are rapidly passing away from the face of the earth – lending a hand to a dying nation, who have no historians or biographers of their own to portray with fidelity their native looks and history; thus, snatching from a hasty oblivion what could be saved for the benefit of posterity (Catlin, 1989, Letter #1, p. 3).

Interviewer: Well, in 1832 PFNA aren’t known or published as philosophers or historians.

Interviewee: Well, gee, I wonder why.

Interviewer: [Frowns audibly.]

Interviewee: Right, anyway, now we are going to get tagged as PFNA author(itie)s first before admission to the bookshelves of various disciplines. Think about where you find Catlin’s book in the bookstore. You don’t go to the U.S. male writers’ section?

Interviewer: Well, no, I wouldn’t look there. There is no section like that in a bookstore.

[Interviewer grabs a post-it and prints a hurried reminder.]
Interviewee: For me, my hunt for Lyons, Mohawk, Deloria, Jr., Hauptman, Berman, Grinde, Jr., Berkey and Venables (1992) seems to proclaim that an individual must be first known as an "Indian" or writer from the periphery or some other intellectual suburb and you’ll earn that before a reputation for mathematics or judicial law is exercised. Where will they put your books when you are published? Who invents these categories anyway?

Whose? Is An Important Question

Interviewer: You are saying then that you are not known by your words?

Interviewee: No, not if your book gets thrown into the First Nations bin and not in the bins of one of the discipline-discourses. Anyway, I detoured. That’ll make coding these transcripts unnecessarily difficult. Sorry.

Apple (1990), or McCarthy (1990), for examples, are trying to get clear [Interviewee’s emphasis] about race, class, wealth, power and other factors as related to schooling and education; but their play(discourse)ground(ing) is a some ‘thing’ labelled sociology. Sociology implies those aspects of measurement and testability not found in philosophy. Philosophers, perhaps, just possess a larger laboratory setting: that is, life. "Oh! Oh!" as Sally, Dick or Jane were prone to exclaiming, in the Dick and Jane series, at unsettling, curious or interesting moments in their middle-class, EuroUnitedStatesian lives (Gray & Arbuthnot, 1958, see, for examples, pp. 33, 46 or 80). As I start this graduate studies apprenticeship, I am puzzled at the unanticipated focus on scientific inquiry. I am just skeptical that measurement substantiates knowing that; particularly knowing that for everyone. That measure is a fact stated, well, O.K.; but that measurement is truth. I might know this and I might know that for myself – but I don’t think-feel-believe I can know this and that for others.
[Pause on tape. Light chuckles. The sound of a thermos cap untwisting followed by the sounds of hissing.]

Do you mind if I take a cup of your coffee? Isn’t language marvelously vague? I mean language could get so far away from reality. So, where were we? Oh, yes. Philosophy, the probing of mind, morals and language to see what light might be yielded to illuminate any potential of exit from the proverbial cave.

I also had to learn to operate outside of these friendly, old, philosophical texts [Interviewee's emphasis.]. In a letter, I see again the conflict between my anticipating that University is this place to nest & brood & think and the demands of having to first background myself about what everyone else is thinking and researching. Then to show you’ve really read the words, really understood [Interviewee’s emphasis] you pay homage to these faceless others with textual citations – legitimating this almost incestuous kinship – and, ah, reproducing a standard genealogical bibliographic documentation. And, the student talk starts to include these names, too. No one ever says something, like, ah, "Oh, yes, that’s like something my Mother told me," or, "Gee, Uncle Fred said that all the time; for example, ‘You gotta watch those government guys all the time.’."

And, of course, we’re doing that right now; constructing the citations and the bibliography?

**Interviewer:** Well, there are references which just naturally arise, ah, have to arise, for this conversation to proceed.

**Canon Speak-Write**

**Interviewee:** Yes, there appear to be, almost an inevitability. I come to understand, a living, breathing canonical genealogy of author(ities) to connect; but not as family, not
personally. I’ve just come in from the field — that is, classroom teaching — where the emphasis is on language experience, the encouragement and nurturing of learners making their meaning for themselves. This has been described as whole language, based on the Language for Life (1976) study in Britain. In this approach language is itself a “heuristic” wherein talking, listening, writing and reading are themselves are engaged in interdependent reciprocal activities as speakers and listeners and writers and readers (Bullock, 1976, p. 50). This interactivity seemed to be to suggest a subject-to-subject ‘speaking’, whether self-to-self or self-to/with-others. There wuz a reel sense for me in the hole languedge approch that, ah, sorry, I was having a Grad 1 Whole Langooeweje Deja Vu. Ah? Yes, information, observations, sensations could be articulated and then transformed through language into knowledge? That knowledge wasn’t something out there. That distinct experiences could be revisited. Perhaps, better known through expression visually, orally, sculpturally or in print. I mean it’s the same, and it’s not, in classrooms here. There’s just so much to process. I am uncertain when or where I will get to self-making meaning in my studies. I’m surprised. I wonder if I will ever have time to produce an original thought — epistemological or otherwise.

Interviewer: [Skillfully prompting.] Yes, a lot to read?

Interviewee: [Reading from a letter handily lying about the bedroom-den.]

I also feel dogged by the realization that I cannot read it all plus not read-deeply enough for deep concentration. I like to mull and stew about what I read. Also, with all of this reading I feel that I don’t have enough time to enjoy my personal philosophic reflections about my past experience. This too, I feel is a rich resource to be mined. It all feels somewhat
overwhelming. There is so much information to be managed (Calliou to Alexander, January, 1991, n.p.).

I dialogue with text, interrogate text, have these interior monologues with text, don’t see text as something to memorize but more something to provoke me to think-feel. I have been reading since I was about 3 1/2; and, for me, decoding signs and signifiers of a text is similar to the Grand Inquisition or a good episode of Matlock – the T.V. lawyer.

[Pause on tape.]

Feeling Disjunctured

**Interviewer:** The reading seems to overpower you?

**Interviewer:**

[Mimes a self-administered half-Nelson.]

Yes. However, it’s more than the reading list load. The journey is about coming to terms with the intentionaliti(ety)(ties) of text(uality) – that interpretations are inscribed and living, breathing. I am intrigued that I am commenting on this disjuncture so early. That is: I came here to answer my question. The institution demands that I produce an adeptly researched answer — fair enough. I don’t like sloppiness or overgeneralities as much as the next person. Yet I didn’t come **up here to be thinking publicly** [Interviewee’s emphasis]. I came here to mull-think-intuit-play. I do not disrespect books or articles. I feel instructed to read&read&read some more. Print is entertaining, informing, educating, stimulating, nauseating, thrilling, saddening, sickening. But, somewhere, right from the very beginning, I feel myself buried in text, which, later, feels oppressive and self-alienating; until, finally I, am speaking adequately as a deconstructionist, and confidently use my new skills to self-describe my situation as one where I
feel-perceive myself as erased. By February 25, 1991, I write in a letter that "I have become too enclosed by text lately in the University experience and this is damaging to ‘spiritus’ " (Calliou to Alexander, personal communication, p. 1). Eventually, I resent some textifying as fictionalising, as (re)colonising, and, at times, as a persistent forms of self-alienation, self (re)colonization and epistemic-affective-spiritual violence. I don’t think I’d ever thought before of texts as toxic or as a form of violence. Toxic facticity which would have me lying on my bed or standing in the shower weeping about this his/her/our story of My People.

[Silence. More silence.]

[Interviewer and interviewee fuss with smoking materials. Interviewer just manages to refrain from lighting a filter-tipped cigarette.]

**Interviewer:** Should I skip forward to that, to that resentment related to being a PFNA and what you find when you locate yourself in text? Perhaps, expand on that impact of Viswanathan’s chapter, "The beginnings of English literary study in British India" (in Donald & Rattansi, 1992, pp. 149-170) on you?

[Pause. Sounds of chair inscribing into the thick shag.]

**Interviewee:** No. No, because that "Indian" thing isn’t happening strongly yet in 1991; not until 1992, when I am teaching as a Sessional. I’m not yet articulating my uneasiness with this form of mental terrorization or continuance of mental/cognitive (re)colonization, or, as I name it euroheritageization. I have extreme physical and emotional reactions to understanding the eurocentric nature of academentia, but that’s something I’ll discuss at the cognitive realm.

[Pause. The sounds of a lighter and a deeply exhaled breath of cigarette smoke.]

I never connected with sof the research terms, for example: independent variables. But erocentric? Now there’s a term that plopped solidly into my schema. I came here as a community educator. I came here as someone with more of a primary interest in community-based curriculum and instruction than emotional disjuncture, or dislocation. Then,
there is my eventual extreme resistence to the dichotomy of objectivity and subjectivity. By late January, 1991, I am informed of the potential bias – hence, contamination – a researcher might bring to a study. Doesn’t contamination of data sound like a science fiction scenario to you? Anyway, I am parroting that

I have a particular bias [unstated]. I recognized that it is important that I survey and keep a mental goal of keeping my ‘mind’ out of this, remove my opinions, and really listen to what I am to be told. . . . I had never considered that I might have a particular hobby horse and that I might want to ride this hobby horse through my study to win face. I do have a bias [unstated] as a researcher and the best I think I can do is to be upfront about this or these biases [never stated]. My personal lenses keep other truths from emerging or any semblance of truth from emerging at all

(Calliou, journal entry, January 25, 1991, n.p.).

Of course, there’s many things going on in this entry. ‘Bias’, ‘subjectivity’, ‘objectivity’, ‘contamination’, (versus ‘pure’ [Perhaps, virginal? How’s that as metaphoric reference to the male reverence for unsullied?] research), ‘truth’ are nuanced words-of-meaning which are context dependent. As well, in retrospect, I view my personal lenses as potential obstacle and also intrinsic to me. I cannot remove these lenses –

[Interviewee removes glasses momentarily and mimes.]

like these ones. Of course, with my lenses off, I’m nearly blind.

What strikes me about this entry though is that I set a "goal" to "keep my mind" outside of, or, ah, divorced from my interests. In the years to follow this entry, my mind-heart-spiritus emerge, if not overpower, my methodological progress. I am puzzled at my earnest willingness
to become a ‘mindless’ (and soulless) researcher. Now, I query what biases I was referring to in this journal entry, because I never state them. I just mouth the socialisation that: Beware Researchers Have Biases. I mean, perhaps, my biases are gifts of caution or (second)(in)sight; not always something to eliminate, to scrub out, to denounce, to fear. Now if this lecturer was referring to biases of racism, sexism, ageism, this was not made explicit in this lecture. The need to be reverential of all lifeforms not enunciated.

Eisner (1992) makes that observation about the need for objectivity as more important than the need for subjectivity as a means to distinguish seemingly different states of being, in the Western tradition, of knowledge and belief, and that most of us are taught "that subjective judgements cannot be trusted" (p. 11). When I think about his words, I think about being taught not to trust myself; to become self-alienated, to dissect and digest and quote everyone first seems to be the priority before I untangle my own thoughts-feelings-observations. And, I don’t think being rational can happen if I’m ‘getting busy’ (dis)(mis)trusting myself, my own feelings, my own hunches&intuitions, my own location in this giant multi-dimensional two-legged equation.

[Sounds of 'sqwarrk', 'graack' and 'hssist'. Unfortunately, a break in the tape occurs at this point. Interviewer’s note. I did not reconstruct the ensuing conversation from memory. The following transcription picks up from approximately five minutes later. I hate tape recorders. The next time I interview, I will have won the 6-4-9 Lottery and I will have one of those computers where people speak directly and text appears. Yes! Yes! Yes!]

Mind/Feelings/Body/Spirit

**Interviewer:** So, something is happening? A split of some sort?
Interviewee: I’m not certain as to how to continue. There is much emotional rollercoastering related to being a graduate student. There is the multifactorial situation of schooling as plagued with inequity as related to ethnicity (primarily, in my case, the "Indian" identity, history et cetera), gender and class. I can empathise well with the contributors to the collection of essays, *Working-Class Women in the Academy, Laborers in the Knowledge Factory* (Tokarcyzk & Fay, 1993), who share their sense of dis(juncture)(location) as education provides interclass access and mobility. However, before I go ‘there’ -- to race, class, gender, etc. -- this entry is particularly poignant, because I realise now that I arrive at university with a sense of Four Realm intactness. Yet, here I am thinking that I’ll remove my(self)(mind). By the eighth week of graduate studies, I write in a letter

*This change in myself of becoming too prose-centered and not ‘spiritus’ or imagery centered - with a balance between the two - I have found to become quite disturbing and rather frightening. I found today at the beach... that I began to break the stranglehold that text prose has on me too much lately. ... I think I was being truthful when I told you, during the rdng. of Giroux, that I felt I was drowning. Symbolically and literally* (Calliou to Alexander, personal communication, February 25, 1991, p. II).

Here I witness myself talking about the mind and the spirit as somehow separate when, in fact, there is only one me.

Separating From Self
Interviewee: I am split(ting). That’s not a very apt descriptor. I guess disjunctured works. As I recall myself describing myself as these oppositional segments, with the cognitive over(powering)(burdening), via text, the spiritus, I am disturbed to see myself segmented, without too much commentary that this is an unusual condition. I mean, look at this, in eight weeks of graduate studies, I am speaking of myself as separate pieces: mind, spiritus. Isn’t that incredible? I am mending this sense of disjuncture. My discovery of the Medicine Wheel reminds me that I am not some Four Realm fragmented beingness. For me, the Medicine Wheel is a heuristic, a meditation device which keeps the Four Realms in front of me as I consider my life journey.

Interviewer: And you symbolize, signify that with self-invented terms like think-feel?

Interviewee: Yes, and that’s not linguistic play or vanity; because, paradoxically, even while I am arguing that cognition is a valid form of research, I am also desperately trying to find a word in English which shows that as I am thinking, I am also feeling; that there is emotion in cognition; that I am not this commode with four pull-out drawers labelled: physical, emotional, cognitive, spiritual. Reading the words of Elder/Chief Louis Sunchild, the focus of Lightning’s (1992) graduate studies, really crystallizes, for me, a sensibility of how thought and heart are integrated at every moment. Thus, the need to take respectful care of our heart-mind. Sunchild speaks of the compassionate mind-consciousness (pp. 224-227). Somehow compassionate mind encapsulates, for me, the direct integration of emotion in cognition and I start to play with terms like: think-feel or logic-heart or heart-logic or feel-perceive. English becomes a very limiting, world-fragmenting language for me and I find myself wishing I could speak Cree and crawl&nest inside the integ(rit)y(ration) of the word for compassionate-mind because there seems to be a wholism there I do not find in English dictionaries.

[Clack of tape recorder shutting off unexpectedly. Interviewer locates a fresh tape.

Interviewee sits quietly waiting.]
All of these emotional turmoils are also hinting at me to look inside. I recall formulating this strong feeling that this alienation process must be like that experienced by my People in the disjuncturing of colonial schooling, only I'm here voluntarily. I really can't explain the sense of feeling I have here.

Mind 'Games', Philosophy Is Still An O.K. 'Thing' To Do?

**Interviewer:** Yet, thinking, a kind of philosophical investigation, is the approach you struggle to assert in research? You argue for an old-fashioned form of thinking? Problem solving events and conditions through language? There's this philosophic side to your beingness which seems to require you start elsewhere before you get to designing schemes of measurement? There are ineffables more significant to you than what some might consider solidly measurable in statistically counted responses?

**Interviewee:** Ah-huh, just thinking? Or, philosophy? What term to use? Also, let's remember that a numeral is only a symbol representing a construct – known as 1 or 1,000; or, that a metre is also an 'artificial' unit based on some standard (Chrisjohn, personal communication, 1994 [?]). By artificial, I do mean arbitrary. A metre could be shorter or longer than it is actually socially-believed to be. I'm not saying these standards of measurement are silly or unuseful. Such measurements as hectare or acre are damm useful when filing a land claim to repatriate stolen lands.

[Interviewer starts scribbling furiously.]

And, while 'me' is fissuring, I am also beginning to sense that philosophical investigation, or, rather, mind-generated conceptualizations isn't considered enough here. The introductory methods course is driving me crazy as I try to squish my community education curriculum interest (by this time, worded as What is community-related curriculum?) (Calliou to Alexander,
March 1, 1991, p. 2) into a quantitative or qualitative ideological frame. I find that "I still could not make this question into really a quantitative or qualitative study" and, ah, that "the more I stewed about this, the more I felt this is a conceptual analysis pursuit" (Ibid., p. 2). I never intended to have to make such a case for the mind as a research methodology; nor, did I anticipate that doing so would be a risk. I did not expect to be challenged about the validity of thinking. I was becoming frustrated and I really wanted to avoid producing

[Respondent-subject-interviewee begins reading from another journal entry.]

another 'pretend' mess like that stupid teachers' survey idea I had. ["They" made me.] I thought I would have to come up with a study which fit quantitative/qualitative modes somehow and that I didn't know how to do it. Instead, I still wanted to get to the business of analysing community-related curriculum. So I went to Dr. M's office and explained community-related curriculum to him from my notion, my bias, through my eight year practice. . . . He was quite helpful and told me that I would be describing the parameters of the definition; the criteria of constructs for the definition and trying to assess the adequacy of the definition. [Interviewee's bolding.](Calliou to Alexander, March 1, 1991, p. 2).

The March 1, 1991, meeting with Dr. M. meant much. Yet, I had to fight for mind as a viable form of knowledge-production. How does one dress up thinking with methodological terminology? I remembered my logic course. I did go to the library and I re-examined some textbooks. I did not even consider that I would make knowledge, that is, a certainty about events and conditions as they truly are. I know I create experiences; ah, or experience experiences. Although sometimes I just have experiences very unconsciously. I struggle to make
sense of, make meaning from these experiences; but making knowledge wasn’t part of my agenda. I was going to produce a definition using Copi’s (1982) Introduction to Logic. To get clear about the usage of a term – word(s), random alphabetical sequences which we assign and agree to as having meaning – is a thoughtful, rigorous process; but I didn’t sense that I was making this clear to the course lecturers. I wanted to understand how I was conceptualizing and using this term: community-based curricula. At least, Dr. A. had figured out what I was on about. I think at that time I believed that if I did some serious self-reflection here I would return to the field and be more skillfully adept in translating this concept to practitioners who were using a community-based curricular approach, or were ready to try this approach.

Interviewer: And, this philosophical, er, linguistic, or, conceptual approach wasn’t perceived as useful? Er, valid?

Asking Me How I "Do Data"

Interviewee: In retrospect, I think-feel that I am arguing that philosophy is still a legitimate form of engaged research. Philosophers just don’t count and interview and "do data" as Patti Lather scolds (1991, pp. 123-125). Of course, at 1991, I’m not there yet with a postpositivistic, deconstructionist, post-Columbusian, post-paradigmatic, or any other sort of post-outlook, ready to "question the basic assumptions of what it means to do science" (Lather, 1991, pp. 6-7). So, in this letter, I speak of ‘pretending’ to construct a survey masquerade methodology design. I allow myself to engage fully in the pretense; faking product(ion) with a parallel consciousness that I could ‘think’ it up on my own, which I do by constructing this inductive argument; I fight with puzzlement that I have to go and locate informants to legitimate what I might think-feel-discover. I had not expected this type of defensiveness to occur at University. I think my larger fear was being able to answer satisfactorily, to myself, my question
about the ‘essential’ nature of a genuine community education field trip experience. I think-felt I knew I had to defend the eventual answer; I had not anticipated having to so strenously defend the method of locating an answer or discussing the legitimacy of philosophy in the construction of a theoretical definition. I had not anticipated that scholarly work is a risk. I think-felt I thought-felt that universities were filled with all these ‘gentlemanly’ types; that, somehow, all intellectuals were also quite well-mannered. And, in retrospect, I did not come here to DO SCIENCE [Interviewee did actually speak in capital letters. I could hear the extreme emphasis.]

I think the sounds of trains crashing would be apt at this point.

[Laughter on tape.]

RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE

Fortunately, the day ended affirmatively with Dr. M. giving me an extension on my EDUC508 assignment, leaving me feeling

good to be out of the cumbersome possibility of the teachers’ survey because it was such descriptive work with not as much room for interpretation as this. I like the ‘total thinking’ aspect of this topic (Calliou to Alexander, March 1, 1991, p. 3).

Dr. M.’s office is not the only location and time I will defend my conceptual analysis techniques. I’ll do that right to the conclusion of the defense of the Master’s thesis. Self-generated mind-work seems, somehow, suspect to some here.

However, it is very difficult [for me right now] to develop this conceptual analysis design methodology and even trying a preliminary skim through
describing how I will approach 'studying' the development of a definition is really difficult. How does not describe 'thinking'? I enjoyed how C-H- and I camped this up in the C- Restaurant Friday evening where the researcher would sit in smokey cafes, drinking coffee (capacinnos), studying the racing forms, throwing the Ching, discussing the 'concept' with restaurant 'regulars’ and basically mulling&stewing (Calliou to Alexander, personal communication, March 4, 1991, p. 1).

**Interviewer:** Yet, eventually, mulling&stewing, sticks as your preferred approach? By February of 1994 you state,

I used to joke about my Master's research and stated that my methodology consisted mainly of reading, smoking, drinking (coffee), questioning, sketching and talking (to myself) (Calliou, 1994, February, p. 73).

You didn’t become an ethnographer or statistical analyst?

**Interviewee:** Yes, to the first question. Yes, to the second. I mean look at the final M.A. product. I **had to count,** [Interviewee’s emphasis] literally count, quantify the number of times particular characteristics appeared in community education texts. The appendices (Calliou, 1992, pp. 197-205) are littered with tables of tabulation to confirm weak or strong substantiation of my self-selected coding of features of community education theory. I remember feeling puzzled that the request, no, invitation, to generate original research is here, but, ah, that I must document the original research, in this case, with the thoughts (quantified) of others. I become an ethnographer in that I justify that I interviewed community education textbooks to develop this philosophical study to construct a theoretical definition of community-based curricula. But when I think-feel-recall that whole period now of fledgling researcher, I just get tremendously weary. I
felt tortured; consumed with self-doubt. This uneasy queasiness is related to patriarchal
privileging of rationality, means of making rational, and, ah, the, acceptable forms of expression.

I don't yet capture their impacts on my life right then as I stroll Nitobe Gardens
(mulling&musing) or sit somewhere in the sunshine. The emotional erosion of having to explain
that mulling&musing is valid, legitimate, and credible as a means to ferret out 'stuff' that
contradicts my anticipation that I came to University to think those 'deep thoughts'.

[Extended sounds of laughter.]

I do not denounce quantitative or qualitative methodologies, per se; although I will
become rather jaundiced and attack the inherent eurocentrism by 1994. I believe there are
many methods — ones we have not even conceived as yet. I do not wish to enter the
dichotomous debate of qualitative versus quantitative. I came here to answer a question for
myself; not to rove the countryside with a clipboard or a tape recorder. I did not anticipate the
volume of emotional strength I would have to turn up in order to survive defending that I only
needed to think about something. That is violence I do not understand. In teasing inquiries, I
would ask why Dewey's writing-thoughts-intuitions were considered insightful and/or credible,
when books like Democracy and Education (1966; Orig. 1916) or his Experience and education
(1963; Orig. 1938) are not constructed on the basis of even one questionnaire. I sometimes joke
that John wouldn't survive a doctoral defense here because everyone would demand he identify
and then dissect his methodology. Yet his philosophical explorations, that is, setting out his
thoughts in a readable form, influence generations of intending teachers.

Somehow we have come to place (over)emphasis on scientific process rather than
product and that links into the power of an institution to legitimate what will count and what is
legitimate — that is, authenticated, valid, confirmed — as a form-technique of knowledge
production [Interviewee’s emphasis]. I am not yet asking, like some others, for example Lather

**Conceptual Analysis**

I did not anticipate feeling so emotionally stressed just because I was engaged in self-deliberation. Yet, it is the emotional turmoil following, paralleling, complementing my thinking which gives me strength, in a way, to complete this battle. The baffling part is that no one took me aside to teach me how to ‘do’ conceptual analysis or taxonomic categorization or et cetera. Although I directly ask my committee to give me relevant references, there were no directives given. I returned to my logic textbooks and basic philosophy textbooks and (re)self-taught myself some basics. I return to Hirst and Peter’s (1979), in The Logic of Education, originally published in 1970, and their explication of conceptual analysis as useful methodology to answer questions like, "What is . . . ?," where thoughtful analysis makes logically explicit the appropriate conditions for usage of concepts (pp. 3-5). Of course, I’m riled up again when I start to demand, *Whose concepts?* However, Peters and Hirst (1979; Orig. 1970) stress that such analysis "cannot be done adequately by just examining the use of words in any self-contained way" as words are linguistically, socially, contextually embedded and linked with knowledge and experience (p. 8). Therefore, conceptual analysis is about precising as

ordinary language is a record of connections and distinctions that men [and women] with predominantly practical purposes have found it important to make.

It is therefore a valuable guide, but it should never be treated as a repository of unquestionable wisdom (p. 8).

In my case some of these connections and distinctions are pretty deeply historically embedded within the events of colonialism, colonization, et cetera.
**Interviewer:** I don’t recall Hirst or Peters getting into colonialism as a key factor in questioning the embeddedness.

**Whose Constructs?**

**Interviewee:** No, I but I take direction from their outline of method and do. However, whether men or women, the point of conceptual analysis is to clarify distinctions that words have been developed or invented to designate, that is, "to get a better grasp of the similarities and differences that it is possible to pick out" (Ibid., p. 8). The intent is to strip the fuzziness and locate, hopefully, essential features of a construct. I guess this could be critiqued as a romantic or dogmatic quest for essentialism, open to severe rejection as Neo-Platonist or guilty of Grand Narrating. However, I believe there is a great deal of difference between the identification of essentials to assist meaning-making and the (un)ethical issues associated with imposition of essentials upon others. For example, the nature and content of Eurocurricula forcibly imposed on PFNA illustrates how some essentials are deemed of more value, worthier, better, et cetera. Racial, gender or other base-bias to words is racism, sexism, et cetera.

So, I am never easy with the research process. I am always fussing with aspects of this process. I keep questioning the solidity of concepts and constructs with the questions.

**Interviewer:** More questions?

**Interviewee:** Yes, for examples: "What is this term to represent?" "What’s this mean?" What’s this mean to me?" "What going on here?"

For example, ‘Canadians’ is a construct and not one very old in comparison with time immemorial. I would feel anxiously uneasy when I discovered statements relating to the fact that this is both a construct and a powerful one. For example, Menno Boldt (1994) writes that the Canadian
'national interest' is an artificial construct, a device of the reigning Canadian
'establishment' for asserting its political, economic, and social hegemony over the
Canadian nation. It is used to create the illusion that there exists a national
homogeneity of interests, and that [Canadian Federal] government policies are
designed to promote these interests. Thus, it serves to legitimate government
policies. But clearly the 'national interest' is not arrived at by any rational
calculations, referenced to the 'national good' as defined by the majority of
Canadians. More often than not, assessments and definitions of the 'national
interest' are made behind closed doors - political, bureaucratic, and corporate -
where only the voices of the powerful are heard. The 'national interest' is not a
well-defined or precise notion (Menno Boldt, 1993, p. 67).

As I am connecting this observation of 'national' (i.e. Canadian) interest with schooling –
acculturation – for PFNA, I am questing and understanding-appreciating the serious nature of
counter-hegemonic efforts required and made by PFNA to utilize education as the means to keep
future PFNA citizens aware-awake as to the nature of the pervasiveness of national interests as
related to PFNA. I see the whole thing - his/her/ourstory built in language and I begin
considering how to unbuild that language – or, at least, for me, look through that language. This
language house, or fort, is socially-believed and very solid.

I see schooling for PFNA as more than culturally-sensitive curricular experiences; it is all
very political - and spiritual. Counter-hegemonic work is the subtext to the grand narrative
where cultural-communities attempt to survive as Dewey observed that it is "the very nature of
life to strive to continue in being" (Dewey, 1966[1915], p. 9). The Assembly of First Nations
(heren: AFN) (1988) stated that FN people have begun to view education as a vehicle for
addressing major social, economic and political problems that affect their communities
(Charleston, p. 10). The difficulty for PFNA is that the immigrants understand the survival
instinct, but somehow rather than respecting-reverencing all lifeforms, there is need to devise means to ensure that forms of life not ‘strive to continue in being’.

**Interviewer:** So your reading of text becomes confusing? Or, your locational subjectivity demands interrogation of text?

**Interviewee:** Yes, something like that. Some event or prompt or instinct or something inside of me motivates me to give curious double/triple/quadruple readings to educational theorists, like Dewey, because when I throw my baggage on Dewey the statements contain an unintended hypocrisy. Although I wonder that Dewey never acknowledges the First Peoples of his area.

So, what I am learning as a novice conceptual analyst (or, whatever I am) and about theories of sociocultural (re)production and/or destruction, I am turning these insights-thoughts-feelings towards other constructs and the daily reality of my life past-present-future and the lives of The People. And, er, I am feeling like everything is not making sense and making horrific sense.

I find it’s O.K. to (de)construct, to really interrogate accep(ted)(able) (percep)(proposition) in order to explore the nature of core-periphery or centered-decentered et cetera. I turn that onto the events and conditions of "Indians" and I resist the horror as I comprehend the magnitude of the horror. My unguided studies introduce me to too many contradictions and I begin to accept using the term **genocide. And, genocide is not only physical death**

[Interviewee’s definite emphasis].

[Interviewer dutifully checks tape recording. Observes that tape seems to be turning in a clockwise direction and is duly satisfied.]

**Interviewer:** So your EuroWestern logic acculturation grounds this study?

*Language Arts: Language & Thought*
Interviewee: Maybe. Am I thinking like a 'White' person? I start asking that of myself. Is there a 'white' way to think-feel-idea? Can I think like a Mohawk/Cree/Stoney/Sioux/French/English person? Does the mix of blood determine the type, quality, er, form of thinking? That's too biogenetically deterministic, isn't it? Blood = thinking pattern. Eventually, I just know I think-feel-sense like myself — like Sharilyn. And Sharilyn is a whole constellation of interconnected moments, some I am not even aware of yet and may never be.

Interviewer: But this post-secondary self-study adds to your awareness of external interconnections? Especially in reading the language about colonization?

Interviewee: Yes, unexpected research opportunity to ask the question, "Just how colonized am I?" If I am colonised beyond salvation, then I am rueful, regretful, about being so colonised with aspects of this form of thinking-analysing. However, the emotional ante is upped for me here because the logic of conceptual analysis itself is (over)turned. An Oneida scholar, Roland Chrisjohn, is always on about language. Curious, I visit with him and ask, "What's the big deal about language?" I, some(how)(time)(where), internalized that words are not reality; just (re)presentations; However, it seems others view words as IT. I've yet to really connect that language has material force. For example, if you are worded as "Indian," then watch out because that word-noun-designation appears to sanction a whole number of actions, emotions, beliefs, opinions and thoughts. Anyway, Roland sics Wittgenstein on me and I delightfully continue my delight in(with)(in) words.

Wittgenstein (1990), writing in 1922, confirms my understanding that Objects I can only name. Signs represent them. I can only speak of them. I cannot assert them. A proposition can only say how a thing is, not what it is (Line 3.221, p. 49).
Wittgenstein uses the personal pronoun in his work. For me, that's significant. He writes as Ludwig, not as a Viennese. You don't find his books in the Viennese or in the Catholic -- he was baptised -- sections of the library. And, this connects to my understanding of bias and will be evident in the words I choose for Wittgenstein cautions that "language disguises the thought" (p. 63, 4.002). The potential of (mis)using words reminds me of the need to think-feel before I speak and to be honest. I may state facts, but I might not be speaking the truth. There is, for me, such an enormous reminder of the responsibility of introducing anyone to a concept, or construct, through words.

And a whole lotta words are used to construct propositions; to get clear in a logical formulation -- like a syllogism with the accompanying truth tables. And, I get quite startled because logic is only logic after all. Propositions are but models or pictures of 'reality', articulated perceptions - (percep)(proposi)tions embedded within other (percep)(proposi)tions (see, for examples, Wittgenstein, 1990, p. 63, Line 4.01; p. 67, Line 4.021; 1969, p. 30e, Line 225). He states, *What I hold fast to is not one proposition, but a web of propositions.*

And, some of the Canadian citizens are holding onto a number of disempowering (percep)(proposi)tions, as are we. In logic, validity is not to be equivocated with 'truth'. Wittgenstein (1990) distinguishes often what is (un)known(able) from what is believed; and, ah, often what is believed to be known is based more on faith or force of reason than certainty (see, for example, Wittgenstein, 1969, pp. 32e-33e, Lines 240-255). And, somehow contemplating his observation confirms my sense that this is a socially-believed-understood world; which, for me, possesses more impact than just talking about a socially-constructed world-reality.

So, in this think-tank-of-one-non-scientific-investigation, I get down to basics -- words as building blocks; words (re)presenting constructs and propositions and it's a sociolinguistically-constructed reality with mighty material force. And, there are reminders that we be careful what/how we speak because WORDS HAVE POWER!
Interviewer: So the M.A. is more about getting clear about a construct, that is, community-based curriculum and further post-secondary studies motivate you to consider more deeply the influence, ah, interconnectedness of language and reality?

Interviewee: Hhhmmm. . . yes. I guess that if I had been acquainted with some of these ideas (materiality, ideological reproduction, etc.), the 1992 M.A. might have been interesting, if not, scary stuff. And, these are places community educators need to start looking. But I wasn’t there yet, so I construct this seven or eight-step inductive argument frame.

Interviewer: And, in the process you produce and defend the thesis based on the "formulation of the inductive argument to hypothesis framed for community education and curriculum in community education" (Calliou, 1992, July, pp. 26-28)?

Interviewee: Oh, Yes! Yes, I defend&defend for 3.5 hours. I am grateful my cousin and J. S. are there in the room as witnesses. You’ve read it?!

Interviewer: Avidly.

Interviewee: [More laughter.] Your quotation alone illustrates the emotional-spiritual violence that occurred against my style of writing. I’m not saying I’m a perfect writer. I think-feel that some earlier drafts of my thesis did have some colourful (if not passionately purple) and convoluted stretches; however, the violence of removal of "me" from my own pages is still a source of wonder and horror. As a teacher of ten years, primarily language arts or language-across-the-curriculum focused, I never savaged student creations the way I witnessed mine violated. Thesis revisions and rewrites were a very demoralizing process, I describe thusly.
Meanwhile . . . and I were locked in some sort of unnamed struggle in ... 

office about the revisions to my thesis. The mtgs. were few; but seemed 
strewn with subtext that even the most skilled directoress would have had 
difficulty unweaving. The plot was becoming nonsensical. I reverted to 
old, old patterns of withdraw, withdraw, withdraw . . . until I was locked 
into drawing boxes of faceless people with tears stuffed inside the head. . . . 

was abusive - who knows what buttons ... I pushed? (Calliou to Flaherty, 

The woman I hired as typist and editor, barely manages to stomach the required revisions. I'd hear her shriek from the other office, I'd smile and shout back at her to just make the changes as suggested.

However, when I examine the final product, I marvel at the clinical sanitation of the pages. A comparison of this Ph.D. dissertation with that M.A. thesis tells all. Yet, I survive. I found an audience; an indulgent audience; although I still retreat into that neat, scholarly style at times. I think I lost some trust in myself, in my unorthodox form of (re)presentation(s), lost some self-confidence in the playful delight I have with language, composing, writing, mulling&musing. In a letter I describe writing an earlier paper for a required Ph.D. seminar.

I had cleared the skids and researched-composed a paper for Dr. W--'s class .

. . . The assignment was to select a doctoral dissertation and deconstruct 
(analyze, thoughtfully consider, examine) the research methodology and 
expose underlying assumptions. This felt like a fancy book review. This 
was the first assignment since the Masters' thesis work which I wrote to
order for the committee I had then. The writing, with its violence to my form of expression, wherein all metaphor and colour were drained and the work became an acceptable research project . . . . In EDCI 601.c. we are into a new Euro-generated form of thought called postmodernism (which I can't quite yet define). The writing style does emphasize pastiche, strung-together quotations (sensibly, although demanding of the reader because you must know the contexts) and the language of metaphor is O.K. Such a difference between departments. However, I was almost paralyzed as I had to write again; take that risk; expose myself to unending criticisms which was not criticism to make me a better writer but to make me write in ways I do not conceptualise or put words together. Thus, I was engaged in this piece because I could write from my position as a thirty-something Mohawk-Cree woman and use those powers of metaphor + logic + word play (punning and playing although the intention is a quirky balance between seriousness and irony). I enjoyed the piece but I did experience a sense of dread and panic because I thought about doing it wrong again! I think that -- will be accepting (Calliou to Tebbitt, personal communication, February 26, 1993, pp. 2-3).

**Interviewer:** Paradoxically, you did not come to university to find a voice as woman, as academic of working-class background, as "Indian", as a creative, non-fiction writer, as researcher?
Interviewee: No. Yet, up here, I realize there is invigorated interest in specifying who is producing written encoding for whom, particularly on an ethnocultural basis - i.e. Who is speak-write(ing) for the Haida, the Dene, the Cree, the Metis of Red River, et cetera.

LitCrit is one area where this tunnelling through text for voice is emergent. W. H. New (1990), in his editorial preface to *Native Writers and Canadian Writing*, tracks the Canadian Native (i.e., not the Belgium or French Native) as more often a "conventional figure" or curiosity or romanticism (p. 4). New (1990) continues that PFNA are not often a "voice" in CanLit, with a trend established to "deny Native communities respect for their own history, to make their own history contingent upon European perspectives, to displace one language of self-perception with a self-justifying substitute" (p. 5). I came here with a voice not predicated solely on the basis of being a PFNA, but in the process of **conducting research** [Interviewee’s emphasis] I come to recognize this is an important voice to be heard-read. I just get shy about sharing mine.

M.A. Walk Across A Stage

Interviewer: You do get the M.A.?

Interviewee: [Train loads of laughter precede this answer.] Yes.

Interviewer: And, something else is going on? In the photograph, you walk across that stage wearing a blue-print treaty dress, with ribbons and a small piece of rabbit fur at the left knee. You’re not wearing a, ah, black robe. What about graduation?

Interviewee: Emotionally? That smiles says paragraphs. I am also a Ts’k’el grad from the Native Indian Teacher Education Program. I am really happy. Happy to be wearing that dress, sewn by Pimina Yellowbird, Verena Cootes, and others, on the long week-end in May of 1993. Ecstatic. What’s been happening in addition to grinding out a theoretical study is a
self-education curricula flung my way with assignment to teaching EDUC441 and EDUC442 at this university.

what we can't face
looks for us anyway

(Trudell, 1994, n.p.)

rattle-RATTLE-rattle-RATTLE
RATTLE-rattle-RATTLE-rattle

Interviewer: So, this journey to that stage is one fraught with an emotional life, which both wearies and provokes. You emerge with a smile of paragraphs. The emotional realm does not take a backseat, er, sit in abeyance while you are thinking the deep thoughts you came here to think, er, think-feel. The exemplary researcher is not just a machine of whirring rationality? Somehow, if I extrapolate, then you seem to suggest that there is emotion, must be an acknowledgment of the emotion in learning. I think we all might admit to some emotion in reading a text. How exactly does emotion add to or undermine this personal journey?

More Learner Than Teacher

Interviewee: Let's see... While in pursuit of a M.A., I am also teaching. I have no formal background in NativeAboriginal"Indian"FirstNations studies. Due to the unavailability of an instructor, my cousin, M., invited me to be a Sessional Lecturer. As the revisions to the thesis are being (re)constructed, I taste of teaching at the post-secondary level. In the Fall of 1992, I start with EDUC441, and I am reading'my brains out in, yet, another field. My intelligence
about this schooling is formed from my mother’s teaching me about her stint in residential school, my experience with integrated schooling and random reading. This communication is suddenly amplifying; magnified enormously as military, political, legal, legislative, economic and educational [Interviewee’s emphasis] events and conditions are locked in this complex interplay of universal oppression. Reading to prepare my lectures and other classroom activities provokes any number of emotions. I don’t think I can explain how, but I can describe what is happening, what I remember happening.

For example, I go through this period of scathing anger, righteous anger, self-righteous anger, indulgent anger, scary anger, anger which I manage to restrain in classrooms; However, is evident in my struggling articulations in print. I rant. I weep. I express my confusion. By 1994, a sense of what the phrase biculturalism suggests to me emerges. Only I find that biculturalism is schizophrenic-inducing, in that I have to be these multiple personalities almost; somehow get inside the published Euroimpressions and Europerceptions while keeping whatever core I possess.

**Interviewer:** Do you recall what you’re reading?

**Interviewee:** At the moment, no specific titles. I’m reading to lecture and I’m reading for doctoral seminars and courses. Every page inhaled means I read (that is, react, respond, decode, interrogate, deconstruct) through thicker, lenses, which I cannot discard. I am learning to read against and through the grain of text and find the (re)Presentations inadequate. I really begin to sweat, squirm and struggle as I process educational texts. The omissions and contradictions are for me, an omnipresent subtext. My ancestors were subjected to acculturative curricular experiences, based on racist rationales, to divorce and dislocate learners and subsequent generations from the life of their cultural-community, the love of their families (see, for examples, Bull, 1991; Ing, 1991,; their sense of land as home and Mother, their understanding of the collective interdependent and mutually dependent of spiritus.
I become an ironic reader. I become a sardonic reader. I become, at times, a hostile reader. I rage at the interlocking, sanctimonious complexity of institutionalised oppression.

I also pray for the gift of forgiveness because, by 1993, I am influenced by Elder Louis Sunchild in Walter Lightning’s 1992 article "Compassionate-mind: Implications of a Text Written by Elder Louis Sunchild." I am also writing, really trying to write a paper about multiculturalism, racism, anti-racism and peacekeeping for an anti-racist pedagogy course (Calliou, 1995). I am resisting, confronting and trying to make peace with enormously horrifically genocidal realisations, which contradict my innately pacifist beliefs. Race means, potentially, death; death of the body, death of the emotions, death of the mind, death of the spirit. Harming someone is harming one’s self.

**Trying To Temper Anger**

**Interviewer:** You often joke about yourself as a graduate of John Lennon High School?

**Interviewer:** Yes. I have this pacifist streak; that’s not to imply I never get angry or resentful or downright mean-spirited. I just believe that peacefulness is a much more sensible-reverential way to live. I’m less romantic about this ideal than I once was, but - I guess I am that dreamer (see Lennon, 1988). I mean John’s song is a much more succinct understanding of Michael Young’s (1971) sense-insight that certain codes predominate and that such predominance thereby empowers some and not others. Lennon’s seen that – and, ah, maybe, totally ‘grocked’ – that these structuralist institutions are fictions causing needless two-legged de(rision)(rogation)(vision)(ath).

The angry irritation I also feel is an impatience with two-leggeds’ seeming inability to transcend reproductive paradigms of violence based on little more than skin colour.
The social construction of knowledge metaphor I've encountered by March 2, 1992, in EDST507. I forget, the name of that course. These metaphors, social CONSTRUCTION of, REPRODUCTION of, are such images of architecture and engineering, embedded there is the sensibility of erection or manufacture. Construction without reference to nurturance, lovingness. Anyway, I'm excited about sociological sleuthing for, "exposing [those] premises, consequences and alternatives" to "improve our understanding of educational contexts and the problems they generate," which Scheffler (1967, p. 5) and others describe as doing [Interviewee's emphasis] philosophy of education. I'm game. I don't find philosophy as dogmatic as sociology. Philosophy is exposure without -- I again guess that some would criticize -- benefit of measurement. Yet how does one measure such a fluid world in movement?

Anyway, I'm approaching EDUC441 and EDUC442 with some of these (de)(re)constructionist -- not yet, consciously Derridean -- understandings. And, with these insights or understandings I turn them on the his/herstory and the emotional accompaniment to my realisations is quite strong because I wonder at our two-legged ability to keep reproducing these situations of violence, injustice, hurtfulness. I think about this conception of cultural reproduction and wonder what we, as teachers of FNA must do, to disable these hegemonic, tightly woven and tightly concealed forms of assimilative schooling as well as helping to heal the inheritance of violence, which is also an inheritance of courage and strength and resistance.

**Interviewer:** For example?

**Interviewee:** Well, there's Whitty (1985). In a letter I write that one of his statements (p. 19),

*really echoes my direction for schooling in that traditionally "pupils have been taught a particular world view with no examination of the underlying assumptions/presuppositions or social processes of how such a*
view developed; and "pupils accept as "immutable" fact what was but one ideological version of the world" (Calliou to Alexander, March 2, 1991, n.p.).

I'm not teaching yet at 1991, but this will feed into how I later think-feel about my lecturing.

**Interviewer:** And, you encounter more D.O.M.?

**Interviewee:** Yes, of course. Whitty's (1985) not the only one. There's Michael Young's (1971) collection of nine essays in *Knowledge and Control*, featuring the 'big' guys, like Pierre Bourdieu, Basil Bernstein, Alan Blum, Nell Keddie and, of course, Michael Young himself. Even while I'm silently asking, 'Where are the womyn in all this?', these ideas are stimulating explorations for me and these ideas influence how I view my role as a lecturer and how I handle the curricular content and experiences. I continue to use Gramsci's construct of 'hegemony' and Apple's (1990) constructed understanding of 'cultural reproduction' via education and the longing to excavate the "positive and negative moments of power" (p. xv).

**Interviewer:** So the ideas of 'men' have value?

**Interviewee:** Gender should not, I think-believe, be enough of a basis to dismiss an idea. However, why certain individuals (gender, ethnicity, religion, et ceteras) have been given the privilege of being the author(ity) [Interviewee's emphasis.] is very troubling to me -- and in my case, I am jarred as I discover just how often I don't hear the voices of The People here.

**Other Voices Exist?**

**Interviewer:** Can you even give an example of an alternate voice to illustrate, say, ah, cultural reproduction?
Interviewee: Sure, glad you asked that. Again my emotions catapult me into this provoked zone where I go looking for our words. We do not use the concepts, but there are examples. In Armstrong's 1971 collection of quotations, Daykauray, a Winnebago chief, replies to Kinzie's plan to educate-acculturate a group of the Winnebago children. He states that the Great Spirit made the white man and the Indian. He did not make them alike. He gave the white man a heart to love peace, and the arts of the quiet life. He taught him to live in towns, to build houses, to make books, to learn all the things that would make him happy and prosperous in the way of life appointed him. To the red man the Great Spirit gave a different character. He gave him love of the woods, of a free life of hunting and fishing, of making war with his enemies . . . The white man does not like to live like the Indian -- it is not his nature. Neither does the Indian love to live like the white man -- the Great Spirit did not make him so. We do not wish to do anything contrary to the will of the Great Spirit. If he had made us with white skins and characters like the white man, then we would send our children to this school to be taught like white children. We think if the Great Spirit had wished us to be like the whites, he would have made us so. We believe he would be displeased with us to try and make ourselves different from what he thought good. I have nothing more to say. This is what we think. If we change our minds we will let you know (in Armstrong, 1971, p. 56, #110).
Don’t you love that line, "If we change our minds, we will let you know."

Daykauray (1829) does not use the words cultural reproduction, but the sensibility is firmly there, imbued also with the understanding of acculturation, cultural genocide. These moments of (re)discovery animate me to question&question why I am to cite Mike Apple or Pierre Bourdieu. With regard to Bourdieu, Daykauray speaks also of honouring the ‘cultural capital’ given by the Creator [Interviewee’s emphasis.] I do get annoyed that Apple – and others – do not quote these ‘voices’ as authorities nor acknowledge the his/her/ourstory beneath his feet as he tells his story of curricula as ideology.

There’s so much happening intellectually. Of course, the juxtaposition of teaching and these ideas eventually get turned onto myself. That is, how I am being culturally (re)produced, marginalised or excluded from particular mobility in this vastly interconnected two-legged web of power and knowledge. However, for me I don’t worry about power as much as I do about autonomy. I mean I see a connection about how abuse of one’s autonomy – power – can disable the autonomy of another being and that disturbs me. But, I also don’t see any discussion about reverence.

**Interviewer:** Ah, and the background reading for teaching helps to see yourself located in this textual, ah, battle zone?

**Interviewee:** Yes, the lecturing in EDUC441 and EDUC442 really does assist me to sharply articulate, begin to contextualise, myself as positioned and/or located within, his/herstorically and contemporaneously, a paradoxically-loaded, highly contradictory, institutionalised system of education - which is both (in)(ex)clusionary, (en)(ac)culturating and (em)(disem)powering.

So, it’s like, "Hello, the lights go on simultaneously full force on a 200 foot high Christmas tree.’ My intuitions get some enunciation although I begin to suspect my use of Brit./U.S./.French theorising to try to explain to myself, ah, for myself, [Interviewee’s emphasis]
some of this business of reproduction. I begin to look for the PFNA theorists. I find myself bored with course reading lists, because the same sociolinguistic redundancy of auth(or)(itie)s is omnipresent. I start looking for courses that this program doesn't offer. Ironically, the only course opportunities I have are ones I teach. The First Nations graduate students are meeting at a time which conflicts with my doctoral seminar.

Squeak-Squawk: Whose Voice Do I Use?

And, I agonize, while teaching, about the 'power' I have to use "educational knowledge [as] a major regulator of the structure of experience" (Young, 1971, p. 47) because this is exactly what's been going on with PFNA since the celebrated heroism of the Jesuits, where the "[T]he tireless zeal, self-sacrifice and heroism of the French [Catholic Jesuit] missionaries among the Indians of Canada" is "too impressive to be forgotten" (Phillips, 1957, p. 4). I can, as Basil Bernstein (1971) observes, manipulate or (re)produce the principles of an "educational knowledge code" to "shape curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation" (p. 47). I become acutely aware that

How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control (Bernstein, 1971, p. 47).

Now-here I am rueful that I am using a British male sociologist, linguist, educator to explain my self-comprehension, but that's what I am being fed. These author(itie)s count BIG UP HERE. That's why I wanted to move on with the dissertation as an analysis of how schooling for PFNA is being constructed as a specialized field or discourse. The emergence of specialized fields provide apertures for textual deconstruction wherein the continuity of a constructed discourse is
opportunity not merely for outright rejection, but for disjuncture to disturb the tranquillity with which they are accepted (see Foucault, 1972, pp. 3-11).

I am disturbed, so I accept Foucault's invitation to disturb.

There is often in this (re)constituted 'alien(ating)' history of schooling for PFNA an emergent periodization which, for me, camouflages, particularly, the crimes committed against humanity. The discursive signs and styles used to narratively (des)scribe some of the events and conditions of this schooling - my schooling - afford leverage to assess what is (un)known and how the (un)known is told. I've learned to become a very skilled reader here, as described by Foucault (1972; Orig. 1969) as "'hearing' of an 'alread' said' that is at the same time a 'not said'" (p. 25). And, I am aware of PFNA theorists' and philosophers who provoke the disjuncture of the already said and not said. But in making this analysis, I feel that I must cite Foucault. For me this feels extremely uncomfortable, unsettling, as, ah, no one seems to monitor that I can(not) cite an authority from a PFNA perspective. I speculate, perhaps unfairly, that to quote a PFNA would be met with a blatant, "Huh? Do you know of Foucault? Derrida? Gramsci?"

I mean, Cardinal (1969) remarks on this said/notsaid business as related to the treaties signed between the nation of Canada and pre-existent nations. He states, that

These pledges are typical, if not all-inclusive, of the promises that were made to the Indians by the government, although the cautionary phrase, 'Her Majesty reserves the right to deal with . . . ,' appearing commonly throughout the treaty, would have alerted a more sophisticated people to possible loopholes and pitfalls. There are many other aspects of the written treaties that are questionable. Generally, the treaties are outstanding for what they do not say rather than what they do say. [His italics] (Cardinal, 1969, p. 34).
Cardinal’s example of said/not said is concrete. Do I take my direction from Harold and ignore Foucault? UP HERE I think my teachers would desire I speak knowledgeably of Foucault. I am not denigrating Foucault.

Whose School(ing)? Whose Language Said/Not /Said?

Interviewer: So from this sense of deep disturbance you decide to disturb. You begin to re-examine these aims of education for PFNA, which range from religious- to subject- to vocational- to genocide-centered.

Interviewee: For me, these labels, these designations of school buildings and facilities clash and collide with idealised horizons of education as being more than indoctrination (see, for example, Peters & Hirst, 1970, pp. 25-28, or, 84-87). Yet, indoctrination is precisely one of the aims of schooling for PFNA. For example, Sarah Carter (1991) examines an indoctrination camp for prairies-located PFNA by introducing her article with post-Confederation (1867) governmental action to consolidate a “variety of precedent, policies, and attitudes” into a foreign legislated Act, The Indian Act (1876) (p. 57). This is legislation to manage those determined to be designated as Others [Interviewee’s very explicit emphasis]. This is a legal policy. This is a language code. This is not a joke.

Further, Carter (1991) emphasizes that what is significant about The Act is the inherent power of the text to de(clare)(fine) who is eligible, entitled, for registered “Indian” status and who is not eligible for this qualification (Ibid., p. 157). Said/Not Said. This determination decides who is to be (incarcera)(educa)(acculta)ted at The File Hills Colony, proclaimed as a model "agricultural colony" in 1901 (Ibid., p. 157). The pastoral phrase – agricultural colony – gives the game of the Canadians’ away, because they bloody well script the plot of the colonialist scenario as not to teach a few nomadic "Indians" how to plough, but how to completely and
legally enfranchise authocthonous citizens from being themselves. Being "Indian" seems to be just not enough; not a sufficient condition for being a designated Canadian. And, I'm bugged that most often the voices speaking about these events and conditions are not PFNA. Foucault asks in print in 1969, "First questions: who is speaking?" (1972, p. 50). Who is entitled and qualified to speak for others? "Who derives from it his own special quality, his prestige, and from whom, in return, does he receive if not some assurance, at least the presumption that what he says is true?" (Foucault, 1972, p. 50).

**Interviewer:** So, with the gaze returning to yourself in the best sense of Socrates' encouragement 'To Know Thyself,' you are confronted with teaching about a 'Canadian' his/herstory to not, ever, never fathom yourself? This feels alienating? Acculturating?

**Interviewee:** And, silencing. I get more publicly "Indian" up here; and I'm angry again. Angry like I was at 18 when I vowed to run away and join the American Indian Movement. Angry like I've been from time to time, wishing THEY'D all go home! This anger is expressed strongly in journal entries from time to time. As I gain an appreciation of survivance, I am unsettled, angry and, regretfully, mean-spirited. This is from a 1992 journal entry.

**Survive. Be strong. Survive. Be strong. That's all there is. Survive some more. Be strong some more.** If it is this much trouble to keep this flame alive [Reference to Archibald, 1993], I don't see the point. . . I am sickened by this whole business of living like a political prisoner in this land. If the White people had not been allowed to live, I would have land, not be forced to live in this stupid urbanized mentality where compassion is spoken and brutality practiced. My people raped by church members; my people stolen from; my people lied to and stalled and stonewalled by
people who dare to write about justice; my people shamed for being who they are; my people whipped by humanists for speaking their own language; and the behaviour continues . . . I am just another member in the sequence. Is there a reason for White People? (Calliou, Journal entry, November 21, 1992).

As ‘data’ the above entry doesn’t need much interpretation.

Much of the background preparation for lecturing that first term (FALL’92) is quite toxic and I’ve been sick often, twice quite seriously, since I arrived here in that snowstorm in 1991. I get noisier in classrooms here, but I too often find myself having to be the “Indian.” I feel like no one seems to care really that I am a woman or community education theorist or a fledgling philosopher of education. And, that’s strenuous, strenuous to be this combination learner and teacher and public relations person, with a forefront sense of active compassion. I cannot stay silent however.

I cannot make silent adjustments.

I am losing the ability to make silent adjustments.

Rattle-RATtle-RATtle-RATtle.

I understand they’re not going home.

Bicultural Emotional Roller Coastering

Interviewer: So, emotionally you’re conflicted once you recognise you’re inside some giant paradox?
**Interviewee:** [Interrupting.] Yes, now wouldn’t that be a great name for an intellectual mid-way ride, The Giant Paradox.

[Laughter. Sounds of a match striking a small black box.]

**Interviewer:** The explorations into cultural (re)production and the historical situations of (ac)(en)culturation et cetera simultaneously provoke, or, at least, help to explain the sense of almost diasporic dis(juncture)(location) you are feeling. In effect, you have two parallel degrees underway. There is the M.A. in community education to explore your intrigue with community-based or community-immersed teaching and learning. There’s another unofficial M.A. in Native "Indian" AboriginalFIRSTNations studies, as related particularly to schooling. All of this convexity focuses on your becoming more overtly "Indian" - and from the sounds of your (re)telling, angry.

**Interviewee:** And, the anger is tempered with a lifelong sense of pacifism; an intuition to be compassionately loving. I mean more than a little, well-behaved Catholic girl. I feel deeply the need not to get swallowed up, consumed by anger. Living in hurtful, mean-spirited anger is harmful to spiritus at micro- and macro-levels.

**Interviewer:** So you wear the treaty, ribbon-dress - ?

[Pause on tape. Sounds of orange shag rug absorbing the silence.]

**Interviewee:** Consciously. Remember I’m wide awake now.

[Explosion of laughter as interviewee mimes doing a long-distance haul across the prairies.]

Of course, not so wide awake that I want to pull a Thelma&Louise into the Grand Canyon.

[More laughter.]

Because by graduation (May, 1993), I have rediscovered a teenage consciousness that I am not ‘Canadian’ although there’s all sorts of mechanisms to make a PFNA believe they are
'Canadian' - like S.I.N.s and passports, 'Canadian' citizenship and voting rights. For example, Mitchell (in Richardson, 1990), observes that

the insistence that we (PFNA-Mohawk) should vote in Canada's elections, and the formal refusal to ratify our supranational border-crossing rights [at the border between the United States and Canada], are but part of a continuing effort to prove to our people -- and, indeed, aboriginal people everywhere in the country that we are Canadians, subject to Canadian laws (p. 115).

Mitchell continues that in 1869, The Newcomers decided that Mohawks (c)should not be in 'lawful' possession of lands without express permission of the Canadians' government (p. 115). The Mohawk at Akwesasne continue to resist foreign, national government intrusion, asserting that the community has existed since "time immemorial, with its own laws and government," without intention of becoming like other Canadians (Ibid., p. 107). Unlike THEM, I can't go home again because, apparently, I've been here since time immemorial.

**Interviewer:** So you stay angry?

**Interviewee:** Oh, yes, certainly.

[Makes a bear-like growl somewhere in the throat area. Frowns while watching interviewer print a tidy note.]

Watch it now. I am teasing. I cannot live in this resurrected anger. I recognise that at heart, the psychospiritual energy I feed into the web of relationships is the psychospiritual energy which will feed me, will feed into my thinking-feeling. I am contemplating the construct of compassionate mind much those -- and these - days. A mind filled compassion, that is, with heart and mind connected, is for me an ideal of rationality I wish to pursue. I am not eager to become an anemotional cognitioner. So as I'm sitting and watching the words go 'round’n’round, I am wondering who I am. I am seeing the yes and no of this dichotomy of Canadians and Indians. I continuously conclude that this his/herstory I am reading is artificially,
foolishly, needlessly dichotomized; and that, at best, the way his/herstory is told is half-truth with their half-truth there and our half-truth here. This segments events and conditions into separate, at times, parallel stories. For example, in Brown's (1987), "Forward" to The Illustrated History of Canada, this his/herstorical gloss shines. He states that this is a history of how Canadians have lived and worked . . . [and] realized their ambitions in their several communities, across generations of huge colonial empires and more recently as citizens in the international world (Brown, 1987, p. v).

The text's chronological sequence plays out as: contact, colonization and conflict (1600-1760), settlement (1760-1840), independence and nation building (1840-1900), industrialization (1900-1945), and post-war construction (1945-1987). None of these chapter titles would prepare any reader for what George Erasmus has to say. George Erasmus, Former Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, delivers this reminder at a self-government symposium in 1990, in Toronto, Ontario. He is one of many voices vigilantly asserting that legitimate, alternative versions of his/herstory (ex)(per)sist. He states that for indigenous peoples of the Americas and in particular North America, our answers lay in the relationships that we created with the European peoples that came here.

We [FNA] rely on our version of what happened, which is still kept alive in every indigenous community across Canada and North America. Our version of what happened is that we had an agreement that we would allow the Europeans to come to this part of the world. They would set up institutions. They would live amongst us. They would not have to live under our institutions (Erasmus in Cassidy, 1991, p. 22).

He challenges the legitimacy of The Newcomers' self-assertion, ah, self-legitimation that conquest occurred and that The People, in this case The Dene, acquiesced to the rule of a "few missionaries" or a "few bureaucrats" (Ibid., p. 23).
Interviewer: By The Newcomers, you mean the immigrant colonists who settle as outsiders in the Americas?


Interviewer: Oh?

Interviewee: Besides the synonyms provided, there is this explanatory sentence. I won’t quote with the italics. "The newcomers quickly established themselves and became self-sufficient" (Urdang, 1992, p. 307). Once I wake up I begin to feel-see these little bits of evidence all over substantiating this rather skewed picture of the events of contact and after. Mitchell (1990, quoted earlier) or Erasmus (1991, quoted above) may be perceived as crazy, unable to accept that a conquest occurred; However, their 'voices' contest the belief system portrayed in Urdang's thesaurus. However, the locational perspective erects a sense of US[PFNA]-THEM[EuroCanadian immigrants] which becomes for me a puzzle to collapse. How do some colonial Canadians and PFNA "Indians" come to believe in the separation? The text I am reading for lecture preparation is strewn with published statements about the "Indians."

William Graham, who joined the Department of Indian Affairs in 1885 as clerk, is soon an Indian Agent by 1887. This is a powerful position and he earns a reputation as someone who shared the belief of many of his contemporaries that the government knew what was best for the Indians. If the Indians themselves happened to disagree, it was regrettable, but hard grounds in itself for compromise. As mere wards of the state, the native people could not reasonably expect their opinions to be considered (in Titley, 1983, p. 40).

Fortunately, Titley (1983) states those acting on behalf of the "Indians" are sharing beliefs and not scientific knowledge.

[Laughter. Pause. More laughter.]
Interviewer: Graham is responsible for the File Hills Farm Colony (see Brass, 1953; Carter, 1991)?

Otherisation

Interviewee: Yes, but in reading about File Hills, this illustrates to me how, on the basis of 'Otherisation', the Canadian government sanctioned a project to "produce a group of Indians who had internalized the whiteman’s religion and culture and who were self-sufficient farmers" (Titley, 1983, p. 27). Dichotomy is more separation; and often two-legged dichotomies. Another example is the designation (homo)(hetero)sexual) which positions 'Other' on the basis of identifying some seemingly significant feature and posi(tion)ting 'One' as not the 'Other'.

This could be no big deal. However, in the case of sexuality designation, questions about rights to entitlements (pensions, spousal status, etc.) are affected by the language code of that designation. For me, Otherisation often seems to invoke forms of violence, despite what Section 15(1) of the 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states, wherein

Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination, and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical ability (Canada, 1982, Sect. 15.).

You don’t have to be a human rights lawyer/ess to archive the daily violations of this ideal [Interviewee’s emphasis] that occur daily in Canada, or the ideals of the Canadian Bill of Human Rights, proclaimed by John Diefenbaker in 1960. That Canadian Bill of Human Rights guaranteed the rights of individuals to life, liberty, personal security and enjoyment [not posession] of property.

[Laughter.]
That property enjoyment business can be quite a knee-slap for "Indians."

[More laughter.]

This Charter is an addition to the repatriated Canadian constitution (see The Constitution Act, 1867-1982), which separates Canadians and Aboriginal "Indians" Natives; in fact, guaranteeing Natives First Peoples' "Indians" an "inherent right to self-government" in Section 35(1). The separation continues use of a Cowboys& Indians trope, with Cowboys and Indians considered separate species. When will we adjust to a (re)understanding that we are all two-leggeds? What will our philosophising sounds like then? How to understand that creation -- fictionalisation -- of Others on a page does not make this the reality? And, the separation is both (un)necessary and maddening and oh-so, pervasive.

**Interviewer:** Ah, but sometimes necessary?

**Interviewee:** Yes, as related to reparation. However, we can make reparations adversarially or in a compassionately community-like way as all two-leggeds who wish to repair the harmful violence done to a species.

**Halfstory**

**Interviewee:** Anyway, in my own field - ah, I guess, that would be education - I have been interrogating Phillips' (1957), *The Development of Education in Canada*. For example, Phillips celebrates the heroism of the Jesuits. The inscribers of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, supply this definition of heroism: "heroic conduct" (p. 666). Hero is defined as "1.a. a man noted or admired for nobility, courage, outstanding achievement, etc." (Ibid., p. 666). I suspect the dictionary's "etc." covers a widely ranging territory of ethical and necessary EuroCanadian instructional behaviours towards "Indians." The Catholic missionary invaders, uninvited by the Iroquois, encounter "great difficulties in teaching the Indians," including the nomadic wandering
at will, resistant "shamen," "strange languages to master," and "animistic religion" (Phillips, 1957, p. 5). These are presented as sympathetic reasons to explain the heroic "instruction of the Indians [which] must have been a laborious and discouraging task" to "convert Indian children" in order to "absorb them into the French culture" (Ibid., pp. 5, 6). He continues that the education of "white children" (p. 7) begins after this story of 'heroism'. Phillips' (1957) unquestioning acceptance of this two-legged dichotomy and the perspective of his sources legitimates fairly complicated human rights crimes, which he fails to mention. The (re)telling deflects questions and reifies this distinction between "Indians" and "Whites."

'Discouraging!?!’ For whom? The voices of the pupils are absent; the voices of the community, also absent. Sometimes I write these imaginary passages to illustrate the forgotten part, or the unknown part, of Canadian his/herstory. For example,

Hard fun-work, but we managed to elude our teacher-priest-man today; had to stealth almost ten miles through the thickly 'animate' forest to one of the tobacco fields, lain fallow in a complicated system of crop rotation practice indicative of sophisticated, sustainable agricultural development. However, a day of calming-freedom. Not like yesterday, when Father B-- made us speak-repeat nonsense words for no reason(s) and suggested we might want to dress as they do, speak as they do, eat as they do and kneel as they do when they talk-plead with their 'God'. Well, I guess we could make a few prie-dieus out of some of those birch trees curing. We thought we were pretty reasonable in treating his entreaties as a pretty funny joke (Ha-Ha); however, Father B -- didn't seem to be
laughing too much. They certainly are keen to teach. I wonder what their trophological images are "within [their] experiences, embodied in [them] as persons and expressed and enacted in [their] practices and actions (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, p. 60)? However, when we ask them to teach us anything sensible, like answers to these questions: 'How long are you planning to stay in Hochelega?'; or, 'Just passing through?'; they don't seem to have too many erudite answers. I must run. I hear prayer beads rattling, so I'll rebury this journal (Calliou foremother journal entry, 1607 (?), n.p.).

This passage does not exist; but oh how I long to read such because they would teach me about counter-hegemony, resistance and survivance - very much ingredients of 'Canadian' his/herstory.

The his/herstory told in Canada is this his/herIndianstory and this his/herEuroCanadianstory. And, this separation continues here at this university, located on the traditional territory of the Musqueam, with 'mainstream' education courses and then two undergraduate and one graduate courses directly related to this his/her"Indian"story of their schooling. The events - lessons - of this his/herIndianstory are 'de-streamed', therefore, lawful only so far, marginalised in special AboriginalNative"Indian"studies courses and/or departments.

This artificial dichotomous treatment of his/her"Indian"story HERE and his/herEuroCanadianstory THERE eludes the confrontation with unpleasant recognition of the global patient called humanity. We inherit an incredible history of violence as teachers. No one can be 'inside' or 'outside' a web of relations so tightly woven; interconnected.

**Interviewer:** So you see this his/herstory as firstly, only half of his, er, herstory and also a his/herstorical narrative as one of interconnectedness which we have not learnt how to write yet?
One Species-ism, Collective Interdependence

**Interviewee:** We are intimately interrelated as a species. Someone cuts down trees and creates energy for me to use my computer. I am inhaling someone else’s exhalation.

Hhhmmm... I guess, it’s here that I pull out all my quotes to buttress my belief about interconnectedness. Let’s see who will I use? I guess the quotation I return to is Black Elk Jr. in Churchill’s (1982) text, *Marxism and Lakota Tradition*:

[Interviewee grabs a book from one the shelves. Access is easy. The books are arranged alphabetically. Interviewee reads. The quotation seems readily available as pages from the book are loose and falling out. An indication of how often she has been to this place inside this book?]

The Lakota . . . close, open, and often punctuate their prayers with the word Metakuyeayasi, a generally accepted translation of which is ‘all relations.’ And anyone thinking ‘all relations’ is referring simply to fathers, mothers, cousins and brothers, is less than ignorant of the Lakota. These human relations are, of course, included. But, in the same sense, so are the four legged animals, the animals which crawl and swim and fly, the plants, the mountains, lakes, plains, rivers, the sky and sun, stars, moon, the four directions ... in short, everything. Everything in the universe is related within the tradition of Lakota spirituality; everything is relational, and can only be understood in that way (Black Elk in Churchill, 1982 (?), p. 148).

This passage is a very elational passage for me; also, very comforting. This passage is an early encounter at one of those times when I felt suffocatingly buried in text. Black Elk reminds me to eschew the redundant anthropocentric perspective of my graduate studies. This is a stopping-place in text I do not resist.
I'm not always as thorough a scholar as I might be. I have not researched Black Elk to authenticate his ethnocultural legitimacy. The power of the words though is the emphasis on relationality, the space-energy-between-among-all-beings - perhaps, spirit - to be understood as shared and, thus, needing our respectful caretaking.

**Interviewer:** When I really ponder this aspect of relationality, the more difficult it is to accept --

**Interviewee:** any two-legged dichotomies? Yes, I agree. Hard to see how a species became to segmented. Thus, I begin to think about this construct I am drawn to construct. I coin the term – *ourstory*. For me, contact is not over; attempts of colonization are not ceased; resistance is not abated or overwhelmed. Survivance endures. This is a story about ourselves: the two-leggeds. The emotional tensions of pique & fury & sadness & grieving & compassion motivate my collapse of the dichotomy of US-THEM. In that first teaching term, I write in my journal,

*I still stew about the threat I was feeling in that classroom yesterday. I am not certain what it was a threat 'about' or 'to' in terms of my personal safety. This was difficult. I know I need to work on myself in some unknown area so I don’t feel that threat so much. Yesterday, as I talked to M -- about this I was trying to tell him that it is all well and good to discuss the theoretical side of oppression and such, but I experience daily in terms of what some people say to me or how they treat me. I feel I could strengthen my compassionate presentation of material and not let the class become an emotional morass... This is not to say that I become an emotionless automaton, just that I feel/sense that these emotional responses [not mar the class]. I need to work more on my compassion center -
making the feelings of love, peace, happiness and compassion stronger. I know I can do this because it was this loving acceptance I learnt in classrooms at L -- which made me such an effective teacher. This quality of lovingness can sure get buried in the cognitive world of the university. I know I was resisting yesterday and creating feelings of separation which do not create those close links needed for teaching - especially teaching about this difficult and complex nest of issues. Well, I try again Thursday

(Calliou, Journal Entry, November 4, 1992, n.p.).

Thus, I desire a compassionately told ourstory, which unflinchingly informs us equally about EuroCanadianimmigrantresidents in contact with NativeAboriginalIndigenous"Indians."

**Interviewer:** So his/herstory as a kind of love story?

**Interviewee:** Freire (1989; Orig. 1967) reminds that if love is absent, then an authentic dialogue cannot emerge-nurture (p. 77). As a dichotomy, US-THEM could become a continuance of the brutal irrational violence of an US-THEM -- this seems a fearfilling dichotomy. Fearful heart-minds, angry heart-minds, doubtful heart-minds just don’t think rationally, carefully, constructively, caringly. US-THEM, or inside-outside, privileges the erroneous possibility of being elsewhere, untouched by this his/herstory of violence and false consciousness legitimation "where Canadian legislators and courts proceeded in the name of the Crown to enforce Canadian sovereignty over" PFNA (Boldt, 1993, p. 87). We all walk this Land-Mother together; She generously feeds us all. Separation is not possible in an interwoven net of relationships, possibly leading only to a lengthy print war where we write back-and-forth to each other but never (re)connect. I believe no one is inside/outside the shaming of violence; nor inside/outside the celebration of healing; nor inside/outside the reparations required to restore
balance-harmony-beauty-spirit-power. "Indians" are not a footnote to his/herstory, this is the his/herstory of Canada/Kanata. We are all two-leggeds, how to construct ourstory? Freire (1989) reminds that there is no privilege, no place of safety, in relations of violence (oppression, genocide et cetera) for the dehumanization equally affects those labelled 'oppressors' and those labelled 'oppressed' (p. 32). However, Friere (1989) observes that as all of the energy of the oppressors is channeled into dehumanization, then the 'oppressed' are those who might lead a pedagogical liberatory struggle to (re)humanize (p. 32). Thus, in light of Freire's recommendation, my desire for a compassionate, self-critically-compassionate, ourstory to (en)(un)fold us together might be a tad un(realistic)&idealistic, in fact -

**Interviewer:** [Obviously excited, cannot restrain an interruption.] But you still walk across that stage, in War Memorial Gym, in May of 1993, dressed in yourstory clothes; not, an ourstory outfit. And you seem reasonably happy, self-satisfied to do so?

**Interviewee:** Oh, yes. And, that smile says everything.
PART II: BRIEF WALK:
THEN I NEED SOME NEW MOCCASINS,
THE SOCIOSPIRITUEMOECPOLITICOCULTURAL & OTHER
WHITE NOISE OF RESEARCH

[Sounds of books being snapped shut, the smooshing of chairs on orange shag carpet
and random vocalizations, like, "Oh, you’re back?"; "Bring enough fresh tapes?"; I
"I honestly didn’t think you’d return. Ah, well."; "Fresh coffee in that thermos?."

For the second day of the interview, the interviewee is wearing a black turtle neck top
with black stretch pants, green ankle socks and black, leather slipper-shoes. Her hair
is scraped back into the semblance of a pony tail.]

False Start(ling)

**Interviewer:** So, you walked off that stage and into a Ph.D.?

**Interviewee:** Ah, yes; ah, yes, stage walking. Sorry I may need some time to catch up
with you. Before you arrived, I was working on generating that (re)periodization of schooling for
PFNA (Calliou, 1995, unfinished). That’s the project I mentioned yesterday. Really exciting stuff,
because I think I’m beginning to see how to write an ourstory. And, I am totally immersed in
the labels of language used to describe and narrate this his/herstory.

Perhaps, we could skip the boring (re)hashing of the mocca-shoes paper and have a look
at here-now?

[Interviewee waits for assent. Interviewer provides none.]
Anyway, in teaching EDUC441 and EDUC442, I have moment to (re)examine the periodization structuration - again the infrastructure is quality deflection.

_Interviewer_: Ah, deflection?

_Interviewer_: Precisely. Deflection, we're invited to look elsewhere, not here but there when we examine this his/herstory. The basic periodization of this linear (re)telling is becoming stultified as: pre-contact, day schools, boarding schools (residential schools and then industrial schools, survival schools and then band-operated schools (see, for examples, Hawthorn, H.B. (1967) [pp. 19-41]; Barman, Hebert & McCaskill (1986), [pp. 1-22]; Lawrence (1987) [pp. 7-20]; Kirkness & Selkirk-Bowman (1992) [pp. 5-19] or Noriega in Jaimes (1992) [pp. 371-402]). The emphasis here-now is on nouns which potentially subdue the actions, usually represented through verbs in English, of underlying epistemological-affective-linguistic-political et cetera violence to obscure the purposeful reasons for physical and segregation of a PFNA and enactment of segregationist policies and attitudes. Now why would that be? The noun-terms reduce the terroristic foundations of a deliberately genocidal policy publicly called 'schooling' (see Chrisjohn & Young, 1994). I mean the imp -

[Interviewer interrupts with a full-throated cough. Interviewer is reviewing laminated, yellow note cards regarding the role of the interviewer. She rereads one quickly and silently to herself.]

The role of the interviewer in non-directive interviewing appears to be passive. This is misleading though. The interviewer must be an active listener, he or she must listen to what is being said in order to assess how it relates to the research focus and how it may reflect the circumstances of the interview. Moreover, this is done with a view to how the future course of the interview might be shaped. While the aim is to minimize the influence of the researcher on what the
interviewee says, some structuring is necessary in terms of what is and is not relevant (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, pp. 113-114).

**Interviewee:** You all right? Cough due to cold?

**Interviewer:** No, I'm fine. No cough. I thought, we [Interviewer's emphasis] might [Interviewer’s emphasis], perhaps [Interviewer’s emphasis with heart pounding], as planned, move to the western realm. I mean I am sure your recent work is fascinating and of interest; yet we are neglecting this interview [more Interviewer’s emphasis]. And, well [Said with genuine tone of apology] this is supposed to be about –

[and Interviewer is interrupted.]

**Interviewee:** Yes, not about the latest hobby horse I’m riding around in some newly discovered corral.

**Interviewer:** I was hoping today, we could strive for, or rather attempt for today the development of a certain "unity of purpose" as "one of the central organizing features of, ah, this collaboration" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p. 74).

**Interviewee:** Hhhmmm... I consider that your role then is supposed to be rather like that of coach, facilitator, co-inquisitor, empathetic co-researcher et cetera. I can read your laminated, yellow note cards upside down; I was a classroom teacher for ten years. I can read sideways too. Let's see, what are you looking at now? Ah, yes, Oakley (1984), the interviewer is "more than an instrument of data collection" (p. 48) such that interview(er)(ee) equally contribute ideas, experiences, knowledge and such to the "research process" (Ibid., p. 48). Awl-right? How about I ask you questions today?

**Interviewer:** Well, if you’d rather not continue, that's O.K. too. I mean we are both able to terminate at any point in this research process, on anyone's say-so.

**Interviewee:** I didn’t say-feel-think-imply-intimate-co-facilitate that suggestion.
Interviewer: No, but I can tell you are, perhaps, uncomfortable; or, erh, ah; not feeling enough trust to continue. Maybe. I just feel -

Interviewee: [Interrupting] Now don't get all (apologe)(anthropologe)tically frustrated with me. Let's salvage some data collection here for you. I empathise with the difficulty, getting participants-subjects-co-respondents to co(oper)(ollabor)ate; particularly in a case where the subaltern is asked to speak-write. Try to remember, though, research is big business; particularly, when it comes to "Indians."

Interviewer: I hope you're not just judging this as my interview. I mean I really hope you are not judging this as some sort of 'Rolling-Stone-Magazine-cum-interview' turned on itself as research where I take "the data and run" and get published? I mean I'd rather hoped that our research "is based on the commitment to advancing knowledge through research grounded in the experience of living on the margins" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p. 64).

Interviewee: Huh?

Rat-tle/Rat-tle/Rat-tle/Rat-tle

Interviewee: Did you hear-listen-(re)read anything I told you yesterday about the artificial false consciousness of inside-outside; core-periphery? That's a hoax. Look at the circle again. Who can stand outside a circle? Who stands outside interconnection in that Black Elkian cosmoecomorphic-transcendent-sense (in Churchill, 1982 (?), p. 47)?

Interviewer: Well, yes, of course. I'm sure we're all connected, related somehow. I didn't mean it that [Interviewer's emphasis] way. I - well, you are marginalised, that is at the margins, which is "the context in which those who suffer injustice, inequality and exploitation live their lives" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p. 33). I mean you are "on the margins not only in terms of the inequality in the distribution of material resources, but also mechanisms of knowledge origination are organized so that the views of a small group of people prevail as the 'Truth' " (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p. 33). "Truth" which is "a system of ordered procedures for
the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements; . . . linked into a circular relation with [self-sustaining] systems of power" (Fontana & Pasquino in interview with Foucault in Rabinow, 1984, p. 74). I am perceiving this interview collaboration as a moment to create that disruption and get at some truth [Interviewer's emphasis].

**Interviewee:** Oh, I thought you were here to ask me some questions. Collect some data, ah, answers. Truth? That might be fun. Tough – but fun. Remember Rosenau’s (1992) observation that "language produces and reproduces its own world without reference to reality" (p. 79) until the possibility to say anything for sure becomes impossible - improbable - "because language is purely an artificial sign system and cannot assure truth" (p. 79)?

**Interviewer:**

[Looks hopefully at the door. Makes mental note to ask committee members about the ideal interview situation versus this interview situation.]

The Serious Play of Questions and Answers

[Michel Foucault (May, 1984) intones offstage, using a gendered male pronoun only]

In the serious play of questions and answers, in the work of reciprocal elucidation, the rights of each person are in some sense immanent in the discussion. They depend only on the dialogue situation. The person asking the questions is merely exercising the right that has been given to him: to remain unconvincing to perceive a contradiction, to require more information, to emphasize different postulates, to point out faulty reasoning, etc. As for the person answering the questions, he too exercises a right that does not go beyond the discussion itself; by the logic of his own
discourse he is tied to the questioning of the other. Questions and answers depend
on a game - a game that is at once pleasant and difficult - in which each of the two
partners takes pains to use only the rights given him by the other and by the
accepted form of the dialogue. (Rabinow in interview with Foucault, 1984; in
Rabinow, 1984, pp. 381-382).

**Interviewer:** Yes, I am asking some questions and then you answer. There are some
certain responsibilities here – don’t you think? And, you are on the margins.

[Continues to pursue the marginalised thesis.]

I mean you even said yesterday

[Relocates Line ‘x’ of typed transcript]

that:

especially, if one is not to the University born. I am an "Indian" (see, for
example, A), Sect. 20(1) of Canada’s Indian Act ), "a person who pursuant to this
Act is registered as an Indian or is entitled to be registered as an Indian" (R.C.S.,
1970, c.l-6, s.5.). In fact, 120 year ago, I could not be at a Canadian university as
an "Indian" (Ibid ., (R.C.S., 1970, c.l-6, s.5.). (Calliou, Day: 001 Interview, Line
‘x’ of transcript Tape #Il(b)(i) ).

You then cite Canada’s *Indian Act* (1876), Section 86(1) regarding enfranchisement. Not only
that, there is evidence to ‘locate’ you.

**Economically You Are**

**Interviewer:** For example, Marchak (1975; 1988). Marchak (1975) marshals statistical
and other evidence to challenge a pervasive "classless image of Canada," which is reinforced and
"renewed with the daily reading of the newspaper, the viewing of television, the study of literature, or history, or social sciences" (Marchak, 1975, p. 31). Despite the amount of curricular experiences devised and the amount of money invested in classrooms and communities, inequity persists.

[Interviewer's hurried note: Except the interviewee is here. Still unequal?]

Marchak (1975) compellingly argues that, in Canada, education does not eliminate the inequalities and inequities of our seemingly seamless society. Instead, she presents statistical information, which located from Information Canada, to illustrate that those in the upper echelons of society, that is, upper income, higher status occupations, are those who send their Canadian children to post-secondary institutions to acquire the skills and credentials to maintain a socioeconomic situation conducive to improved access to and enjoyment of particular financial, medical, occupational and other privileges. She cites that "Indians" continue to be one of the groups educationally disadvantaged (Marchak, 1988, p. 39). Although Marchak (1988) notes there are individual exceptions, the overall "process of inter-generational mobility via the educational channels is less effective for the lower income groups than for the middle-income groups (p. 36).

There Are Margins

They Taught Me That In School

Interviewer: There are margins. I think my "methods [are] appropriate for researching from the margins" and "grounded in a political awareness of the need for change" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p. 63). I really do believe --
Interviewee: in the existence of margins? Hogwash! Codswaddle! Squashshit!

[Interviewee smiles broadly.]

Great! I always wanted to use those words. I didn’t manage to sneak them into any of the dissertation proposals I penned. I’m sorry I don’t believe I live (o)(i)n any margins.

Interviewer: Yes, I’m beginning to see that. You are attempting to conceptualize some sort of spiritus-connected ourstory – a new version of world history. But there is the reality here that you are marginalised. And, I’ve come out here to these margins to --

Interviewee: I come here to this campus, located on the traditional territory of the Musqueam, and find out I supposedly reside somewhere in the margins. My mother didn’t raise me to think of myself like this. My mother and father did tell me I was a Mohawk-Cree + member of the Michel Band. They did not raise me to call myself marginalised or minority. I don’t live -- [Interviewee’s voice rising, almost with a Martin Luther King like tenor.]

[Interviewer’s note to self: I guess when I write something like that King business I am editorializing. She actually has quite a soft, delicate voice -- the kind that extremely shy people possess.]

– beyond the borderlands; where, occasionally, border workers will ride out in their Jeep Cherokees to meet with me. However, I’d have to say that with the exceptions of a few treaties we signed with Les Canadiennes, that someone might well be inhabiting the margins (the borders, the periphery, the suburbs), but maybe it ain’t us PFNA.

Interviewer: I appreciate your frankness; particularly, not translating your experiences and perceptions into the "concepts and language of the status quo" (Kirby & McKenna warning to those researching in the margins, 1989, pp. 64-65). I could leave the construct – ‘hogwash’ – in the final transcription if you like. I understand that the actual words people use can be of considerable analytic importance. The ‘situated vocabularies’ employed provide us with valuable --
Interviewee:

[Interrupts. Sounds of an impatient frown. Rubs right temple vigorously. Finishes quotation.]

- information about the way in which members of a particular culture organize their perceptions of the world, and so engage in the 'social construction of reality' (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1989, p. 153).

Oh, boy! Ave!O-vey! and Hoor-rah! If you like I could adopt an even more colourful vocabulary? I picked up some richly textured phraseology while working seismic in Alberta.

**What Is Under Construction Here?**

**Interviewee:** Try not think of me as representative of any particular sub-population – ethnocultural or otherwise. This margins business. Now who designates the margins? I admit there are numerous statistically supported differentiation among Canadians. Visit the fifth floor of the Main Library and you can spend a life’s time studying the numbers. The bottom line is I can’t put anybody in a margin anymore. The more I look at US-THEM equations, I can’t see the distinction.

Besides, I thought if we were researching from the margins, then we would all have to be marginalised to get at that genuine "intersubjectivity: an authentic dialogue between all participants in the research process in which all are respected as equally knowing subjects" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p. 129).

[Longish pause on tape.]

I mean, doesn’t someone have to be marginalised here if we’re gonna ‘do’ research from the margins?
We could take turns?

Procedural Requirements

**Interviewer:** Well, this is getting off to a rather bad start. We seem to be talking at cross-purposes here; but that's acceptable? I mean I understand you to be marginalised and you think you're not. Quite a contradiction, eh? We've found one of those pesky paradoxes. I guess we have a difference of opinion.

[A kinda eardrum splitting squeaky laugh.]

I'm not sure how I'll code these "bibbits" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, pp. 137-140) when I start analysis of the data, I do mean, data, which "involves living with and making sense of the large amount of data available through the method of researching from the margins" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989, p. 134). I'm certain I'll be living with these interviews for a long, long, time; however, finding the umbrella terms, well, ah, that's my worry isn't it?

**Interviewee:** [Obviously lost in thought, asks cautiously.] Bibbit?

**Interviewer:** Yes, that's Kirby and McKenna's (1989) term for a passage from a transcript, a piece of information from field notes, a section of the document or snippet of conversation recorded on a scrap of paper that can stand on its own but, when necessary, can be relocated in its original context (p. 135).

**Interviewee:** Ah, yes, the bibbit. I thought you were, perhaps, referring to a grandchild of Franklin Bobbit. How about that? Learn something everyday. I think-crave I will run over to the store and get some cigarettes. Do you want anything? Besides an interview? When I return, we'll try again; because, perhaps, mocca-shoes might be worth a (re)visit. While I am away, why don't you write up some field notes.
Interviewer's field notes

Day 002/hr. 0947/Same location as Day 001AM. Tape at 06:42.

*Any ethnographer worth her/his salt keeps field notes. Field notes are documentation of context, site, and the non-verbal realm of the interviewee, a traditional method, in ethnography, for "recording observational data" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, p. 145).*

The subject-client, ah, co-respondent, seems unnecessarily edgy today; resistant, if not, rude. (Well, that's how I feel!!) From reading her earlier works, I suspected and now confirm that 'x' is uneasy about the research process. I feel enormously slighted that she appears to be unbelieving of my sincere desire to research in a politically sensitive manner. I mean it's not like I am unaware of the subaltern's challenge (Spivak, 1988) and the limitation of Western humanistic critique in that the Subject may still merely be a (publici)(historici)zed subject, reduced to a sawdust bag of dehumanized subjectivity (p. 75). I have read Kirkness and Barnhardt (1991) and understand that First Nations students face the disrespectfulness of the University to The People and that university can represent "an impersonal, intimidating and often hostile environment" where there is emphasis on a "literate world in which only decontextualized literate knowledge counts, and that knowledge must be displayed in highly specialized literate forms" (p. 8). I am trying to be polite with this interview. I mean look at yesterday. My questions yesterday were sparse and I even abandoned about 45 of them as she rambled on and on about ourstory, and course requirements and her emotional roller coaster ride through here. That will be some mess to code and analyse. I already feel challenged about managing this data, locating what
Carney (1983) describes as seeing the "larger, more holistic understanding" contained within patterns which emerge (p. 58). Just how are these patterns supposed to emerge? What cues do I use? How do you when you've found the right 'code' to fit the 'pattern'? Is it really all so arbitrary?

I feel she is making 'fun' of me. Must remember to locate this Franklin Bobbit she mentioned. A relative?

I am uncertain about trying to convince her that my intentions are honourable and that in reading I have tried to sensitise myself to researching with those historically uninitiated into the inheritance of a particular canon. I mean what am I supposed to do with the image of a snowstorm? How do I get this interview back on track? Darn! I feel like starting to smoke again. Where is she? How far away can a corner store be? What am I supposed to do with that obviously fake journal entry she concocted for 1607? Must note that. Interviewee obviously very capable of spieling (hhmm, 'ie' or 'ei'?); significant of a rich fantasy life? I think I'll omit these as they don't seem to speak directly to anything about the four major topic areas identified. I guess I should describe the research setting and try to incorporate Hammersley and Atkinson's (1989) sensibility that the "preservation of concreteness is an important consideration in fieldnote writing" (p. 151).

Today we are in a corner of her bedroom, which doubles as a study. The bed is unmade. Who sleeps with four pillows? Should I mention that there is obviously a homemade quilt and sheepskin on the bed? Does that matter? How about a calendar on the wall from the T.V. program, The Young and the Restless? There are about 8.4 metres of book shelves, with books packed solidly along the south and west walls of the area. The carpet in here is nauseatingly orange. There is no phone.

Abort. Abandon.
Oh doesn’t this just meet the requirements of rich scene sketch where the reader will be "struck by a vivid sensory impression, describe[d] primarily through detailed imagery" (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995, p. 85)?

There are stacks of papers everywhere. O.K., what kind of papers? I wonder if I should touch anything in here. They are obviously academic papers. Well, no, there’s a phone bill. And, there’s an open journal. Wow, she draws in her journal too. She didn’t show me any of these. Yesterday we met here, but she quickly transported me to the F-C on West Broadway. I noted the throwback ’60s interior decor. Lives in past? She did mention living in a commune on L- Street in the neighbourhood of K-- in the early 1970s; with brief mention of going to a B-In in S-P-. What is a B-In? Should I ask one of 'counter-culture' aunts? Interviewee stuck in a time warp? A radio plays pop-schlock constantly. There’s nothing really "Indian" in here. No buckskins dresses or drums. Well, wait. There is her moccasin lighter case, a gift from J-- S-- (Haisla), a stretched neck turtle rattle, a gift from R--C-- (Oneida) and a fair amount of literature related to PFNA. Otherwise, what to document? There are a bewildering number of details I could record, but which are the significant ones? Which really identify this interviewee in her situated situatedness?

[OFFSTAGE (Basically a cheap trick to slide in a footnote, which is not allowed in A.P.A.): Voice of Wendy Rose (in Jaimes, 1992) somewhere in the background.

As a poet, I am continually frustrated by the restrictions placed on my work by the same people who insist that poets should not be restricted. It is expected - indeed, demanded -- that I do a little "Indian-dance," a shuffle and scrape to please the tourists [as well as the
anthropologists]. Organizers of readings continually ask me to wear beadwork and turquoise, to dress in buckskin (my people didn't wear much buckskin; we've cultivated cotton for thousands of years), and to read poems conveying pastoral or "natural" images. I am often asked to "tell a story" and "place things in a spiritual framework." Simply being Indian -- a real, live, breathing up-to-date Indian person -- is not enough. In fact, other than my genetics, this is the precise opposite of what is desired. The expectation is that I adopt, and thereby validate, the 'persona' of some mythic 'Indian being'[Her italics](p. 413).]

[Sound of a squeaky, brown-painted door opening, followed by the sound of the door being firmly shut.]

Well, that interrupts these brief notes. Back to sparring, I mean, dialogic intersubjectivity.

**Interviewee:** [Gestures at interviewer's field note pad.] Did you note that turtle rattle?

[Interviewer begins speaking quickly, obviously wishing to guide the interview back to original focus. Fiddles with S- compact cassette recorder. Checks tape counter and records numeric reading. Looks up and sees Interviewee writing field notes.]

**Interviewee's field notes:**

Day/date? Check calendar later. Time? Must still be morning. Two days past new moon. I am wondering at my brashness to write a dissertation this way. Now why did I code that as 8!BRASH!; that is, 'brashness'? How about 'temerarious'? Perhaps,
tendentious'? No, that sounds too manipulative. Hhhmmm..., perhaps, retarius?

Whatever. I am very comfortable writing in this playlet form; Plato (1973, Grube translation; Orig. 385-380 B.C.) manged. Basically, this extended transcription, rather like a dissertation in drag, is a recording of the voices in my 'head-heart'. Oh, great, now they'll think "I HEAR rattles and Voices." I can just see some avid coder striking that passage as JARC*S; or rather, Joan of Arc Syndrome; or MLR*S, that being Metis Louis Riel Syndrome. However, does self-transcription of 'voice' authenticate me as an authoritative supplier of knowledge to commence a "decanonisation" (re. decanonisation, see: Hassan, 1987; in Jencks, 1992, p. 196) of Eurowestern everythingness? That is, if I admit to being marginalised. There is novelty here as I bypass the 'traditional' skeletal internal structure of the dissertation as genre; but the value? Value to whom? Is this an adequate (re)presentation of an "Indian" female's post-secondary schooling experience as that "knowing subject" Freire (1989) invites me to be. Is my hesitancy indicative of Freire's (1989) observation that "self-depreciation is another characteristic of the oppressed, which derives from their internalization of the opinion the oppressors hold of them" (p. 49). Yes, I am hesitant to challenge and be a liberatory (re)creator of the world (Freire, 1989, pp. 54-56)? I did not come here to this university to do this at all.

**Interviewer:** [Full-throated cough.]

**Interviewee:** Sorry, Yes, the Western Realm. [Interviewee dons a cowboy hat and begins.]

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, after the Convocation Ceremony...

*Actually, I made the part up, about the cowboy hat, it's out at the trailer. But I did put it on imaginarily.*
Interviewee: I'd throw on my moccasins for effect; but I need some new moccasins.

Yes, you're absolutely right. I walk across that stage at Convocation right back into the emotionally charged atmosphere of 'the research process'. In the January of 1993 EDCI601 doctoral seminar, the focus is on research.

[Interviewer's Note: Subject makes a very histrionic gesture of self-strangulation, followed with miming of a self-hanging. Hah! The research texts talk about making the research environment a 'safe' environment for the interviewee; but I do not recall mention of researcher safety. Help! I might be wise to terminate this interview here. I could rework the proposal a bit and maybe just survey the experiences of PFNA at post-secondary EuroCanadian settings and watch for (dis)similarities and (dis)simulations of experiences. The (dis)simulation stuff could get interesting because then I could use Gerald Vizenor (1994).]

Interviewee: Do you have a question?

Interviewer: [Quickly recovering.] Yes, perhaps, this would be an appropriate time to link the white noise of research with the Western Realm you suggested?

Interviewee: As I recall, you decided that the four areas of my existential nauseau identified seem to fit. You state, "I just felt the four areas of 'existential nausea' you mention earlier, appear to 'fit into' the Four Directions/Realms. For example:

(1) Anemotional Cogni(ondi)tioning;

(2) The sociospiritueomoecopoliticocultural 'White' Noise of Researching;
(3) Canononicity: Euroheritageizationing; and
(4) Acculturative Secularizing. (Tape III(i)(c)).

**Interviewer:** Yes, but you said, "Yes, almost too neatly" (Tape transcription segment III(i)(c)).

**Interviewee:** Yes, that’s one of my uneasy queasies about the research process; that is, the final product always seems to ‘hang together’ almost too agilely and then, with photocopier precision, the findings are ‘written up’ and ‘sanctioned’ and people begin to legitimately believe them. Beliefs gird action. In this case, research occurs and is publicised. Then all manner of events are in play. People, even PFNA, start believing "Indians" have a learning style (More, 1984), er, lately preference. ‘Too bad if you’re an "Indian" with a highly abstract print style because you’re gunnaget experiential, hands-on curricular experiences - even if it kills you.’ At least, that part’s historically consistent, schooling for "Indians" has always intended genocide more than academic excellence (see, for examples, Chrisjohn & Young, 1994; Noriega in Jaimes, 1992).

**Strewn With Absurdity**

The "Indian research" field is strewn with absurdity. Try hacking your way through McShane and his collaborators’ (for examples, McShane and Willensbring, 1984) scientific attempts to "show that the brain of the American Indian differs from the brain of the Caucasian" in terms of left-right asymmetry (see, Chrisjohn & Peters, 1986, p. 63), which might explain the ENGLISH language impairment of "Indian" children learners. Impairment? These "Indian" children learners are not left-ear-brain-impaired; they are Imperialistically impaired - ENGLISH is not always the heritage language of the "Indian" children learner (See, for example, Battiste, 1986, for an earlier view of linguistic imperialism).
What Is An Assumption of This Research?

**Interviewer:** Well, there can be different interpretations here.

**Interviewee:** Exactly. For me, it's Chrisjohn's (1986) paper, The Mythology of Indian Education Research, that makes me look at the racist codification of research findings when the sample population chosen is based primarily on the criterion that THEY be NativeAmerIndianAboriginal"Indians." The inherent nature of such research design is racist; so, how valid are the findings? I mean how to do you find an "Indian" brain? If they took out my brain and measured it, would they be measuring an "Indian" brain? Sorry, "Indian" female brain? Did I miss something while reading the research here?

More R.R.P.

**Interviewer:** Perhaps, we'll just leave explication of the western realm's linkage with the physicality, the er, materiality, of the research process? Being in a Ph.D. program means you are again confronted, challenged with revisiting the research process.?

**Interviewee:** Yes, more R.R.P.; an unintended obsession. Research is from the French, recherche, meaning to find again. My interest in research is ironic. I barely survived 508. Yet, I am spending a great deal of time thinking about what research has been, is and might be in relation to myself; as a First People, as a womyn, as a P.O.W., as, pick a label. I am asking what this all means to intercultural research? I am reading to lecture prep for EDUC441 & EDUC442 much research about myself and my brothers and sisters. Much of that research was of that ethnographic quality which seems to consider humans as objects of study - as curiosities or oddities which could be understood and categorized by collecting and categorizing stories, artifacts, languages, methods of food preparation, beliefs, creation stories, etc. What is exotic is
attractive. Now, often marketable. Often the published research fails, for me, to illuminate. Instead static pictures emerge about people predicated on a dichotomy between researcher and researched, with the researcher privileged to ‘code’ and ‘interpret’ the ‘data’ - and more often published than the researched.

**Interviewer:** But that’s changing, right?

**Interviewee:** Well, there is more research from PFNA. However, the history of this researched investigation with regard to PFNA is so makeshift as to be unbelievable. Lane (1972) exposes the poverty and paucity of the research extant in the 1970s and I don’t see much improvement. He states that we have not identified enough of the psychological characteristics of particular Indian populations. We do not know whether characteristics stem from aboriginal backgrounds or from recent times. We know nothing about the rigidity of or the persistence of psychological traits or personality types within groups. We are still at the stage in which purportedly serious researchers can study Indian children in one school classroom on the West coast and then write about the characteristics of Canadian Indian children (pp. 352-353).

And, I see this eagerness to learn about "Indians" (even if they do say First Nations) in students who come into EDUC442, Critical Issues In First Nations Pedagogy. What a course title – what isn’t critical once you start deconstructing the mythology? Anyway, they’re looking for The Way.

**Rattle-rattle-rattle-rattle**

In 1972, Lane observes that there are two consequences of this reductionist generalisation, . He states because
so little is known about the psychological characteristics of Indian school populations, there is a tendency to generalize whatever is described for a given group. One must note the conclusions about US Indians borrowed to fill the lacunae in the Canadian scene. Similarly, conclusions are borrowed from studies on the US urban poor – White, Black and Puerto Rican. Some of the findings have relevance for the education of Canadian Indian children but the procedure is uncertain to say the least. There may well be cultural attributes in Indian school children which influence their performance and their opportunities but our knowledge of them is sketchy, subjective and impressionistic (Lane, 1972, p. 353).

When I started background reading for EDUC442, my first reaction was disbelief, until I realised that there are individuals who consider it feasible to study "Indian" or aboriginal or Native students as a specialized group of learners. There are some teaching students who are seriously looking for researched findings or recipes to handle the teaching-learning encounter with 'me' as "Indian." They don't seem to grasp a need to know about the love, trust, care, devotion, respect, laughter requisite to enable that wheel of teaching-learning to start to spin. They focus on technique – well, more recipe or craft. And, the language of the research process seems, to me, to be one which at times attempts to erect a shiny, false, acryclic shield between the research(er)(ee)s.

I suspect this language use – that is, word choice, sentence set-up, et cetera – attempts to enable some sort of objectivity. The research process begins with this attempt to pull back or pull out of a highly interconnected, shared world.

As I am sure you are trying to do throughout these interviews? That is, listen to my story dispassionately, without judgement or sympathy? See yourself as not part of this?
Sympathetic, But Must Understand Who’s Inside, Who’s Outside

**Interviewer:** Well, ah yes. I mean I do feel twinges of sympathy for your situation here; but that shouldn’t prejudice my findings. Geertz (1979) summarizes the polarized stances in his discussion of the anthropologist’s seeming double-bind to speak for and about individuals from different cultural communities (p. 226). Geertz (1979) describes the research(er)(ee) thusly,

The formulations have been various: ‘inside’ versus ‘outside’ or ‘first person’ versus ‘third person’ descriptions; ‘phenomenological’ versus ‘objectivist’ or ‘cognitive’ versus ‘behavioural’ theories; or, perhaps, most commonly, ‘emic’ versus ‘etic’ (p. 227).

**Interviewee:** I find it difficult to share this distinction between core and periphery, etc., although I think I understand some of the rationale for the necessity, but the attempt to position one’s self as a non-resident of the situation (of a highly interconnected cosmouniverse) seems to me to be a difficult position to attain because I am a relational being in all events and conditions (which responsibility is just really beginning to sink into another level in me); and, secondly, emotionally, I am drawn in when people speak. From a position of interconnectedness which views relations or relationships as the organizing feature, rather than objects or events[read: units of analysis], then the attempt to distance becomes impossible (for me).

I am not always conscious of how I am in relationship, sometimes I do get sloppy and careless and disrespectfully oblivious to my potential in relationships throughout time; but this borrowing from all manner of theory and metaphor, as in the case of phonetics and phonemics to designate internal function or acoustic properties of sounds in language, seems to place heavy value on individuation; perhaps, at the expense of overlooking the interconnectedness of all beings – not just the two-leggeds. Those at the core, or those at the periphery or those who study up or those who study down seem to overlook that placement is, at heart, one where
individuals are distinctive in a collectivity of relationships. There may be circumstances which seem to impede individuals from acting on or from within their own volition, but ultimately I believe that we live in relationship. It's just that our relationships are not always in community.

**Inside/Outside:**

**What is The Possibility Really?**

**Interviewer:** Well, Geertz (1979) furthers his discussion of the distinct positions of researcher and researchees using two terms developed by Heinz Kohut (as cited in Geertz). Kohut used the terms *experience-near* and *experience-distant* to designate this objective stance, with *near* referring to a concept which informants can speak naturally for themselves about what is seen, felt, thought, imagined and so on, distant referring to those concepts which involve specialists, like experimenters or ethnographers, to advance their own particular philosophical, ideological, scientific or practical aims (cited by Geertz, 1979, p. 228). Kohut used 'love' and 'loneliness' as examples of experience-near concepts, while 'religious system' or 'social stratification' are examples of experience-distant concepts. However, these may be coloured by the collective's cultural perspective, for, as Geertz points out, concepts like 'caste' and 'nirvana' can be experience-near concepts, "at least for Hindus and Buddhists" (p. 228) while, for me, these may be experience-distant concepts.

**Interviewee:** Yes, but we're here in the same room -- on the same planet. How can it be that the researcher is so independent, not interdependent? The researcher is making knowledge off the knowledge someone else has already made? What is the purpose of that? Who is speaking for whom here? Geertz (1979), in anthropology, which is a field which educational research borrows heavily from in terms of studying the culture of teachers, or ethnographic narratology (or other fieldwork methods), is the issue of one's ability to speak for,
about or with individuals about their experiences. Like Stanley Diamond’s (1974) observation that anthropological fieldwork is like spywork as anthropologists — and, potentially, educational researchers — are

frequently taken as spies because of the inquisitive nature of their work; their concern with local affairs in the remote places to which they go, their tendency to fade into the background of local custom in living up to the canons of participant observation (p. 89).

This initial search to define the research sample has been in question, by more enlightened anthropologists and educational researchers, in that this researcher and researchee designation creates only the illusion that the objectification somehow frees the researcher for "in order to objectify the other, one is, at the same time, compelled to objectify the self" (p. 93). For me, in a relational world, this is illusional; and objectification static and dehumanizing.

**Interviewer:** [Voice rising a little.] Yes, but in 1979, Geertz displays an acute awareness of the issue of, erh, going, Native. Er, First Nations? He acknowledges this by stating that certainly no one knows this better than they [anthropologists] do themselves; hence the passion to swim in the stream of their experience, and the illusion afterward that one somehow has (p. 228).

**Interviewee:** However, he does not provide a solution to the fact that we cannot get into another’s skin or consciousness for the ethnographer "does not" and "largely cannot perceive what his informants perceive" (Geertz, 1979, pp. 228-229). Just **what will you do with these interviews?** [Interviewee’s emphatic question.] You’re going to read me and my words over&over again until you get it right and then write-construct-interpretive textual interplay. I won’t be doing the writing-thinking-feeling-composing.
Interviewer: Yes, but Geertz (1979) continues that, aware that one is always spectator, then investigation to understand how individuals perceive themselves as a person, in this case Javenese, Balinese or Moroccan, not by presuming to become nativie-ized, but, perhaps, instead to seek and analytically examine and interpret for them their (the Javanese, the Balinese, etc.) symbolic forms in order to examine the "words, images, institutions and behaviours" of these individuals under study by setting aside his conceptions of what selfhood is (p. 229). He doesn't actually give instructions for how to set aside one's self, but, ah, there is that truism about the possibility of objectivity again. I mean what do you intend to do here? Interview yourself?

[Sounds of laughter]

Interviewee: I [more laughter], ah, that's really rich.

Interviewer: [Annoyance emanating from within.] I can help you get your voice heard.

Julie Cruikshank (1990), anthropology professor at the University of British Columbia, grapples with this issue of speaking for or with her 'research sample' in her introduction to Life Lived Like a Story. Aware of the debates related to challenging cultural representation – summarised in the question: Who Is Speaking for Whom About What? – Cruikshank (1990) adopted life-history research because the model attempts to reduce the dichotomies, described by Geertz (1979) above, because, she states, instead of researching from a conventional formula in which an outside investigation initiates and controls the research, this model depends on ongoing collaboration between the interviewer and interviewee. Such a model begins by taking seriously what people say about their lives rather than treating their words simply as an illustration of some other process (Cruikshank, 1990, p. 1).

Interviewee: Yes, see(k)ing collaborators seems, somehow, more human to me than identifying a research population or sample; and the collaborative nature seems more relational
with an emphasis on being research rather than doing research on those hapless specimens placed, figuratively, under Euro-tinted researcher lenses. I am also uncomfortable that Cruikshank (1990) must add the words that in this method peoples’ stories be taken seriously, for it raises this question to me: Were the stories of womyn of First Nations ancestry not taken seriously before?

**Interviewer:** I, this is, ah, why I thought Kirby and McKenna’s (1989) hope to focus on the "world from the perspective of the margins allows a different and authentic perception of the world" (p. 33). They also raise these questions about the lack of "fit" between themselves and the sense of "being trained / socialized to communicate with/ in the terms of the dominant institution" (Kate McKenna, 1989, p. 18). In fact, they recommend that the fledgling researcher, following advice from Judy Golec (cited by Sandy Kirby, Kirby & McKenna, 1989) conduct a self-interview to identify one’s conceptual baggage about the research question (p. 21, & see ftnt. #3) and the research process (p. 32).

**Interviewee:** Yes, I am just starting to sift that book. In order for your presumption to operate someone here has to admit to being in-from the margins; and that, won’t work for me in my belief in interconnectedness. Interconnectedness as more than just authentic intersubjectivity of two beings dialoguing. There’s the aspect of this everactive relationship and honouring that relationship.

**Interviewer:** So back to your desire for ourstory, not pomo pluralist rupture?

**Interviewee:** Yes, away from separation to integration: for humanity to become whole again.

**Interviewer:** So, objectivity would never be possible for you? For me?
Interviewee:

[Sits with a look of stern concentration on her face. Extremely long pause on tape.

The silence heightens the intensity of the moment. Surprisingly she does not reach
for a cigarette.]

Sorry. I was experimenting with being as objective as I possibly could. I don't know if I
can access that zone? Did I look any different to you?

Somehow for me, objectivity means to desist being Sharilyn. Can I do that? Why would
I want to do that? Ethnographic assumptions have been challenged since Geertz. For example,
Pratt (1986) reminds interviewers that ethnographic practices are "often inherited from" other
genres, including travel books and journals, personal memoirs, journalism, and written accounts
from settlers, missionaries, colonial officials and bureaucrats, and others (p. 26). She cautions
that ethnography is not a "neutral, tropeless discourse" with possibilty to render ‘reality’ in a
faithful manner "not render[ed] through our own values and interpretive schemes" (Pratt, 1986, p.
26).

Interviewer:

[Internal muttering: Gree-aat! Just what is my role supposed to be here? I need to
talk to those committee members.]

Genesis in the Library

Interviewee: So the questions are back and you R.R.P.?

Interviewee: Yes, I return to all of those textual places and visit those old, familiar faces.
I go right back to the beginning. Educational research - blah-blah - originates from a variety of
sources, which include personal observation of a phenomenon, investigation and consideration
of theory or the related literature, examination of social and political - blah-blah - issues,
reflection about situations of practice and personal experience and insights (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, pp. 75-77). The literature itself may be a "useful point for research" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, p. 30). I don't know if H and A meant I take them quite so literally eventually. Identifiable places to seek out problems seems to be a fairly standard litany through the educational research texts scanned. In other words, leave no stone unturned because you just might find the O.R.P. - that's overlooked research problem.

Interviewer: And, you're teaching EDUC442 again while attending this doctoral seminar in research?

Interviewee: Yes. And, I've read the Chrisjohn's (1988) argument that research is fablesque. I become very intrigued with the actualit(ys) of his propositions. I approach EDUC442 (Jan. to March, 1993) differently. I desire that students, intending teachers a.k.a. critical pedagogues, deconstruct the nature, substance and structure of the research base extant about NativeAboriginalAmerIndian"Indians." In EDUC442 I cannot sanction anyone hunting for recipes about how to teach "Indians" or children of First Nations ancestry. I believe that before anyone looks at the research, one has to look at the sociopolitical or racist or other connotations of the codes employed to identify this population of research sample(s). In a letter, I write of my attempt to try a different approach.

The course is partially lecture and partially student-research team work. I am trying to set up a course where we actively share our readings and our research. I have the students on Contract Work where signed up for a grade (9,8,7,6) and this correlates with a required number of readings plus an additional assignment. There is so much written about FN education in terms of issues, characteristics, principles and practice. Some of the
statements are based on research . . . and some based on opinion and visioning (Calliou to Tebbitt, personal communication, January 24, 1993, n.p.).

But the EDUC442 class isn’t exactly prepared for this. Further in the letter, I write, that I do not want this to be a course where I come in and lecture about SO-and-SO said THIS and SO-and-SO said THAT. The class has started uneasily because I don’t think I was exactly clear about what I wanted or how the course would run - collaborative teaching and learning - and for another reason. I think that students are very used to being spoon fed items. I think they want the information in a predigested fashion and I just feel this is dishonest and not intellectual. . . . I felt today that the class was beginning to get the idea about critical thinking as we worked through a very simple example (Calliou to Tebbitt, personal communication, January 24, 1993, n.p.).

As I am learning how to look hard at, ah, deconstruct the white noise of research, which is always this presence until I find myself wondering if I would recognise and appreciate an alternative if it fell on me. I feel rather like I am walking head thrust forward into a blizzard.

I am also enjoying the puzzlement. I am almost shouting AT OTHERS TO DO THE SAME! That is not suggest, or have you infer, that I am believing I am THE ONLY ONE IN POSSESSION OF TRUTH! More, I am shouting HEY, TAKE A LOOK HERE BECAUSE THIS IS INTERESTING! [All Interviewee’s emphasis.] Just put me on a Soap Box in Hyde Park. You been there? Do you know they actually do that? Stand on boxes and things and pontificate? I
was there in ‘87 with my Mom and there was a man literally railing against the elitist, bourgeois capitalists! Loved it! Very exciting. Perhaps, I should do my doctoral defense there. Are you nervous about yours?

**Interviewer:** [Ignoring question, busily writing in field notebook: ‘Been to London, England, 1987, Hyde Park, finds free speechifying stimulating’. How does this affect her classroom curriculum presentation? Find out. Maybe, interview some former students - at least, try to find some who will talk openly.]

So you become, choose to become, a curriculum provokcator?

**Interviewee:** Er, I think that’s spelt: provocateur? French, I think. [Continues, sounding hurt, but maybe, she’s teasing.] Well, gee, that’s what Dr. W. is doing in EDCI601(c).

**Interviewer:** Only he’s a Canadian? That is, ah, ‘White’.

**Interviewee:** You have this real fixation on race, don’t you? Like "Indians" (can)(not) say this and ‘Whites’ (can)(not) say that? Think, two-leggeds.

[Pause on tape. Interviewee toys with a piece of cigarette package foil. Starts to fold a complicated origami replica of the Statue of Liberty.]

Did you ever consider that ‘race’ is just a construct? That it’s something we made up?

That this is a socially-believed world?

**Feels Like Starting Over**

&Over&Over&Over

**Interviewer:** Right. So, you begin again to (re)examine research by returning to the texts about research? You return right to consideration of source?

**Interviewee:** Yes, looking for that stimulus. I appreciate Crowl’s (1993) caution that the novice researcher consider that research originates from the "[f]irst, and by far the most important
criterion" for research "which is the degree of interest" possessed about a topic because the novice researcher will be spending lengthy time with the choice made (p. 6). Yes, I am looking for that stimulus, "a surprising fact or set of facts" which alter previous consciousness or conclusions about events and conditions as they seem (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, p. 30). Hammersley and Atkinson provide this one example where a researcher observes that gender seems to suggest some sort of correlation with achievement on science exams (p. 30). Here, they suggest that the import of the problem may be more of a pragmatic or political surprise than theoretical. However, the duo stress that "even where the starting point is not current social theory," that theory is soon a necessary component of problem elaboration" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, p. 31). So, I think-feel we must have theory to interpret findings; that's cool. I love to theorize. I actually get excited about the opportunity.

Then, to illustrate, the two ethnographers introduce this extended quotation from a researcher's 1970 study, titled *Mohawk Heroes and Trinidadian Peasants* (See: Frelick, 1970). Of course, I'm gagging' – N.B. physical realm. The deliberate inclusion of this example draws on a glamorized fantasy heightened through non-First Nations-authored social psyche theory to explain a Mohawk 'love' of heights and steelwork. The example discredits the 'goodness' of Hammersley and Atkinson's (1991) intent to argue that ethnography be valued as a source of theory development due to the method's "capacity to depict the activities and perspectives of actors in ways that challenge the dangerously misleading preconceptions that social scientists often bring to research" (p. 23). While Hammersley and Atkinson (1991) are arguing that "social phenomena that are otherwise taken-for-granted become visibly problematic" (p. 32), the Mohawk-thesis is founded in sheer colonial factitiousness which they (H&A) omit to deconstruct.

**Interviewer:** All contrived?

**Interviewee:** Not all; however, there are enough factoids abounding that knowledge related to "Indians" become "[m]anifest manners," "simulations of dominance; the notions and
misnomers that are read as authentic and sustained as representations of Native American Indians" (Vizenor, 1994, p. 6). Part of that mannerliness is to code "Indians" as a global set of problems to be studied. The 'Other' is a problem, not a brother or a sister. That strikes me as just odd, like is it possible to believe 'Other' is not a member of the exact same species?

Perhaps, 'Topic', Not Problem?

**Interviewer:** Eventually you get to Crowl (1993) who begins his research sequence with selection of a research topic, followed with formulation of research questions (p. 17).

**Interviewee:** Yes. Although he provides no discussion of the terminology 'problem' nor reasons for his switch to use of the term to 'topic', the usage seems less problematic for me. Crowl (1993) defines topic as "difficult to define," but, generally, this is "an area of interest distinct from other areas of interest" (p. 23). I find I can live with this language expression of a starting point. However, I am troubled by the irony, and only mildly amused, at the absurdity (not to mention chagrin), I feel that I (again) introduce the words of a White male to buttress my change in direction. Am I guilty of cultural or patriarchal appropriation? Or, is this an expedient solution?

**Interviewer:** You become repulsed by the "taken for granted icy surface of Euroderivative epistemology" and you "are forced to swim deeper to locate currents of resistance to further intellectual colonization" (Calliou, 1994, February, p. 4)? That feels dangerous?

**Interviewee:** Yes, dangerous. Self-colonization is dangerous; and stupid if I let the homogenization process happen to me while I'm awake. Do I really wish to go there? How much of this public, systemization of finding out through research tactics do I have to accept?

[Interviewee looks up and sees that Interviewer is NOT listening -- Advisor please

N.B. -- but is scribbling a field note.]


**Interviewer:**

[Scribbling a field note. 'Perhaps, leave anecdotal journal entry re. snowstorm [Tape segment III(a)] in.' Revisit Connelly and Clandinin (1988) wherein "The image reaches into the past, gathering up experiential threads meaningfully connected to the present. And it reaches intentionally into the future and creates new meaningfully connected threads as situations are experienced" et cetera. (p. 60). Snowstorm may be useful.]

**Interviewee:** What am I? Talking to myself here?

---

**A Little Readerly Summation**

**Interviewer:** Thus, the texts explicate that the researcher begin with an area of interest in order to (re)conceptualize and make ((un)known)(old) knowledge (il)legitimate. So, you're in search of a problem? You begin to search for a problem, or, er, area of interest, and then decide to turn your attention completely away from community education and into First Nations teachers, their lives. Since 1972, the watershed year of the release and bilateral acceptance of the then Federal Liberal government and the National Indian B(r)otherhood (established 1968; now, the Assembly of First Nations since 1988) of the policy paper, *Indian Control of Indian Education* (See: Calliou, 1994, February, (pp. 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 29-31, 32). You perceive and are "intrigued by the obvious lacunae in the literature about the lives of professional and lay and [other] educators who have served for the past twenty years as Elders, language instructors, volunteers, curricularists, home-school coordinators, aides, administrators, and classroom teachers in this alternative, community-based, educational movement" (Calliou, February, 1994, p. 12).

You decide your research **interest** is teachers of FNA, that is, classroom (professional and lay) as being in pivotal positions in the escalation of local control of First Nations education, and
implicitly, other sovereignist objectives to assert self-determination. With background study you note the growth of 24 First Nations teacher education programs in operation by 1989 as testament to community support of this specialization (Nyce, 1990, pp. 39, 42). Kirkness' (1986) observation that teachers of FNA are "keys to progress," critical to the achievement of First Nations educational objectives "for a number of reasons," unsubstantied with "reports of investigations of their effectiveness" (p. 47). Much text is available re. the struggle to seize control of education's formal and informal structures to reassert sovereignty and deconstruct the grand narrative of Eurocolonial empire building and exploitation of individuals considered 'Other' and 'lesser', deemed not worthy of self-determined lived experience as who they are-might-be from within their cultural/ethnic/sovereign context. The role of the teacher, you realise is a key leverage point of responsible potential intervention for overturning schooling processes from those of acculturation to one of enculturation. For you, this is further complicated in situations of pluralism where education has been a one-way system of integration.

For example, Emerson (1987) states that curricular experiences can be seen through cultural contexts or frameworks which provide educators and parents with renewed support, vitality and advocacy for curriculums and programs designed to link the native past with the present so that the future of native peoples can be that of adaptations to assure the best cultural continuity and change (p. 41).

Thus, you desire that these teachers of FNA can be coaxed, I guess, into self-reflexively describing how they are "using the National Indian Brotherhood's policy of Indian Control of Indian Education (1972) to design and deliver curricular experiences" (Calliou, 1994, p. 31) - assuming they've read the policy. In short, you desire to provide opportunity for these teachers to self-appraise their effectiveness as educational activists - political and et cetera?

[The novice researcher learns to recover quickly.]
Interviewee: Ugh, did I write that? Put that way, I sound very earnest and very much in search of my own agenda. I am doing the if 'X' is an "Indian", then 'Y' may, or may not, occur. How sturdy is this as a starting point for any research? I mean getting out of that if-then scenario is my part of my agenda. How?

Enculturation may seem an obvious condition. Dewey, writing in Democracy and Education, originally written in 1915, stated that "So obvious indeed is the necessity of teaching and learning for the continued existence of a society that we may seem to be dwelling unduly on a truism" (p. 4). However, in light of the attempted genocidal devastation of PFNA, which systemic magnitude is really physically assaulting me. As I read, I am once more cheering the efforts of our ancestors just to survive. That appreciation becomes a sense of profound reverence and I feel very humbled to be alive because of what they survived for me to be alive. Dewey’s statement has new urgency for me as engaged in counter hegemonic cultural-political work/struggle/joy/survivance.

I am awestruck with PFNA absense in educational theorizing. As I read so many voices of experience are missing. As a teacher, I read so much up here which isn’t from the purview of the teacher herself. With the teachers of FNA, I guess, I find a hobby horse. Well, not just a hobby horse, this is fascinating reading to continue backgrounding for teaching, as sessional lecturer, for EDUC441 and for 442. The opportunity, and privilege, of teaching these two courses become graduate-level self-study courses.

Anyway, I really admire that the N.I.B. was so vocal internally and internationally in the 1960s and 1970s. That’s a major political accomplishment with the formulation and acceptance of an educational reform policy known as Indian Control of Indian Education (1972-1973). So I link this to Freire (1989), a Brazilian steeped in the cultural theologies of liberation of the 1970s, who released Pedagogy of the Oppressed in 1969. In reading through his conception, er, philosophy I consider how decolonization is for the cultures of silence, curricular objectives
which stress learner-centered empowerment (that is, conscientization) to politicize the interwoven complexities of oppression, literacy, power, culture and knowledge. Indian Control of Indian Education was framed to "end the prevailing situation of education as an alienating and often counter-productive experience" (Ponting & Gibbins, 1980, p. 205). I mean, you're right, I wondered what stories our teachers had to share about their understanding of their role in terms of Four Realms leadership. And, of course, I am reanalysing myself in light of this policy and wondering what normative nonsense should baseline my teaching as a teacher of FNA.

**Interviewer:** Further, you state,

Who are these First Nations teachers? What have been their experiences as revealed through their self-told stories? What common, or dissimilar, feelings might be revealed through their retold experiences (emotional realm)? What common, or dissimilar, behaviours (for examples, instructional, interpersonal) might be evident (physical realm)? What lessons might these teachers have found which can be shared with other intending teachers and the wider public of educators about educational activism and social change (cognitive realm)? What insights have they gained about the process of teaching in order to locate and sustain respect for First Nations identity and sovereignty, cultural teachings and autonomy (spiritual realm)? (Calliou, 1994, February, p. 31).

I thought-felt you said you didn't come here to be "Indian" (Tape segment II(b)(i))? Suddenly, you are wondering, "Where are our stories?" (Calliou, 1994, February, p. 14).

**Interviewee:** Gee, I wonder what I was looking for then? Maybe, now I'd just go and interview teachers who self-identify as being involved with counter-hegemonic struggle? Or, even more interesting, interview teachers involved with sustaining the prevailing capitalist hegemony?
Interviewer: Well, whomever we interview, it's O.K. to get those stories heard. Your move in research seems to progress from investigation to storying?

Interviewee: The story(ing) business. I think I reconciled my hesitations and doubts by deciding to collaboratively nurture stories in this (co)(self)reflexivity. Seeking collaborators seems, somehow, more ethical, or, the storying business quells some of my uneasiness. Hhhmmm...of course, I could end up getting together with a whole bunch of unethical storytellers. As prepwork to explore this dissertation possibility, I find myself believing that I finally see an acceptable role for myself as a researcher. I think of myself approaching First Nations teachers and simply stating: "So, what's teaching like for you?"

Reading Milburn's (1992) questioning of Clandinin's work has me agreeing that the term "teachers' stories" may not differ much from that of 'life history' or the plain old term 'autobiography'. Then, I convince myself that as PFNA tell stories, then storying might be a -- not the -- [Interviewee's emphasis] method to research with PFNA. Fortunately, I have read Vizenor's piece regarding simulation. Beyond storying, however, I do consider it legitimate to find a way for teachers to write and hear or read about each others' experiences in trying to enact self-determination through education. In some ways, this is where I can say that I saw much of this multigenerational interpenetration occurring at Rae-Edzo. For example, I saw the two first-year Dogrib teachers really X 1010 listening as those with more experience spoke. I was also involved with stuff with the Calgary Writing Project and collaboration and such is just a bias I inherit from relationships and projects I enjoyed as a classroom teacher. Developing a sense of community is important to me. Community seems antithetical to an ingrained image of the researcher as individual – as pioneer breaking the epistemological barrier.
Anyway, I end up believing that this is the role of the researcher for me in that I do not write to bring myself to light for an audience but to bring the power of the insights and delights of their stories to light/to press. I know their stories will emerge through structural techniques I use and through the categories and resultant codes I design and deploy. I am curious about the experiences of teachers of FNA. Here I am recreating the sampling criteria technique I loathe. Ugh. And, I can’t escape the fact that stories are formed and shaped by the media in which they are . . . interpreted by the researcher. When stories are written (recorded, video-taped, filmed) and then published (shaped, revised, edited) by another person, then that the person inevitably leaves his or her mark on the content, structure, and form . . . I am not suggesting that this is a fault in the process that should be rooted out -- I simply note here that it is an inevitable characteristic of the task of preparing a story for another’s reading (or viewing) (Milburn, 1992, p. 63)

Like I’m going to write stories even as I resist shaped stories shaping me.

**Interviewer:** So you muddle around in there for awhile about the ethical implications of story recording and (re)presentation?

**Interviewee:** Yes, for quite awhile. I might still be in there. [Pause on tape.] Just kidding. The inevitability Milburn (1992) refers to has me really stewing. I am wary of (re)presentation and the (re)presentation business is omnipresent for me. This ‘crisis’ of representation seems omnipresent. What right do I have to go and get someone’s story? What right do I have to represent, and reconstruct? What purpose is served by running off-campus to get someone else’s story? Whose? et cetera. And, there’s the ethical legitimation nonsense of the researcher having to establish they’ve found real "Indians" or PFNA to interview.

**Interviewer:** So, in the end, you never leave the campus? You don’t interview a teacher of FNA?
Interviewee: No, not a single solitary sole. I don’t blood type any teachers and find out how their classroom educational activism is going? I am too paralysed with doubt, to ask anyone anything.

[[Laughter.]
[More laughter.]
[More laughter after that.]

Dear Anthropologists, &

Educational Researchers: I Am Not a Problem

Interviewee: Yes, where are our stories? The problem; ah, yes, the problem with the problem.

Interviewer: I guess, "New Moccasins" (Calliou, 1994, February) is just the start of many well-intended dissertation research proposal drafts. Given the slightest impetus, you just churn them out assembly-line fashion. How did you ever get to the delineation of a research focus-interest area?

Interviewee: Two committee members threatened to quit.

Interviewer: So, this first articulation of a problem becomes your opportunity to do some research on "Indians" as teachers?

[Interviewee mimes a finger-down-the-throat-vomit-motion.]

Interviewee: Ugh, asked that way, is really uncomfortable. I mean how does it sound if I decide to study White teachers, really hear their stories about teaching White children, particularly in relation to their left hemispheric pronouncement. WHITE is a colour; although,
somehow that’s become reified as privilege. I see lots of WHITE people on West Broadway begging for food money in 1995. White is a horrifically difficult sample population for me to even describe.

Actually, I never did the new-moccashoes study. At that time, I think-feel-believe I had honourable, that is ethically worthy, intentions of doing a tea&bannock interview number with teachers of FNA. Well, kinda; because as I am writing this study-cum-proposal, I am again feeling like I am going crazy. I am so leery of (re)producing the "Indian" research business. Especially, if my empirical or ethnographic investigations expose us to mass consumption of more Euroideology and possibly provokes a spate of bureaucratically-funded studies (akin to Mohawk steelworkers) to document the narrative and/or cultural and/or other metaphors of teachers of FNA. This has me feeling (qu)(un)easy.

I mean, there’s this very public aspect to researching, and I am challenging my intention to research, particularly, if an (un)intended result is to expose teachers of FNA and then have such exposure(s) reified — leading to God knows what? Hhhmmm...leading to Coyote knows what? Because I perceive that there is always a very serious possibility that published research, left laying around openly, publicly, on shelves, can feed back into that nightmarish: What do "Indians" want?; or, This is how to teach "Indians." Now I am not questioning the genetic codes of knowledge-production so much as the consequence-production: two entirely different species. Although we talk about some aspects of this in 601, my doctoral seminar, through assignments like questioning the (pre)(as)sumptions of the researcher, I don’t hear too often: No, don’t do that study - That is racist, sexist, genderist, ageist, etc. When I began to describe my intended research area, I began to question the beginning, middle and end of the traditional form of research taught to graduate students. I had this intuition that should I wholeheartedly adopt and use this product of the W.W.S. that I might well continue a self-colonization process. Even the
beginning, that is, the definition of the problem, may seem non-threatening to some; but I have reservations.

**Interviewer:** Yes, I see, the problem with the problem. Whether of a quantitative or qualitative nature or design, one is to begin with the definition of the problem. Best and Kahn (1989) sympathetically alert the student that "one of the most difficult phases of the graduate research project is the choice of a suitable problem" wherein "beginners are likely to select a problem that is much too broad in scope" (p. 28).

**Interviewee:** Yes, it's so prevalent. Borg and Gall (1983) explain that the research process begins with a convex focus on an "educational phenomenon" which the novice researcher may desire to describe, or an observed event which needs explanation or a problem needing a solution. These author(iti)es are not as dogmatic in their emphasis on problems and solutions as some of the earlier writers such as, for example, Gay (1976), who wholeheartedly adopts the W.W.S. gospel according to Bacon (1561-1626). Remember Bacon describes the inadequacies of deductive logic, with its poverty of scientific experimental methods (Re. Bacon, see: Cohen, 1984, pp. 147-151; 500-505).

**Interviewer:** So, there's something inherently distasteful to you about the word 'problem'?

**Interviewee:** Yes. I am asked to begin with a 'problem'. Gay (1976) describes problem formulation as "a refinement process which begins with the identification of a problem area and terminates with one or more testable hypotheses or answerable questions" (p. 19). I am perplexed that I can be expected to predetermine the possibility of an answer to a question, unless Gay (1976) is merely alluding to an optimistic affirmative to a question like, "Is there a cure for cancer?". He does not explain how some problems are answerable and some are not.
Further, Gay (1976) stresses that all problems must be "researchable," which includes those "which can be investigated through the collection and analysis of data;" but those problems "which deal with philosophical or ethical issues are not researchable" (p. 23).

**Interviewer:** Oh! Oh! So, you’re right back to -- this dichotomy you protest: science and philosophy? Or, science and ethics?

**Interviewee:** Or something and something? Yes, more direction, instruction to ignore the ineffability of just trying to be a good [Interviewee's emphasis] two-legged. That somehow educational research avoid issues which cannot be examined without empiric data. There's a real sense, to me, that data must have this solidness, this physicality, if proof is to be really real [Interviewee's emphasis]. I fail to see which problem could not contain either philosophical or ethical foundations or nuances or canyons. None of the texts I review seem to question this zero point start to research although several mention the current anti-positivist argumentation (see, for example, Cohen & Manion, 1989, pp. 23-27). Always, though, there is that relentless direction to find the problem, locate the subjects, collect the data, use the method, and so on [Interviewee’s emphasis]. All these mechanistic elements of a very two-legged activity become valorized, lablike monotony. All of the very interesting stuff is struck out. I sense, also, the hopeful belief that selection of the problem is intended to reduce the feeling of being out of control and that precision can guide methodology. Tough to do in a highly contingent universe.

**Interviewer:** So you rebel against the luggage of the language? You admit "problems abound" but "find the term 'problem' leaden with colonialist scientific methodology and ideological mentality which denies the shared legacy of problem formulation" (Calliou, 1994, February, p. 21). A glimmer of wanting ourstory? Further, you state, "The choice of the word problem [Interviewer's emphasis] implies a set of values I just cannot rationalize and accept" (Calliou, 1992, February, p. 23). You are reading against and through the grain of text again (see tape segment III(b)(ix)(b)?)
Interviewee: Yes. Yes. And, yes. Actually this 'fake' proposal - How many of these have I written now? - is a literary device to make a point about something else entirely. And, that is about research, eurocentric systemic monopolization of episteme and language, language, language. In reading research from anthro, education and research, I find myself shouting, unladylike, back at text: "I am an Indian, not a dubious or vexatious problem to be solved. Don’t think you can solve me on the basis of race, which is a fairly recent (fiction)(construct)." By extension, I worry that the people I visit with and then write about may end up being viewed as problems, that is, something difficult to understand or manage. I understand my rejection of the formulation of a problem statement is essential if I am to leap into research. I am searching for a way not to research.

I am just not going to self-anthropologize my own brothers&sisters and, in fact, I don’t like to think of any group of people (for example, left-handed Quebecois women) as a (sub)set of manageable and researchable problems.

Such dehumanization sickens me physically. I believe this need to lump individuals together on the basis of some researcher-selected criteria (for example, right hemispheric pronouncement, aboriginal bellhops, Polish medical receptionists or others) abstracts individuals as researchable projects; enigmas needing data definition. The relationality is blurred and obliterated and then no one’s responsible. Such dehumanization promotes a sickness of psychological denial. As a teacher in an inner-city school (1979-1989), and a resident of that economically-challenged community for eight years, I listened in constant horror and consternation as some well-paid middle-class teachers treated students and community members alike as vexatious problems to be solved. These individuals would blame the community residents as somehow responsible for their poverty when, for example,

In 1974, approximately 250 individuals earning incomes over $50,000 paid no income tax at all. In 1983, 8102 individuals with incomes over $50,000 paid no
taxes. Among the explanations for this are numerous tax shelters built into the income tax provisions which can be utilized only by those with wealth (Marchak, 1988, p. 48).

Those children were economic hostages in a First World Country. They were going to need to do more than personally attain Grade 9 to change the embedded dollar-power equation of inequity. This confronts both my understanding of one species-ism and the sensibility of interconnectedness of all beings.

I cheer when I find something like Robert Lane's (1972) study. He attacks the oppressive codification of children of FNA as a 'problem' or 'problem learners'. He questions why teachers can, and do, provide schooling for "non-Indian conglomerates of children who are different" from each others without reification as ethnoculturally-based problems (p. 355). He continues to puzzle over this justification of what I call 'Otherisation' - noting that some teachers who encounter NativeAboriginal "Indian" children as "They have flaws which make them poor clay for refinement in the educational system" (Lane, 1972, p. 356). Lane challenges, in the same year that the National Indian Brotherhood formulates the grassroots synthesis which becomes Indian Control of Indian Education, that EuroCanadians ask, "What are the problems we [EuroCanadians] pose for Indian children trying to learn in our school culture?" (p. 356).

Gurenstein (1977) is somewhat more sensitive to the unthinkingly applied label, Indian problem, as research about First Nations people cannot begin without some self-reflexivity about the term itself. For "What is perceived as a problem by one group may not be perceived as a problem by another" and "[w]hat is a priority consideration in one context may be irrelevant or even counter-productive when planted in a different context" (Gurstein, 1977, p. 1). Gurstein, however, does proceed to identify the problems experienced by 'urban Indians'. Good grief! Here is a really puzzling subcategory of "Indians" – that being, the "Urban Indian." This
declared sample population rests on so little foundation. It's like this combination of geographical and legislative realities and it's supposed to mean something.

This is continuing the very tradition Lane (1972) finds questionable. If Gurstein (1977) had encountered Lane (1972), the study question might well have been, "What is it about our EuroCanadianurbanized setting which create problems for PFNA?"

Problem Becomes Rich Source of Information

**Interviewer:** However, even the vantage point of viewing research participants as rich sources of information rather than problems can be troublesome for you? You protest the ethnographic anachronism of bifocality

that has always been part of the anthropological rationale: seeing others against a background of ourselves, and ourselves against a background of others (Fischer, 1995, p. 199).

**Interviewee:** Yes, but when I read as a female "Indian" I am left wondering just who the Others are supposed to be [Interviewee's emphasis]? And, then I'm questioning the need for others in an interconnected schema of two-leggeds? There exist these government studies of "Indians" like "A Survey of Contemporary Indians of Canada," directed by Harry Hawthorn at the University of British Columbia and Marc-Adelard Tremblay at Laval, which involved about 50 ethnologists. This report is also known as the Hawthorn Report (1966, 1967). This is the report which makes wide-sweeping recommendations from the need to clean-up the textbooks of "inaccurate, over-generalized and even insulting" references in textbooks to the need for "laundromats" (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 13). Within the text, there are those curious statements of bifocality. For example, "The new [EuroCanadian] ideology favours progressive integration of the Indians within the entire Canadian family from sea to sea" (v. 2, p. 41). Right here, there's this
evidence that I am now admissable to Canadian family society. I am (re)located textually. However, in Volume I of this same report, there is the enduring legacy of recommendation number 7, which states, that

Indians should be regarded as 'citizens plus'; in addition to the normal rights and duties of citizenship, Indians possess certain additional rights as charter members of the Canadian community (Hawthorn, 1966, p. 13).

I look at such reports as part of the Grand Narrativization.

In Patti Lather's (1991) book, *Getting Smart*, on my reading list for EDCI601(c), she refers to the rupturing of Grand Narratives in order to direct postmodernist attention to eschewing logocentrism, which is Eurocentric norm-referencing filled with postulations of meta-narratives, mastercodes or other globalized forms of storytelling. Just who is antecedent to whom? My teeth always do this weird dance at postmodern encounters because PFNA, here and elsewhere, have been telling the Euroworld all along that the Eurocentric story is incomplete. To narrate is to give an account, a story. Suddenly, Catlin’s research isn’t that fleeting glimpse of disappearing "truth" he hoped to record, but only an account.

[Sounds of richly brewed coffee waterfalling into a delicate porcelain teacup, painted with the international logo for "NO" over Columbus’ three 'sister' ships. O.K. I made that up too. Actually, I am slurping from a green and white plastic travel mug from Motomaster, an "environmentally considerate motor oil."]

Can "They" Hear Our Own Labels?

*Interviewer*: Ah, for example?
Interviewee: This following example, from Deloria, Jr. (1970) may seem an impotent barb at the postmodern heroic struggle to de-center; however, the import is not insignificant. He relates the difficulty of some EuroUnitedStatesians encountering Sioux, Cheyenne or Lumbee surnames. One gentleman keeps calling Mr. White Rabbit, 'Mr. Rabbit', as if is surname was Mr. Rabbit and his first name - White (p. 27). A woman, meeting with Helen Shierback, Imelda Schreiner and Vine Deloria, keeps asking their names throughout a tea party at her house. On leaving, she again asks their names and then remarks, "Indian names are so peculiar and hard to remember" (Deloria, 1970, p. 27). To exchange names is an act of intimacy. If our names are so difficult to apprehend, then no wonder the pre-post-modern-world seems so insensible to voices from the periphery. They don’t even hear our names. No wonder we need to keeping reminding them about sovereign mineral rights, sovereign water rights, sovereign land rights, sovereign educational rights, sovereign aboriginal rights, sovereign human rights.

Interviewer: So you keep asking yourself all these questions about the nature (particularly ethical) of the research process, how to even describe the research participants, how to collect data – particularly, if this is their personal experience – and such?

Interviewee: Yes, and I don’t find many satisfactory answers. I don’t even know if ethical is the most accurate word. Perhaps, compassionately-thoughtful? Perhaps, reverential. Lather (1991), highlights the questionableness of the use of traditional Western tradition to do research on 'Others’ in order to ‘get at’ Brazilian women as rich sources of information (Read: Data). In her choppy summary, Lather notes Patai’s (1988) questioning the (false) hopes that an "interviewer might solve a problem or know what to do [Interviewee’s emphasis] as this raises ethical questions (Patai cited in Lather, 1991, p. 93). By ethical, I assume Lather (1991) means normative standards of right, wrong, honor and respect. Certainly, to me, it is unethical to begin research by viewing and defining some individuals as a problem, for even defining the individuals’ context as problematic, also, in my understanding, cloaks some two-leggeds as
problems. Further in Lather (1991), Patai (1988) is cited. Patai (1988) states that she wishes to utilize her research skills to "work on the problem of invisible women" and to learn from these women how their lives appeared to them" [Interviewee's emphasis, in Lather, 1991, p. 94). I appreciate Patai's (1988) non-empirical, interpretive researcher stance; wherein, she begins, as Cohen and Manion (1989) describe,

with the individual and sets out to understand his interpretation of the world around him in order to develop an understanding, perhaps, theory of human behaviour 'grounded in real life data (p. 39).

Yet, somehow some of Patai's (1988) research still seems like the worr--sst of anthropology dressed up as radical chic ethnography. Yet, even here, I worry about producing this wholesale denigration of anthropology that just means the study of 'man' or two-leggeds. What annoys me – perhaps, I offend easily – is the anthropology within the "context of white rule" where to a considerable extent, anthropology has been the social science that studies dominated colored peoples – and their ancestors – living outside the boundaries of modern white societies (Willis, Jr. in Hymes, 1974, p. 123).

And, I wonder how this mentality may also seep into how we look at 'poor' readers, math enrichment programs, policy evaluation, et ceteras.

**Radical Chic, But Still Anthropology?**

[Interviewer's quick field note: I am thinking-feeling-wondering if I left the iron on at home. I mean what is this interviewee on about? What will satisfy her? I am reevaluating this interviewee as the best choice of my case study purposive sampling procedure.]

Interviewee: How does this intention to explore the sociocultural&etc. psyche of invisible womyn (or men) differ from Deloria's (1969) OBSERVATION of the UNIT OF ANALYSIS he generically identifies as Visible Anthropologists (p. 83)? Deloria (1969) states that when school terms end, then a

veritable stream of immigrants heads into Indian country. Indeed the Oregon Trail was never so heavily populated as are Route 66 and Highway 18 in the summer time. From every rock and cranny in the East they emerge, as if responding to some primeval fertility rite, and flock to the reservations to write "long adversous narratives" (pp. 83, 85).

[Interviewee continues.]

I’ll skip a few of his pithily pointed, humorous comments TO UNDERSCORE his understanding of the effects of this unquelled and unmediated historicism; for example, Had the tribes been given a choice of fighting the calvary or the anthropologists, there is little doubt as to who they would have chosen. In a crisis situation men always attack the biggest threat to their existence. A warrior killed in battle could always go to the Happy Hunting Grounds. But where does an Indian laid low by anthro go? To the library? (pp. 86).

Interviewee: You’ve read him, no doubt?

Interviewer: "No."

[Interviewer lists another text to (re)excavate in order to contextualize and 'manage' the data.]

Interviewee: Deloria (1969) continues,

The origin of the anthropologist is a mystery hidden in the historical mists. . . . An anthropologist comes out to Indian reservations to make OBSERVATIONS. During the winter these observations will become books by which future
anthropologists will be trained, so that they come out to reservations years from
now and verify the observations they have studied (p. 84). . . . [In addition to
publication], The reports are spread all around the government agencies and
foundations all winter. . . . [which become simplified; i.e. "Indians" are
right-brained.] [which begat] conference themes (p. 84) [which begat] government
programs (pp. 86-87) [which begat] Indians [who] parrot the ideas of
anthropologists because it appears that the anthropologists know everything about
Indian communities (p. 87).

**Interviewer**: So, you’re feeling, and, ah, thinking, that you don’t cannot buy into the
invisible persons business – like the other, invisible womyn, womyn of FNA like yourself – just
to find yourself apologetically reanthropologizing your own People, ah, that is, your brothers and
sisters? Your sense of the crisis of representation is internalized? You are keenly aware of Said’s
(1989) insight that representing
someone or even something has now become an endeavor as complex and as
problematic as an asymptote, with consequences for certainty and decidability as
fraught with difficulties as can be imagined (p. 206).

**Interviewee**: I really wish you wouldn’t tag me as INVISIBLE. I do have a REFLECTION
when I look in the mirror. Sorry about speaking entire words in upper case; Vine has that effect
on me.

**Interviewer**: Right. So, before you even begin to research, you revisit the historical
consequence-production of anthropology on a group (cod)(reif)iedn as OTHER [Interviewer’s
emphasis] in their own territories and wonder what you are being asked to ‘do’ ‘here’? When is
research not voyeurism of some by others? And the ethics of asking PFNA to potentially
disengorge some of their most painful memories, doubts and etc. in emotionally-laden
interviewing processes? Not only that, you question, despite Cohen and Manion's (1989) caution that theory used to analyze and manage data "must make sense to whom it applies" (p. 39).

**Interviewee:** Yes, "Indians" swim in generalizations. I really fret and stew about not participating in any more reductionist reifications.

**Interviewer:** Like case studies?

**Like Case Studies**

**Interviewee:** Yes. Although one writes explicitly that one is 'do'ing a case study, heeding Patton's (1980) warning that there is no need (or desire) to "generalize all such cases," (p. 100), the researcher-writer can't predict how the avid student-reader is linking observations and conclusions into their cultural baggage schema. I mean the researcher is expecting to encounter a pretty skilled reader, decoder, who identifies knowledgeably the differences between the extreme-case (most unusual), typical-case (rep of the norm, normative), unique-case (rare, unusual), reputational-case (expert approved) or critical-case (dramatic instance) study (see Patton, 1980, pp. 100-107).

Even I start thinking of 'do'ing a case study. I consider doing a one-friend-collaboration. A former student, now a colleague and adopted daughter, is slated to be placed in her first, shiny, new classroom in the Fall of 1994. An inner-city school is her introduction to teaching. This placement - inner-city, multiethnic population, high teacher stress, etc. - has some similarities to my placement in 1979. I realize times have changed? Or have they? She enters her career with a sturdier sense of cultural-community and national identity than I know I had in 1979. She also has the additional benefit of a TEP program. We have worked out some of our behaviour protocols (as women, with regard to age, etc.) and some of our teacherly protocols (novice and experienced). Yet, I worry that our collaboration will intrude on or alter the privacy
and autonomy of her first year as a beginning teacher. I'll affect the contingent nature of the universe (un)(en)folding. But I never do that study either. I just keep finding there's too much opportunity to start believing what you read and applying that to all cases.

**Interviewer:** Especially when it comes to "Indians."

**Interviewee:** Yes, es-pe-cial-ly th-en; there seems to be a high need to know what to 'do' when it comes to "Indians." And even if I reconcile research data with story and I settle on an acceptable population size (1-2500), then I still am expected to go forth and collect something. This just feels so invasive, a continuing of the invasion into the hearts-minds of The People. I think I liked community education theory because of the continual emphasis that the community is the place to start, the people the ones to construct the 'problem' and conduct the investigation into solutions.

One of the questions Dr. W- asks me relates to what it is I intend to find out. I nod off at this question because I did not really comprehend the question. Finally, after some readings related to formulation of the problem statement, or research topic, and research questions, I begin to understand that I am invited (I think) to begin to predefine the product I was intending to fashion and market. In terms of the doctoral research project, I had no questions. I try to fashion countless pages of questions, or, adopting a Modern Miss Ethnographic stance, I shy away from specific questions. Instead, I listed issues (lesson planning, classroom discipline, availability of credible First Nations teaching resources, reasons for particular classroom layouts, parental/guardian involvement, shoe size, etc.), harking to the advice of Hammersley and Atkinson (1989) that "[e]thnographers do not decide beforehand the questions they want to ask, though they may enter the interview with a list of issues to be covered" (p. 113) This non-First Nations duo recommend that "non-directive questions" may be developed to "stimulate the interviewee into talking about a particular broad area" (Ibid. , p. 113). Non-directive or
directive, closed or open-ended, structured or unstructured [interviews] for that matter, the predetermination of questions or checklists of issues remains problematic for me.

**Interviewer:** So you feel that you are being asked to begin to create the dichotomy between researcher and researchee, where one individual functions as the, in this case unknowing, expert and the other(s) [n] are those who need your assistance to tell their stories?

**Interviewee:** Yes.

**Interviewer:** Hhhmmm...

**Interviewee:** In the extreme, I may be asked to empower the participants which I find a distasteful form of colonialism. This dichotomy buttresses 'traditional' forms of Euroresearch which "place the researcher and those studied in a hierarchical relationship" (Gitlin, Bringhurst, Burns, Cooley, Myers, Price, Russell & Tiess, 1992, p. 19). I think it’s Malinowski who brought us the sense that anthropology also be some form of advocacy, some sort of anthropology as social change praxis. I don’t recall where to look for that reference so you can insert the page number. The significant event or suggestion for me is that the Circle is to be temporarily broken. There is an exclusionary, fragmentary element here which I feel uncomfortable with as a student of community education which views teaching and learning as shared, reciprocal, relational activities, and the roles of teacher and learner as shared, lifelong, reciprocal roles based on a firm understanding of and faith in individuals as equals.

Thus, the development of research questions without the involvement of the participants seems somehow false and not truly collaborative, producing a situation which Gitlin (et al., 1992) terms "alienating," leaving the researcher as "still the expert, still the producer of knowledge and the subject is still silenced" (p. 19). Again, I find it ironic that I, as a Mohawk-Cree member of the Michel Band, am referencing a EuroUnitedStatesian text, in order to substantiate my intuition, my cultural-community sensibility and my agreement with community education theory.
To continue the reference, Gitlin (et al., 1992) are developing a theory of educative research which attempts to develop a less alienating form of researcher-researched paradigm to enable the voice of the usually silenced to construct knowledge by creating a more dialogical process to ensue (p. 20). This dialogical relationship is presumed to be one which would encourage participants "to work together on an equal basis, to reach a mutual understanding" (p. 20). Are we talking conversation here? If so, why do we keep dressing up talk [Interviewee’s emphasis] as research? Is this in order to promote the existence of a capitalist production market known as research in order to distinguish what we do as somehow different, more valid, better, more authoritative than what folks just do anyway? Talk together and make meaning, sometimes getting into the zen of and the comfort of certainty and sometimes missing each other altogether?

Although I try, I am a hopeless failure. I develop no questions.

So, although I am proposing to nomadically wander and meet teachers of FNA in Rae Edzo, Edmonton, Toronto, New York, Los Angeles et cetera, and a correspondent writes and says, "Yes, need this study," I realise that I just cannot venture afield to collect, crunch and scrunch data into models, theories or paradigms about "Indians."

Interviewer: And, just when you think you are going crazy, you locate Hampton’s (1988) doctoral dissertation? Now he’s President of Saskatchewan Indian Federated College? Chickasaw?

Interviewee: Yes. Yes. Yes, Chickasaw; but more educational theorist, philosopher. See, we’re making those occupational niche distinctions again. Hampton (1988), in addition to discussing the inadequacy of non-First Nations research about First Nations citizens also encounters similar difficulties which I anticipate. Should I march off-campus with a list of questions, topics or issues? In his analytical paper for his Harvard doctorate, Hampton describes beginning with an interview schedule (based on Katz, 1981; Halpem, 1977) as a framework for data collection. However, he perceives that such interview schedules are a disruptive impact on
the "process of learning together" and that a more open-ended style of question is demanded (p. 27). He finds his interview style is as obtrusive as that of non-First Nations researchers and is "embarrassed to hear [himself] asking such questions as, 'How do you see the American Indian Program handling issues of change and continuity?' and 'On a scale of 1-7 how characteristic of the American Indian Program is emphasis on performance rather than outcome?' "(p. 27).

Hampton, aware of his uneasiness with regards to the research process and First Nations (re)(dis)covery, concludes that the interview process cannot be a construction of questions and answers. He desires, instead, "a reflective discussion that enabled the participants, including me, to build our thoughts together in an additive or somewhat exponential way" (p. 29). Through his reflective interaction with the interviewees, Hampton recognizes that the research process is not merely attainment of responses recorded accurately and objectives of procedural knowledge, but necessary opportunity to use "the interviews to gather our scattered thoughts and experiences to create a better understanding of Indian education" (p. 29). Hampton's paper, which I read in 1992, invited me to (re)(de)consider what I am asked to do when we are asked to conduct a systematic, documented investigation of a phenomenon through location of a specified number of "units of analysis." The synergetic relational element Hampton discovers on his journey serves as a cautionary tale to me to question myself about the nature, purpose and process of research(er)(ing).

If research is to be a collaborative process, then I feel that the fellow travellers, those who volunteer to come, need to be involved in the identification of these questions (non-directive or other), topics or issues for exploration. I believe teachers have legitimate knowledge about what it is they would like to ask themselves, about the stories they would like to shape and tell, about the insights they honour me through their telling, and, especially, with the initiation to this journey. In this respect, the research avenue (street? alley?) resembles Clandinin's (1986) description of two possibilities for research on teacher thinking, a field related to exploration of
teachers as autonomous, deliberative and reflective agents in classroom practice, these being research which adopts the theoretical perspective of the researcher or research which adopts the teacher practitioner’s perspective (p. 10).

The Method

**Interviewer:** So you are just going to skip the questions part and get yourself out there and basically drink tea, eat bannock and teach-learn-talk-listen?

**Interviewee:** Basically. I believe-recall-think I really believed that then; of course, I believe all my dissertation proposals. If I haven’t problematised enough already, then I get to method.

Whenever I think of research method, the first image which often enters my consciousness is an image placed there while reading Eber Hampton’s (1988) description of how he came to use the six directions as a template for understanding his data. On page 38, he talks about the cultural ceremony he used to focus and guide his vision and his research journey while sitting with Miles and Huberman’s (1984) *Qualitative Data Analysis* (cited, p. 38). The juxtaposition speaks to me so wholeheartedly about my queasiness as I enter the research arena. There is a poignancy here for me wherein I see brave spirits - like Hampton, like my beloved cuzzie - struggling with the world at University; a material force of educational, political, social, spiritual, legal and other events colliding here to force the moment when I attempt an uneasy compromise.

Whether sitting with Borg and Gall or Miles and Huberman or Hammersley or Atkinson, I sit with books - ideological texts or factoids? - which begin to intrude to (re)colonize me. Gauri Viswanathan’s (in Donald & Rattansi, 1992, pp. 149-170) analysis of the colonizing agenda of the beginnings of English literary study in British India provokes a self-knowledge that books are
truly as powerful as colonizing agents as territorial theft and attempted conquest. Viswanathan traces the contentious development of schooling, with disagreement from the missionaries present and "fears of native insubordination," which led to the location of an "ally in English literature to support them in maintaining control of the natives under the guise of liberal education" (pp. 162-163). Shakespeare, Addison, Adam Smith became the prescribed texts, which present English literature "as the highest example of empirical reasoning" to introduce the British (re)presentation of ratio (reason with understanding) which superiority will disperse(arm) indigenous resistance (pp. 16-167). At this point, Viswanathan quotes a British government publication which exposes the colonization attempt (read: cultural genocide):

> If we lay it down as our rule to teach only what the natives are willing to make natural, viz. what they will freely learn, we shall be able by degrees to teach them all we know ourselves, without any risk of offending their prejudices (p. 167).

Thus, Viswanathan observes/argues that the hegemonic valorization of textual superiority (& forms of thought(making) effaces-erasures a "sordid history of colonialist expropriation, material exploitation, and class and race oppression behind European world domination" (p. 168).

Bingo! I thoroughlystand Throughstand is my word for understand; like, if you thoroughlystand some'thing', you are through it, no longer under it. I am beginning to try and comprehend that text becomes, and became, an agen(t)(cy) of self-colonization. And, I'm thinking to myself: ‘Aw-right enough of that.’ I see-feel Greg Young-Ing’s (1988) assertion that Canadian and "other settler nation-states are both presently in an era where the continued exercising of their colonial power over FN peoples through the administration of formal education has been clearly articulated and exposed and condemned" (p. 37). I am thinking-feeling that the The NewcomerEuroCanadians, foreign BritU.S.Euroetc.theorists. whoever, etc., got me in Grade 1,2,3, upwards. Grade 1 Cree or Mohawk languaging-epistemology were not options at St. Pius the X in 1959 in Edmonton, Alberta. I am
attending school in that period for us referred to as integration (see, for examples, Hawthorne, 1966-67, Part 2, Sect. 2(c), pp. 35-36) You got me in my first undergraduate degree (A B.Ed.’79 from the U/C–). You got me in that Dip.Ed. from the U/A– and the M.A. (at U–). Enough! I am supraconscious now that I am attending a ‘foreign’ university, located on the traditional territory of the Musqueam People. The curricula is so much Euroized, there is a distinct lack of equity inclusion of all those other voices. Like mine. I am frustrated. I take the ever-accommodating Dr. W. on a walk and talk — sans bannock — and press my concerns that I need some graduate courses coming at me from some sort of non-generic-Euro analysis. After some deliberation, we think of two courses I might take. Ah, I’m teaching those.

**Hampton to the Rescue**

**Interviewer:** That’s where Hampton (1988) comes into your research? Hampton’s (1988) juxtaposition highlights the constricting tensions felt. I imagine that whether reading fieldwork with Sara Delamont (1992) or grounded theory with Glaser and Strauss (1967), you ask: Whose data-turned-as-findings do I use to discover-construct-create-legitimate my findings, my data, with?

**Interviewee:** I am. I do not wish to decry these methods as bad or wrong or unethical just yet because I do worry about making alienating pronouncements. I believe strongly in the need strongly for collaboration for our survival, for constructing our story. Colonization and decolonization are a shared ‘moment’ which ensnares us all.

I am not unique with these questions. Archibald, Pepper, Urion and Selkirk-Bowman (1995) investigated this concern in their seeking respectful ways to bring First Nations contexts and research together — to create an appropriate meeting place perhaps. To get to this meeting place we must examine our motives and assumptions, and question our methods,
approaches, and practices. We must consider whether our motives and our methods honour and respect First Nations (p. 12).

**Interviewer:** And you want to avoid researching as the "Indian" for the "Indians"? Or, ah, go out to purposively sample "Indians" as the research population?

**Interviewee:** No, not then. Not Now. I have a point-of-view not exclusively "Indian." I don't want to get coded as "Look, now she's doing "Indian" thinking-researching-mulling&musing." I get sucked into that whole self-romanticisation business about 'Indianness', and, my friend, J-S., pulls me out of that one with the statement, "S., the best way to be an Indian, is to just be yourself". No, I am returning to myself after a long haul to survive as A People until now; this moment in time which is everything. I feel impelled to search for methods which address my concerns. I am at the questioning stage.

In a First Nations graduate seminar, held in January of 1994, this research issue was raised. After the discussion, another graduate student and I walked and talked and summed our inner queries that in relation to research the point of the story is not the point, the story is the point. I understand that as a novice researcher I need to have a format and a systematic method of how to locate what it is I am seeking. Thus, I am questioning how to see(k) and how to articulate this see(k)ing in a story(ing). But(!) I can't impose this story(ing) on anyone. If someone hears-reads-decodes this case study/story and there is a resonation – maybe, even an epiphany – then, O.K. But(!) I do not believe that this can be an antidotal truth serum against EuroWesternism.

**Interviewer:** Now we're getting somewhere. The means to see(k) without becoming an (un)conscious agent(t)cy of Eurocultural reproduction, the formulation of a counter-discourse or counter-hegemonic discourse (See Mohamed, 1984, pp. 281-299)?

**Interviewee:** [Sighing rather deliberately and protractedly.] Ah – Yes, counter-hegemony; counter-hegemonic. I am reading-mulling for course preparation and seriously working through
my understandings of what counter-hegemonic initiatives might be as related to schooling re. PFNA. For example, Kirkness (1985) states that recent educational initiatives of PFNA result in conservative change and that a much more radical approach to education is necessary to ensure the future of Indian people. In offering her alternate direction for the future, she cautions that "centuries of outside influence are not easily displaced" (p. 25). That particular remark really makes me question what centuries of influence might be (mis)(dis)placing me?

I find myself questioning what actually occurs when my experiential knowledge gets (en)coded, (re)translated into-by Gramscian thought? What if these thoughts are analyzed by words from Sitting Bull or Khot-La-Chah? Then does this analysis, somehow, make the interpretation more correct? But(!) wait, why do someone's words (have)(need) to be reformulated through the thinking-lenses of someone else? I am not speaking to you to give you an opportunity to illustrate new feminist procedures or deconstructionism or pomo genre fracturation. Am I?

I am speaking for MYSELF [Interviewee's emphasis].

**Interviewer:** Well, ah, surely, we'll have to **DO SOMETHING [INTERVIEWER'S MOST DEFINITE EMPHASIS]** with the data.

[The interviewee stands and stretches. Gesturing at her computer, she concludes the interview, stating that she has to get back to her research into the constructed periodisation of PFNA schooling as encoded in a variety of textu(red)(ualitie)s.]

[The interviewer looks hopefully to the door and takes her leave.]
The 'Good' Researcher's Field Notes,

Well, Actually a Journal Entry

(Too Tired For Field Notes)

After a Long Day of Interviewing

[Interviewer arrives home, kicks off black, stiletto heels, and flops into an overstuffed wing back chair, decorated with a northeastern First Nations motif. Reaching for the all-purpose, battery-powered remote, she cruises through the cable stations (muted), turns on the automatic coffee-brewer, powers up the microwave to begin sizzling the ready casserole, flips on the CD-player (sounds like a Grateful Dead bootleg tape, What A Long, Strange Trip It's Been) and adjusts the lighting level. She displays brief interest in the swirling maps displayed on the television channel dedicated to weather news. Placing the all-purpose remote on her lap, she reaches for her FIELD NOTEBOOK, and grunts. Clicking a pen to full pneumatic force, she stares blankly at a blank sheet of paper. Daunted and plused [as opposed to nonplused], she flips through her field notes. Painstakingly, with a frown not unlike that of a six-year old trying to form the capitalised overlapping curvature of the letter 'W', she begins to write.]

No matter how tired, the 'good' researcher should go home and make field notes for it is "absolutely essential that one keep up to date in processing notes" as "[w]ithout the discipline of daily writing, the observations will fade from memory, and the ethnography will all too easily become incoherent and muddled" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1991, p. 53). A journal is a good idea too and do not expect to see your spousal unit for weeks at a time (Calliou, 1995,
unpublished, in fact not even written). And, if you are writing your dissertation over Christmas holidays, precook and store your turkey (prestuffed) or haunch of marmot in June or take your spousal unit out for Christmas Brunch (Ibid.).

**Interviewer’s Doubts About Case Study & Setting**

A case study of one is more demanding than I imagined. Thankfully, I am not doing 20 or 201. Is this the best procedure to adopt? I recall Allen and Uwin (1987) stating surveys are the most multi-purpose, case studies are probably the most flexible of all research designs. At the simplest level they provide descriptive accounts of one or more cases. When used in an intellectually rigorous manner to achieve experimental isolation of selected social factors, they offer the strengths of experimental research within natural settings (p. 61).

Well, the bedroom certainly is a natural setting. I am just not assured that these responses are isolating "selected social factors" (Allen & Unwin, 1987, p. 61) well enough. What is a social factor anyway? I guess that’s a variable created by society which affects some (?) all (?) members of a social grouping? I guess I should have been ‘shadowing’ her around to class and stuff too for some ‘participant observation’, but (!) she wouldn’t hear of it.

**Lucky I Got An Interview**

She said that she was even reluctant to be interviewed. She recited Dosman (1972), who states that in the case of Indians and Metis, however, it is not possible to conduct a scientifically valuable survey based on long questionnaires, or to interview a large or
representative sample of major Indian-Metis groupings in the city. Those days, if they ever existed, are gone. After a century of ruthless analysis, Indians are unanimous in their rejection of surveys, whether conducted by Whites or Indians. Native people are about as willing to confide in any interviewer as the average Catholic is to divulge secrets of the Confessional (pp. 10-11).

‘Ruthless?’ Is she implying that I might be ruthless? How else do we find out? I think she’s unfair to anthropologists. She’s right Malinowski did advocate anthropological investigation as needing to be socially re sponsible). And, there are some re-evaluating ethnographic projects; like George Catlin (see, for example, Crapanzano in Clifford, 1986, pp. 53-60). But that was then; this is now. Besides, I don’t think she distinguishes well between "learning to live a new mode of life" and "learning about another mode of life" (see, Asad in Clifford, 1986, p. 159). Asad explicates that the anthropologist needs to do the ’write-up’ within the "conventions of representation already circumscribed . . . by their discipline, institutional life and wider society" (Ibid., p. 159). What is so wrong that she doesn’t elect to know about rurally-located Saskatchewan women, left-handed or otherwise? I think it is fascinating to understand how others are living their lives. And, why shouldn’t we interview single-parent moms returning to complete high school? We just might learn something about being better teachers? New curricula? Better ways to improve post-natal care at schooling institutions for these girls? I mean, it’s O.K. too if they want to write their own stories. If we extrapolate the researchee’s argument far enough, well, everybody will be speaking for themselves. Gee, that might put my uncle Jerimiah out of work as a lawyer.
Interpretation Begins

My first impression of this 40-something, far-from-shy female is that she's tortured. Well, not really, tortured. The first dictionary definition of tortured is too extreme (See, OED, op. cit., 1991, p. 1525). Tormented? Yes, tormented (op. cit., p. 1523). She seems out-of-place (misplaced?) in this post-secondary environment. She arrives in an unseasonable snowstorm (Tape Transcript segment #III(a)). She does not come here to be a researcher (Tape Transcript segment #III(b)(i)(b)). She did not come here to do Eurosecularscience (Tape Transcript segment #III(ii) & #III(ii)(e)). She did not come here to become a fractured mind/body/spiritus (Tape Transcript segment #III(viii)(a)). She did not come here to turn the gaze on herself (Tape Transcript segment #III(ix)(d)) nor to 'return the gaze'. She did not come here expecting to get so angry (Tape Transcript Segment #III(ix)(e)) and to test her ideals of compassion. She did not come here to discover she is considered marginalised (Tape Transcript segment #IV(a)). She did not come here to be an "Indian" (Throughout, for example, Tape Transcript segment #IV(f)(vi)(b)).

Either this woman is incredibly naive, or - just unprepared. Maybe, there could be orientation sessions for people like this entering post-secondary settings, especially when they are the first generation. My friend, B.- M - is a fourth or fifth generation University attendee, and this graduate student knew he was coming to University to do research. Or a buddy system of some sort might be developed. I'll note those as recommendations, chapter six.

All of these 'nots'. Hhhmmm...this probably supports well the rationale for single-case designs in that her hyper reaction to campus life as a novice researcher is an example of a "critical case" (see Yin, 1989, pp. 47, 53). Oh! Oh! I don’t think I meet Yin’s criteria exactly because he states that the critical case can be similar to experimental designs in that this form of case study "represents the critical case in testing a well-formulated theory (again the analogy to the critical experiment)" (Yin, 1989, p. 47). I mean look where we left off today. The
interviewee seems completely uninterested in 'do'ing something with any data. Like everything will be this great resonation? However, did she teach a thematic approach to literature? I mean somebody's got to spell stuff out for other people. And come to think-feel of it, this single case study will probably be amused if I code her experience using any tainted eurotheory. Of course, my committee will probably 'boo' me off the stage if I don't analyze(re)analyze these 'thick' descriptions. Well, maybe, not 'thick', just text(ured). Help!

All Is Not What It Seems

What else did Yin (1989) say? Oh yes, "Box 8" (p. 48), there's the revelatory case as a single case to enable description with the basis for selecting a single-case rather than a multiple-case design is that investigator has access to a situation previously inaccessible [Check, "Indians" not long at post-secondary institutions.] to scientific observations [Ugh, she'll detest reading that. But do I have to show her any of this? I thought I just checked transcripts with her? Ask committee member.] This case study is therefore worth conducting because the descriptive information alone will be revelatory (Yin, 1989, p. 48).

Why didn't I select multiple-case? Yes, we must have sufficiently plausible reasons for setting up all these research preferences – for believing so isn't enough. RATIONALISE A BELIEVEABLE RATIONALE. RESEARCH is not about FAITH!

When in doubt, doubt yourself.

This is a very frustrating interview. I am still steaming that I had to abandon about 36 questions. I didn't expect to be listening so much. She seems to just take a question or a prompt and go somewhere else. Half the time I find my mind running to catch up with hers, and when I do, she's already elsewhere. Oh, damm, I never did get her to describe the Western
Realm on tape. She does that! She can be loquacious, but not very cooperative at times. Must check with other researchers to see if their informant-respondents-interviewees are more succinctly directive with their answers, or, if this is a common experience in interviewing where participants tend to wander all over the place. I mean the researchee is certainly flexible enough here; so defensible choice of methodology. N.B. Be flexible.

What do I do with all of this snowstorm, wolf-dreamtime, etc. imagery? Is this "Indian-like"? Of course, if I code thusly, then I’d get creamed for romanticizing the "Indian." I guess I could listen to the tapes again&again and record and identify, and then transcribe and then code the images as just nature-related tropes. I wonder if I should leave that run-on sentence in these field notes? What if some graduate student is working through them someday? I wonder if there’s a content analysis search device for nature imagery or for marginalised womyn (re)telling their stories yet? That might be profitable. I should look into that with my computer geek brother. Perhaps, an index listing of key terms to ‘really’ watch for to guide codification? Idea: I could listen ‘at each direction’ and pick out particular recurrent patterns as related to emotional turmoil/not turmoil; then physical turmoil/not turmoil; then intellectual turmoil/not turmoil; and, finally, spiritual turmoil/not turmoil. Yes, the Four Realms could be the major organizers and then I could subcategorize ‘bibbits’ under these umbrella terms. That would be quite ethnoculturally respectful and sensitive.

Interviewing is exceedingly challenging. I mean I had hoped that we would ‘do’ the Zen of intersubjectivity in a mutually, reciprocal dialogue process, a collaborative process of co-producing knowledge. I intend to get away from that foundational element of anthropological projection where the concept of "primitive is a construction created by white people from their racist perceptions of contemporary" people (Willis Jr., 1974, p. 124). At least, I know I didn’t come out here to interview a primitive. I mean who thinks like that anymore?
Imagine the subject suggesting she’d ask the questions today. Not that this case study is reluctant to speak. Gawd! in class, I don’t recall any tips for dealing with a blabbermouth. Well, the interviewee is not really a blabbermouth, I mean this researchee is articulate. I guess I didn’t expect so much wandering about to occur in an interview. I’m not sure I selected the best case study sample, rather illustrative of Yin’s (1989) caution that single-case study designs must be carefully investigated because "a potential vulnerability of the single-case design is that a case may later turn out to be not the case it was thought to be at the outset" (p. 49). Maybe, I should have gathered more information about my informant. Maybe, I committed myself too soon (see Yin, 1989, p. 49).

I know her by reputation. Well, I had heard about her. Her name kept coming up when I mentioned interest in interviewing an "Indian." As I recall, she said she’d talk about anything but pot shards, Italian glass beads versus plastic, fur trapping, hide tanning or Ruth Benedict’s description of the Kwakiutl potlatch in Patterns of Culture (1934). Fair enough, most anthro books cover that stuff pretty thoroughly anyway so I could just look up needed factual background in the texts and reference reliable authors when I need to add background context. I thought a contemporary study about an "Indian" female would be unique, valuable for potential insights which might become pragmatic recommendations, raised through implications, for design and delivery of post-secondary education experiences for these people. I thought she’d be a fairly typical example of the individual transiting to this new setting, this academic setting.

I thought she’d be a stable example of Patton’s (1980) typical-case, but I think I have a critical-case on my hands (pp. 100-107); or more revelatory, I guess (Yin, 1989). I mean 100’s of persons achieve graduate study degrees annually, and, I doubt they stew over every little word and procedural choice the way she does. However, this interview isn’t turning out at all the way I expected. This is beginning to feel like a holistic, rather than embedded, case study. Yin recommends that the holistic design "is advantageous when no logical subunits [of analysis] can
be identified and when the relevant theory underlying the case study is of itself of a holistic nature" (pp. 49-50). The Medicine Wheel she uses is pretty holistic theory, except she keeps forgetting to talk to me about this. I could adopt that; except Yin (1989) warns that holistic designs may end up being "conducted at an abstract level, lacking any clear measures or data" (p. 49). Well that fits. She keeps telling me to look again at educators' wholesale borrowing of anthromethodology, if not to entirely eschew the entire process. She keeps telling-reminding me to question why we borrow the process, or to (re)consider how-why we borrow these processes -- but, I don't hear her suggesting any meaningful alternatives. I mean iconoclastic quibbling certainly doesn't provide much pragmatic direction. What will satisfy her anyway? I think-feel (Now, she's got me doing it!!) she's suggesting that every researcher is also a philosopher, or an expert in ethics, or some sort of critical social theorist?

That ethics stuff seems rather overly demanding. I mean, who can predict the consequences of every action? Sometimes you just gotta'go with the flow. If humans deliberated over every little thing, then we'd never get anything done. The Trans Canada Highway would still be a system of pathways. There'd be no railways. I can't help it if Hitler picks up my research!! Am I accountable for that? Of course, maybe, she's not saying this at all. Maybe I am only inferring this is what she is intending to state. Is this study is shifting? Is there to be solid ground anywhere? Or is this, maybe, more about interpretation than just getting through this interview? Now I really have to sit my committee down and talk with them. I think, just as Yin (1989) cautions where holistic designs have the further problem where "unbeknownst to the researcher," the complete "nature of the case study may shift" (p. 49). Of course, if it's unbeknownst to the researcher, how will I even know I don't know? I can sit out here to do research from the margins and she won't even consider herself marginalised; she's interconnected. I did not expect research to be so messy. Ugh.
Must remember to let her read chapters when I start drafting. Wait. What if she starts rewriting my stuff, does she get co-authorship? Probably not, this is my study. It is my idea. Must check the copyright business with my committee.

Language is Just Language?

What A Nitpicker - with a Double Capital letter 'N'. Always on about Language.

Nitpicker with a big capital letter N. That might be a revealing coding clue to consider. I could begin the dissertation with the sentence: 'This is the story of a 40+ female who nit-picked her way through two graduate studies degrees at a Canadian University'. No, there would be important information omitted. 'Since 1604 (or, 1607; N.B. check Jesuit date with Parkman?), this informant, and others like her, known as PFNA, have been coming to institutionalized schooling settings’ expecting education only to find, to find [words needed], resulting in what can only be described as nit-picking skepticism.’ That opening should hold a reader’s attention. How do I describe, without inscribing, no, without erasing, what she thinks-feels [Quaint, cute phrase really] she finds? Yes, that’s a better opening, more his/herstorical context for The Reader. Of course, where do I work the "Indian" ethnocultural heritage in, without capitalizing on that? Plus lapsed Catholic? And, I don’t think she’ll approve of a research question which is basically a question of difference typically asking if there are observable differences between two, or more, "units of analysis" (Schumacher, & McMillan, 1989, p. 88) when I formulate, pragmatically, that difference basically on the fact of her "Indian"ness.

Besides, if I'm going to illustrate differences, then I need another case. And, I think this one case study will be quite enough. Further, I know she'd howl Pan-Indianism (Chrisjohn, 1986, p. 36)! Of course, if I code this into an "Indian" personal journey, I'll wander into what
Chrisjohn (1986) lambasts as the mythologising of "Indian research" in education (pp. 29-30).

Well, let him. Chances are I'll never meet the guy.

Besides, just because he got published doesn't make him right.

I Thought We Didn't Say "Indian" Anyway

How come she's using the term "Indian" anyway? Vizenor (1994) jabs at that term. He states that the word

*Indian*, however, is a colonial enactment, not a loan word, and the dominance is sustained by the simulation that has superseded the real tribal names. The Indian was an occidental invention that became a bankable simulation; the word has no referent in tribal languages or cultures (p. 11).

I thought the more sensitive term is 'First Nations'. I wonder if I should do a global search with the computer and change all of her instances of the usage of "Indian" to "First Nations."

[Interviewer puzzles over a hastily written notecard, one of several thousand in her collection: "In effect, the European invented the term "Indian" to mean a kind of 'other.' The indigenous peoples of the Americas identified themselves as distinct peoples such as Dine or Haudenosaunee or any of hundreds of other distinct peoples. There is no evidence that they conceived of themselves as a hemispheric whole or continental whole in the way the Europeans soon came to be known." "Conversely, the white man was judged to be that which the Indians were not. If the white man should change
through adoption of things Indian, he was then no longer a white man."

(Mohawk in Lyons, Mohawk; Deloria Jr.; Hauptman; Berman; Grinde, Jr.; Berkey and Venables, 1992, pp. 51, 52)

Of course, I'm not doing a life his/herstory. Thank God! I'd probably have a tape library bigger than the Smithsonian's. So, maybe I could just leave some of that stuff out. I guess, first, I would just explain my interest in knowing about this post-secondary experience. The literature review? Hhhmm... there isn't much about "Indians" attending University; especially since they were legislatively barred from attendance until 1927. Details, details. Perhaps, I'll open with "... a story. Hhhmmm, am I becoming formulaic?

In January of 1991, I arrive in a freakish snowstorm silencing the cosmopolitan noise of a city I consider a second home. I love the ocean. Normally, the ride is about 18 hours; however, the snowfall elongated the trip to approximately 57 hours. As usual, my life is tinged with irony."

[End of journal entry, Day 02. Sounds of coffee sloshing into a sturdy, blue pottery mug, provenanced [Yes, I just made a noun into a verb.] as belonging to the family of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, leader of baronial opposition to Henry III over the Magna Carta business. [Double Sigh.] Yes, I made that up too. The Motomaster/mistress plastic cup is still in service.]

\[Rat-tle:Rat-tle:Rat-tle:Rat-tle\]

And, somewhere a wild horse
won't be broken.

[John Trudell, mea culpa, the bootleg tape.]
 Much is made about the selection of a concise and researchable research question or questions, such being a direct and glaring reflection of the astute abilities of the researcher-to-be. Such selection being considered an augury of the success or failure of the research to come. One is not advised to look for such questions within the entrails of pulverized field mice, hogs' noses and outdated texts. The research question(s) then.

**Compulsory: Question A:**

If you are nearing the end of your doctoral candidacy and it's a little late to decently assemble another committee (unless, heiress to substantial funds); and, then, two of your committee members (humorously) threaten to quit your Ph.D. committee (not their careers entirely) if you do not (re)consider composing a self-reflexive written (& typed, double-spaced, with one inch margins) exploration of your thoughts-feelings about the research process, would you, then, (re)consider this self-reflexive exercise as a legitimate endeavour to articulate some of your observations, already shared in previous papers and conversations about the research process from your point-of-view rather than rewrite the his/herstory of First Nations schooling - especially as such original research might precipitate the risk that they will 'make good' on their promise, which, as a form of hypothesis, is only testable upon their leaving?

**Answer A:** Yes.

If time, Optional Questions:
**Question B:** Would you publicly share any of your doubts about certain of your committee members?

**Answer B:** I would sooner eat field mice entrails.

**Question C:** Would you publicly share any of your doubts as to the validity of this research product?

**Answer C:** I would sooner eat field mice entrails.

**Question D:** And, if you accept that they might make good on their threat, will you do the self-reflexive slice-of-life (not life history) with grace and good humour?

**Answer D:** Yes, but I would sooner eat field mice entrails.
[Interview Day 03. The foil, ah, the interviewer returns, with all usual equipment and with the addition of a video camera, obviously received for Christmas. The sounds of chairs jockeying for position in the forest of orange shag carpet. The muttering of statements, "Ah, Santa, new vidcamsoultaker?"; "I tried calling Santa, but he seemed unsure about settling land claim."; "I hope we can rumble through this quickly today"; and, [with a twinkle in her inch-thick lenses] "Gotta publisher for this thing yet?". "Sorry, we can’t do pictures. The bed’s not made." "Don’t worry, my husband’s going out soon, just set up for the interview as usual."]

Interviewee: Oh, I see you brought more research questions.

Interviewer:

[A one word answer nearly hissed through clenched teeth.]

Yes.

[Watch what we can do with language. A one word answer sung brightly like Florence Nightengale after a night of life saving in the Crimea.]

Yes.

[Or again. A one word answer mumbled almost apologetically.]
Yy-ees.

[Actually, all the interviewer said was, "Yes."]

Theorising Warm-up Exercise

**Interviewee:** Where did we leave off? [Flipping open her field notebook.]

Ah, yes, the plight of those marginalized. Understanding that becomes a real exercise in compassionate mind (see Chief/Elder Louis Sunchild in *Lightning*, 1992, pp. 220-225). I consider more how contact is ongoing, multigenerational. To see Charleston's (1994) understanding that for some of The People, Strong Medicine for us, especially

[o]ur people must learn that ignorance, dropping out, alcoholism and substance abuse, poverty, unemployment, disease, hate and preoccupation with the injustices of the past are symptoms of oppression; they are not prerequisites for tribal identity (p. 28).

There are many theories to explain the 'alcoholism' of PFNA. How do theorists hypothesise these rich sources of information? Just how do THEORIES of the supra-organized and safe progressivism of modernity or APOCALYPTIC postmodernism apply to invisible Brazilian women or Mohawk steel workers or teachers of FNA? I end up stymied, wondering what will happen to the PFNA voice in all this? WHAT and WHOSE theory are you going to use to ANALYTICALLY, INTERPRETIVELY MANAGE my data? THAT'S why Hampton's (1988) redefinition of education is significant because here PFNA begin to theorize from their locational situatedness (Hampton, 1995, pp. 6-46). We might have our own answers to age-old philosophical questions like, "What is education?" Our answers may differ from Peters and Hirst's (1970) statement that education is related to processes to bring individuals to "desirable states of mind" (p. 26). For example, for some PFNA, mind is not only the desirable location.
Maclvor (1995) employs Hampton to get at her exploration of verification of the authenticity of "science education needs of our [PFNA] students" (in Batiste & Barman, 1995, p. 74).

**Interviewer:** Ah, that leads into this potential fallacy where "Indian" theory must be applied to "Indian" research work?

**Interviewee:** Precisely? Is that racist? I don't know. Perhaps, just erroneous, because "Indian" is an artificial, legislated, legally enforced categorization of the Canadian(foreign) government. We're wandering into the area of false essentialism(s). Yet, why their need to slop Eurotheory over me, my data, like a coat of gesso over a canvas?

[Interviewer writes a hasty field note on neon orange post-its, which are reserved for remarkable inspirations: Lovely image of 'White' on 'Red'. Perhaps, use as a subtitle? Have to use with quotation marks, of course, because this is the interviewee's idea. Or, maybe even has chapter title potential. N.B. Don't forget this image! There is something here!]

**Let's Try Feminism:** "Oh! Oh! White on Red"

**Interviewer:** I thought I might use a feminist entry, say, for example Lorraine Code's (1991) thorough examination of the exclusion of women from knowledge production and legitimation in her text, *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory And The Construction of Knowledge*, in that women's exclusion parallels that of those marginalised, previously (thought)(treated as) invisible. Spender (1980) has already been there. She's noted that within society where theorising has been the province of men, and where their theories have so often been used to mystify, to intimidate and to oppress, it is well that we as women
should be wary of what we have come to see as theorising - and theorists. . . .

'Theory' has been used to construct a division between those who know and those who do not, and, like most divisions in our hierarchical society, it is not a division of equal parts. . . . And, we need to see that men have no monopoly on theory: theorising is an activity engaged in by all human beings (pp. 22-23).

I think the similarities of exclusion ary articulation are strikingly apt to your situation.

**Interviewee:** So, today, we're back to the pronoun 'your'. What happened to the marginalised business 'Us'?

**Interviewer:** Well, you didn't agree to being marginalised and I respect that. So, we'll just interview here, somewhere in space I guess.

[Interviewer starts scribbling furiously in field notebook: Oh, gad, I was snippy with the interviewee. Well, she baited me. I should have just laughed or shrugged.

Besides, she's the one who wants to have this great conversation. O.K., be cool.]

**Interviewee:** [Pause on tape.] You are suggesting that we (re)'read' this passage from Dale Spender (1982) and "Indian"ise it? Say, like this?

In a society where theorising has been the province of Euromen, [and, seldom acknowledged Eurowomyn even though Euromen know about them] and where their theories have so often been used to mystify, to intimidate and to oppress ['Others' like me], it is well that we [as PFNA] should be wary of what we [as PFNA] have come to see as theorising - and theorists. . . . 'Theory' has been used to construct a division between those who know [Euroderivative] and those who do not [like, unlettered, illiterate PFNA], and, like most divisions in our hierarchical society, it is not a division of equal parts. . . . And, we need to see that Euromen [and, seldom acknowledged, Eurowomyn] have no monopoly on theory: theorising is an activity engaged in by all human beings (pp. 22-23).
Interviewer: [Looking somewhat rueful of facial physiognomy.] Of course, we’re taking English-speaking womyn theory and slapping that on to articulate the exclusion of PFNA as intellectuals?

Interviewee: Well, I am English-speaking; actually, the only language I manipulate with any facility. I mean I can order black coffee in Magyar, and, my French is enough to announce a singular diurnal unit filled with precipitation. Gee, what’ll we do? It’s all rather pervasive isn’t it?

Interviewer: [An even more ruefully assembled countenance.]

The persistence of euroH?

Interviewee: This persistent Eurogenealogy continually fascinates me as I lecture in EDUC441 and EDUC442. I am continuously confronted with Eurolabelizationnounbabblespeak just rolls and slops out of my mouth in my analysis of schooling. As I provide these Euroskewed renderings, with reference to null curriculum (for example, Eisner, 1969) knowledge, control and power (for example, Foucault, 1972), I cannot help but wince (anatomically, affectively, psychologically, intellectually, politically, spiritually, and otherwisedly) as I import the conceptual terms and framework of Euroderivative theorisation. For example, the null (hidden, mislaid, marginalised or other) curriculum is not a new invention of non-First Nations theorists, but I cite Eisner - from 1979 I think. Our literature is laden with astute observations of our ancestors who described the enforced cultural nullification presented as curriculum.

Iroquois leader, Conassatego
Interviewee: [Continues speaking after placement of the subtitle.] Iroquois leader, Conassatego, a spokesperson at the signing of the Treaty of Lancaster (July 5, 1744), refuses an offer, made by the Virginia Legislature to place students in the Williamsburg College of William and Mary. He states that the Iroquois know that the Eurosettlers

. . . highly esteem the kind of learning taught in these colleges, and the maintenance of our young men, while with you, would be very expensive to you. We are convinced, therefore, that you mean to do us good by your proposal; and, we thank you heartily. But you who are so wise must know that different nations have different conceptions of things; and you will not therefore take it amiss, if our ideas of this kind of Education happens not to be same with yours. We have had some experiences of it. Several of our young people were formerly brought up in the colleges of the Northern Provinces; they were instructed in all of your Sciences (Conassatego in Armstrong, 1971, p. 16).

and return ignorant of their teachings-lifeways. Conassatego concludes his commentary on his peoples’ normative standards of educational requirement and then graciously offers to provide education for several of the colonizer’s sons (Armstrong, 1971, p. 20).

Interviewer: You are experiencing that questioning moment that Roland-Martin (1994, after Vallance, 1973/74) experiences when she discovers and then asks, "What should we do with a hidden curriculum when we find one?" (p. 154).

Interviewee: Yes, except Roland-Martin (1994) calls her hidden curriculum one where "outcomes or by-products of schools or of non-school settings, particularly those states which are learned, are not openly intended" (p. 156). In the case of schooling for PFNA, the outcomes are definitely intended although not globally supported. And the intention is disablement [Longish pause on tape captivatingly aromatic with the smells of a Cadbury bar.] disempowerment to stop being who you are. The word for this is a term reserved for criminal acts – genocide


That is a very explicit curricula. But to relate Jane’s further development of her exploration of ‘hidden’, she states that once found, such is no longer hidden. She states that as soon as the learners in a setting are aware of the learning states they are acquiring or are supposed to acquire, these learning outcomes no longer belong to the hidden curriculum of that setting (pp. 161-162).

Stay Awake, Stay Awake Again

**Interviewer:** Ah – so, this is for you that awakening you describe earlier, an awareness that once more the epistemological lenses to be worn here are Euroderivative (See Tape Transcript segment II(b)(iv)). You see the political nature of instruction?

**Interviewee:** When I start staring into the text, more and more our absence obviates itself. The People have emotional, intellectual, logical, researched responses to mutual but not often respectfully reciprocal contact. But our thoughts, feeling, examples, explications are not present. For example, postmodernism’s evident playful self-referentiality to push philosophy beyond the ‘modern’ obscures the quotidian expression of daily land grabs, child molestation and rape, inadequate housing, sterilization of women & et cetera. There is hard copy about the emotional confrontations and devastation which continue as The People endeavour to make emotional, physical, intellectual and spiritual sense of contact. And - contact is not yet completed.

We are in contact now.

One example is that of the Cariboo Tribal Council’s (Alkali Lake, Canim Lake, Soda Creek and Williams Lake, British Columbia) (1991) attempt to collaboratively self-study the
multigenerational effects of Euro-induced residential schooling. Empirical and anecdotal data document vividly the abuses (sexual, psychological, physical, mental & etc.) in a report sadly titled "Faith misplaced" (pp. 161-197). This quantitative-qualitative study documents how children of the residential incarceration schools continue to experience the near fatal colonial fallout of abuse as adults, as individuals, as parents and as community members. Those abused, abuse. I am aware that the reactions of some of The Newcomers to such revelations of truth are met with emotional resistance. The (re)actions range from denial to trivialisation to belittlement to demands of further proof. Moreover, any Newcomer would be naive to assume, in light of the fluid interrelationality of all beings, that it is possible to stand outside – or even centered rather than peripheral – and safely beyond the pain of these communities. Here, postmodernism’s attempt to abolish subject-object dichotomies might work if the analysis becomes a naked admission of shared pain and healing, rather than a fictive dismissal to service amoral, subjectivist relativism – often confused on their part with license. Freedom and license are not the same constructs.

**Interviewee:** Oh, Wait! Wait!

**Interviewer:** Wh–uut?

**Today’s the Day!**

**Interviewee:** Today’s the day!!

**Interviewer:** Today’s the day?!?

**Interviewee:** Yes, today’s the day we talk in lower-case.

**Interviewer:** Huhhh?!!! sorry, i mean, huhhh?!!!

**interviewee:** yes, it’s euro-H day, so we have to speak-write-listen-read in lower-case, where anthropocentric privileging of certain proper nouns is challenged, with return to emphasis
of other elements - like Medicine Wheel as opposed to william graham or baltimore colts or the beatles. we should redo’ the title of this section.

part III: canonicity:

built on an inflated currency of euroheritageization

Interviewer: o.k. but, i think two of the ‘older’ members of your committee found this to be a bit of an eyestrain..

interviewee: we’ll speak bigger.

interviewer: i guess you are not going to explicate your connection of the northern realm with cognitive ratiocination, are you?

interviewee: nope. [Extended pause on tape.].

interviewer: i didn’t think so.

interviewee: i’m really reluctant to. i think you have to ‘be’ at a Medicine Wheel not just read about it. we could just reprint the stuff from the chapter published in battiste & barman (calliou, 1995) as an appendix to this thing?

[interviewer’s mental note: [ ‘wha’s this ‘we’ business?’]]

forts, and the need for (de)fortressing

between the too warm flesh
of the literal event and the cold skin of the concept runs meaning (derrida, writing and difference, p. 76).

like, i really think i thought pomothought was going to save me; do something for me - Hah! (calliou. 1995. unpublished)
interviewer: well – sorry, well, without explication of the northern realm (should that be capitalized as an indicator of power-direction-source?) with the cognitive realm, how should we begin?

interviewee: [politely offering a suggestion.] with a story, perhaps?

interviewer: i’m never sure what to do with your anecdotes. i mean my research methods class didn’t really prepare me for this. i more assumed you would just directly respond to my questions, not tell me all these stories.

interviewee: Oh, i thought intersubjectivity, that is, a subject-to-subject position, would ‘allow’ the free trade in stories, experiences, emotions, et cetera. of course, you haven’t exactly shared your story yet. besides, these aren’t just anecdotes to be shared at some dinner table. you’re not doing that are you? this is my life i’m sharing.

interviewer: but, we’re not doing a life history.

interviewee: no, not exactly. how about that story?

[without waiting for a nod of assent, the interviewee begins. the interviewer listens, but is more determined to be an interactive component of today’s interview.]

the fort at the forks

interviewee: in 1992, i was invited to winnipeg, manitoba, to participate in a think tank sponsored by the canadian institute of planners. while there, kent gerecke, a compassionately humanist planner, now deceased, took me to the forks, the original site of fort winnipeg at the meeting of the red and assiniboine rivers. of course, the forks is going to be some hockey rink now despite the protestations of the manitoba chiefs who are "angered by proposals to build a new hockey arena for the national hockey league’s winnipeg jets on an historic site" (canadian press/vancouver sun, 28-04-94, p. a9). kent describes this area, bathed in hot sunshine, as the
place where guides - like my great-great grandfather louis and great-grandfather michel calistrois/callihoo - stayed while piloting river boats on east-west expeditions. i savor many emotions, but also recognize that indians lived outside the fort. after long journeys they did not live inside the fort with food, a warm bed and affable conversation. two solitudes sharing the same landscape without exploratory celebration of insights and visions about this new time and the potential of a new common culture under construction. separate camps linked in trade, which mutual, but not reciprocally respectful, contact was (re)shaping.

**interviewer:** so you're feeling this insider/outsider sense of exclusion written right there at the forks in your own his/herstory?

**interviewee:** yes. inside/outside: exclusion is very physical. at night, under a blanket of stars piercing the wide, black, prairie's sky, one could look to these forts, squatted on the land, our Mother, the Earth, and wonder about the activities of newly-arrived two-legged brothers and sisters, who, our seers prophesied, would come with many different words and lifeways. demarcated with stick-like fences, those little forts sprouted until one could stride the perimeter of the fort, dance around the fort, sit in the shade of the fort, and, at times, even attack the fort.

**interviewer:** so the presence of these forts is disconcerting, especially as they'll develop into city structures, with their inscriptions carelessly scrawled upon, what you call, Mother. weatherford (1988) remembers this foundation. remember that quote?

even though european settlers imposed new architectural styles and new ideas of urban planning on america, they usually built over existing indian settlements . . . subsequent generations of americans usually forgot that their towns and cities had been founded by indians. myths arose about how the colonists literally carved their settlements out of the uninhabited forests (weatherford, 1988, 231).

**interviewee:** yes, but look at how weatherford (1988) remembers how the newcomers "continued the same settlement patterns already firmly established by indians" (p. 231). the
emphasis is on the pattern of (un)planned development; an acknowledgement of the presence of previous anthros, but without mention of Mother. I mean when Ted Fontaine talks about the proposed site at the forks, where Red and Assiniboine rivers meet, he states, "when you start putting in piles, you're destroying the soil. Whatever is buried down there has to be respected" (Canadian Press/Vancouver Sun, 28-04-95, p. a9). The sense of reverence and the reminder that anthros, humans, can't just run around hacking, digging, scraping, or clawing into the earth solely on their own authority is missed. Instead, a spokesperson for the proposed real estate development counters Fontaine with the statement that the arena would be "built on top of any buried historical material" (ibid., p. a9). The unnamed developer's language is evidence of physical linguistic erasure of common colonial policy. Also indicative to me that s/he missed totally the communication regarding respect—reverence.

**Interviewer:** So Weatherford (1988) is setting the his/herstory record straighter, but missing the element of reverence of spirituality to show "respect for the spiritual relationships that exist between all things" (Hampton, 1995, p. 19) and to reverence as well the his/herstory (Hampton, 1995, p. 32).

**Interviewee:** Thus, their buildings are planted into the blood, bones, and ashes of generations of The People, MY PEOPLE! So we have been under the fort, outside the fort, perhaps, even above the fort; but never really inside the fort.

**Interviewer:** So suggesting, building on top is like proposing to wallpaper the fort, while underneath the original wood finish exists—still?

**Interviewee:** Yes. Gee, you do have a sense of humour. It's rather like expecting that a lie eliminates completely certain existent facts. Erased—poof!
listening-hard & keeping my mouth shut

**interviewer:** so forts symbolize, for you, the concrete existence of eurocolonialist expansion and the mental processes of colonisation?

**interviewee:** you could say that. i dislike having to thoroughly explain the subtext of my images. that's rather like being asked to write a 250-500 word description of jasper johns' 1959 painting, device circle; or, wassily kandinsky's 1910, first abstract watercolour. i mean what would be the point of painting in the first place? there are other languages.

now, where (were)(are) we? [interviewee's confused emphasis] how do interviewer's keep track of all this?

**interviewer:** the presence of forts as - ?

**interviewee:** yes, the presence of forts predominates. as a survivor of attempted colonialist expansion and genocide, living in a neocolonial country, i listen hard when men and women inside the fort speak-write. when i first heard jo-ann a- use that phrase 'listen-hard', it went inside me as a descriptor of the importance of listening. i must listen as institutionalised policies, formal and informal, like the 119-year old policy of wardocracy, known as the indian act, continue to govern the lives of some by others.

that indian act policy of 1876, with revisions through to 1989, codifies previous canadian policy and legislation governing the quality of relationships expected of ourstory. a former assistant deputy minister of the then indian affairs branch (canada) comments that the act has "the force of the criminal code [!!] and the impact of a constitution on those people and communities that come within its purview" (doerr in doern & wilson, eds., 1974, p. 40). i am tempted to turn my back, but i can never remain impervious to theoretical argument from inside
the fort because, somehow, i will be affected. however, a multilogue, that is, a more inclusive multiethnic/religious/cultural speaking-listening, must, i think-feel-urge begin because in these ecologically wounded times our two-legged concerns are minor, perhaps, even trivial, when so much apology to and healing of ourselves and our Earth Mother is needed.

ever euroheritageization

interviewer: so university wakes you up to the fact that there seems to be a predominant (pur)(world)view?

interviewee: perhaps. perhaps i wake myself up? perhaps, my Ancestors send me a wake-up call? i knew this before, but coming here is, perhaps, another wake-up call, another kind of consciousness-raising. remember when that phrase was all the rage?

[interviewee waits for a response. none forthcoming.]

i remember and understand more through this experience about the experience of being ever schooled in white society. my life is a constant remembering to undo eurocatholiccanadianschool-induced amnesia; to keep the fact alive that a fort shadows my horizon and reinforces borders. i do not bead nor make bannock. i cannot speak-write any of the indigenous languages of my inheritance. grade 1 cree was not an option when i entered school in 1959 and started a lifelong acculturation process to make me forget who i am.

imagine going to school to forget. schooling is about learning, not forgetting. this being 'schooled again' is undermining - hhhmmm . . . don't like that word - my parallel biculturally schizophrenic journey to remember-understand who i am before i can walk-speak-write in both, or multiple, worlds. in my heart, i can only speak-write-feel as one outside the fort, while employed as a civil servant at a canadian university in a native indian teacher education program. engagement with my own contradictions highlights a constant struggle to know who i
am and the difficulty of speaking clearly for myself about [interviewee's light emphasis] my thoughts-feelings. sorting this out is going to take a lifetime, so i do not think i am going to have too much time to speak for anyone else. i don’t want to because this feels exceedingly disrespectful. i don’t want to tell you how to think-feel - what to make of our interviews specifically.

interviewer: oh, so, you don’t mind some interpretation?

[pause. checks for non-verbal behaviours. none forthcoming.] -Of course, without this explanation becoming some sort of universalized portrait of the "Indian" in university-school setting as examination of the author(ity) of those within their institutional sites?

interviewee: yes, forget the surreal portraiture. i mean that’s my resistance. opposing the portraiture created through so many words based on so much researched investigations -- like, the examples given earlier. i read these research pieces and I find myself not knowing myself. this re-realization saddens me; makes me very homesick to just start having the time to do the scholarly reading-locating- writing about my own ‘unknown’ theorists, philosophers, etc. i get very sad up here. i think i might have gone mad; but, fortunately, i am teaching EDUC441 and EDUC442. in addition, to highlighting certain contradictions, i get a balanced reading diet before i get buried in eurocryptic text. as well, dr. c.’s savvy humour and tutoring assist. I recall one of my favourite supportive statements he would throw at me, "Nooo. . . you are not going crazy!" somehow, this slogan would ready me for another day of textual battle. that must be the reason i started reading so early in life, prepwork for what came here.

[exceptionally boisterous laughter.]

this is a long way since Dick and Jane (see Gray & Arbuthot, 1958).

what we can’t face looks for us anyway

(Trudell, 1994, n.p.)
interviewer: ah, well, that's very nice. you do devote a great deal of time to postmodern literature, er, textuality up here? pomo for postmodernism, a term deployed in a variety of fields. this is a fractal-like discourse not yet measured, definitional exactitude is elasticized to encompass contradictory stances which compete for (re)presentation about a number of questions, including the nature of autonomy, reason, language, history, epistemology and so on, with complete discussion beyond the scope of this paper. as a reaction, across a range of disciplines, to modern(ity)(ization) (e.g., hebdige, 1988; best & kellner, 1991; rosenau, 1992; barker, hulme & iversen, 1992; harvey, 1993), or challenges to collapse disciplinary boundaries (e.g., vattimo, 1988), the postmodern project is an attempt to signal a paradigmatic shift of beliefs beyond mere chronological periodisation.

for example, rosenau (1992), who confesses to writing as a ‘modern’, illustrates examples of overt shifting in art, architecture, literature, psychology, political science and anthropology. rosenau (1992) is one of the few who critically assesses the spectrum of postmodern-isms, which she ranges from affirmative to skeptical. she cautions that the subjectivist, ironic, paradoxical tone and nature of postmodernism (perhaps, only ‘cut & paste’ juxtaposition presented as inquiry) produces a tentative lack of unity which is "both a strength and a weakness" wherein everybody can locate "something about it with which to agree," with such accommodation pressing postmodernism to a brink of perpetual collapse (p. 14). such shifting in form, consciousness, style and social constructions of knowledge are characterised as more a marked sensibility to deconstruct, displace, negate or reject the totalising construction of a euro-common currency of events and conditions presumably constructed through objective eurowestern science.
interviewee: well, yes. for example, lyotard (1993a) argues that (euro)science with a capital 'S' can no longer be the means of legitimation of knowledge for "scientific knowledge" never did "represent the totality of knowledge," but coexisted in competition or in conflict with narrative knowledge (p. 7). statements like these are assuaging some of the uneasy queasiness i describe feeling in our first interview - like the W.W.S. so, initially, i am taken with the postmodern. i don't use or not use a hyphen in the term to indicate sympathy (see rosenau, 1992, pp. 18-19).

interviewer: are you attracted to the acknowledgement of indeterminacy and immanence?

interviewee: yes, and now. there is that appeal to dis(locate)(rupture) and decanonicalize with the active encouragement of pluralist voices as valid -- even necessary -- the desire to (re)present the ineffable, and the invitation to hybridisation rather than "mutant replication of genre" (see, for explication of these features, hassan in jencks, 1994, pp. 196-199) with irony, parody, wordplay(ing), et cetera. there is also the attraction that language is viewed as becoming too representational; that there is a futility in languaging where we try to make a very fluid world solid. i am so enamoured that i go to dr. c.'s office and announce, "i think i am a postmodern." [laughter.] and, dr. c. goes, "no, you're not." then, i make a weak case for why i think i am. [more laughter.] because i think i am looking for a label. am i an historian? a researcher of research? historiographer? whh-aat?

one seems to need a label up here. handy for business cards i guess.

anyway, i leave his office rather sulkily and decide to go and do an exceptionally thorough scrub of postmodernism to see if i am or not. i start with four starting places:

(1) (re)legitimation of the emotional realm,

(2) localism (knowledge, action, politics, etc.)

(3) a serious challenge to the hegemony of reason, and
(4) spirituality.

such foci receive varying degrees of emphasis, in oppositional ways, in postmodernism.

**interviewer:** only you find you are not? while "reading" postmodernism, you describe yourself as feeling that you are 'hanging around the fort' (calliou, 1995, april-september version, p. 4). this phrase is used to derisively remark on those two-leggeds who wannabe of first nations ancestry (often resurrecting a grandparent as ethnic proof), or to those who desire to be acceptable to those inside the fort.

**interviewee:** yes. yet i do not feel like a Euro-groupie. a pervasive euroheritageization continues neocolonial importation, from previous and current time and The Continent, of hegemonic ideological thoughts and feelings expressed in write-speak-visual media. these formulations constrict a path we interdependently walk and shadow the wisdom of the lessons to be learned from the land, from our first Mother and teacher and each other. like that conassatego quotation earlier, i know i'm reading his words in english and i wonder what the iroquois construct 'science' is (in armstrong, 1971, p. 16, last line). i am **not** suggesting the iroquois did not have science. i don't think i ever got so deeply into questioning before i came here. of course, i have all these great questions and no answers. yet. euroheritageization is based on the false assumption that contact did not produce mutual consciousness shifts; that we, somehow, managed to construct and continue to live parallel lives since 1492. although some elements of postmodern theory hold promise of melting the shadows, a majority of "texts" separate The People from The Newcomers and fail to acknowledge contributions to shifts in consciousness.

for example, legitimacy of the u.s., or canada, as countries and nations with privilege of dominance over other nations is questioned. sioux legal scholar deloria, jr. and non-sioux legal scholar lytle (1984) argue that the "nations within" do have "higher status than [U.S.] states," without being "primitive delusions of grandeur" (pp. 7, 1). falkowski (1992), legal historian,
exposes the racist, hegemonic basis of international law as no more than the "European law of nations," or "more accurately as the public law of Christian nations," particularly, the evolution of international law through the Nuremberg trials which necessitated the need to establish international principles of law and justice to introduce the charges of "crimes against humanity" in order to assert the supremacy of an international law over national laws (pp. 6, 16, ftnt. #1). The 1991 Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other international human rights initiatives affirm pre-contact nationhood and the existence of aboriginal rights. See, for example, operative paragraph 15, which states that autochthonous peoples have collective and individual rights to own, control, and use the lands and territories they have traditionally occupied or otherwise used. This includes the right to the full recognition of their own laws and customs, land-tenure system and institutions for the management of resources, and the right to effective state measures to prevent any interference with or encroachment upon these rights.

**interviewer:** ah, where would i find that document? i haven't looked at many legal documents for this educational research project.

**interviewee:** for the complete text of the 1991 version of the Draft Universal Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples see, Falkowski (1992, appendix IV, 151-156). These racist (pre)(as)sumptions are not raised in text. Pomo just leaps in with so much *fait accompli* and i wonder, as i watch hegemony in action [Laughter on tape.] and, i wonder why it seems suddenly that pomo is the rage when there are numerous PFGA sources to cite as authorities regarding indeterminacy or incompleteness of grand or otherwise narrative. Again, the dissonance between my baggage and my reading just adds to how the world stops making sense up here - not that i have the corner on what makes sense.

**textual genetic parentage**
interviewer: so there's more white noise, and, for all the emphasis on pluralistic disjuncture, you are again confronted with absence, which is disjuncturing.

interviewee: oh, how we are absented! i am stewing, wondering, just how badly does this 'other' world mean to have PFNA included. this is not a postmodernist example, but an illustrative example to challenge postmodern times. here, the absence-making is active. professor charleston's (choctaw, 1946-1991) "towards true native education: a treaty of 1992" was written while he was project director for the u.s. indian nations at risk task force [herein: inartf] inaugurated in march of 1990. the report was "not published by the u.s. department of education" (swisher, ed., 1994, p. 1). thus, the journal of american indian education made the decision to publish the manuscript in its entirety in order to widen distribution of his vision (swisher, "editor's note," 1994, p. 1.). of the 14 member inartf, a majority felt the text to be "too harsh" and offensive to "most people" (ibid., p. 1). the final report is titled "indian nations at risk: an educational strategy for action". this is the 1992 world of publication; not 1892. charleston's report is a proposal for a peace treaty not a call for anarchic insurrection and retribution. euroheritageization has some very active and powerful mechanisms.

interviewer: so, it's not just the (re)presentation of the text, but what text sees the light.

interviewee: yes, the publishing industry sustains a canon. i applaud the american indian journal of education's willingness to devote an issue in homage to dr. charleston's work. to have such words of honesty and willingness for peacemaking banished made me sick, cold-sick. why/how can words like these be perceived as a threat? oh, sadness.

interviewer: so, i imagine that you bring these words into your classrooms?

interviewer: yes, to balance the textual genetic parentage that encodes a tradition of privileged euro-ideology which translates, interprets and explains the wor(l)d in terms from inside that fort(ress). i don't believe in censorship. read them all, i say, but read it all to discover ourstory. for pomo, such textual genetic materials include "french structuralism, romanticism,
phenomenology, nihilism, populism, existentialism, hermeneutics, western marxism, critical theory, and anarchism" (e.g., see mcgowan, 1991; rosenau, 1992, p. 13). so, here i am some, economically-disadvantaged "indian" [Interviewee's emphasis] girl from 124th St. in[locational name deleted] savouring quite the brew, but one with a distinctly euro-flavour. mcgowan (1991) traces a lineage extending through nineteenth century thought, evident in works by kant, hegel, marx and nietzche, which resembles the european romantic movement's reaction against a scientific, mechanistic view of the world, accompanied with a fervent embracing of emotions and a sensed spirituality, especially through nature (see mcgowan, 1991, chap. 2, 31-88; 271-274). as well, elements of poststructuralism and discourse theory surface through french philosophers – foucault, derrida and lyotard – and german thinkers – nietzche and heidegger. for a focused analysis of french postmodern theory, take a quick look at best & kellner (1991, 25-28). as one outside the fort, i dance and twist under their shadows again and again.

my (re)reading of pomolit leaves me feeling irate, frustrated, saddened, curious. the challenges to phallocentric epistemological (re)production is more stereotypical textual incest. the desire to rupture is seemingly more desire than praxis. even the feminists are absent and the womyn spender (1980) resurrects from the grave are absent. thus, i am sitting blinded in the midst of more white noise of euro-male privileged discursion. the extent of non-euro challenge is more a topic or subject of index entries.

[Subject emits a muffled gagging noise. Interviewer emits a temporary moment of panic as researcher was not taught Heimlich manouever in any of the methodology courses. Interviewee recovers.]

rather than finding an ideological enantiomer, i (re)discover the same geneology.

[long pause on tape. sound of whitney houston. sound of absense. sound of wind in trees. sound of a match striking the cover of a well-known research textbook.]
while postmodernists rally to include the decentered, the victimized, the oppressed, the
disempowered, evidence to this effect is limited. As I scan bibliographies and index entries to
"locate" myself in this literature, I find myself

absent,

absent,

absent.

absent

rattle-rattle-rattle-rattle

interviewer: But we can't be critically simple-minded here and simply label and dismiss
the entire postmodernist enterprise as eurocentric?

interviewee: I agree. I do perceive that some postmodernists feel very deeply the many
illnesses of an emotional, physical, intellectual, spiritual, or combination thereof, in need of healing. Seriously (re)working cultural, political, aesthetic, scientific and other theoretical
understandings is evidently needed. I share this sorrowful angst at the hourly displays of our
ability to dehumanize. first-hand and media witnessing present this lack of reverence as (re)presentations of our global dysfunction.

**interviewer:** perhaps, euroheritageization encompasses us all?

**interviewee:** through text? the text does go on breathing, living, colonizing, conquering? what is the antidote to this virus? i hope to avoid getting bogged down in a textual battle. there’s so much to repair among ourselves, with our Mother. we can write and publish all we want, but that won’t change the fact. we will be known by our works, our actions, our letting go of ego, not by our words.

[another longer pause on the tape. interviewer field note: *i am feeling very uncomfortable because i am uncertain of the informant’s state-of-mind. she looks like she is going to cry and she’s chain-smoking. i am not a psychologist and i think all of this recollection is stirring up emotional turmoil and i do not know how to handle this.*]

god, i get so weary, revisiting this. just bone-brain weary. i read-worked so hard to make sense of this mind puzzle.

[more laughter, but sad]

all i end up with is an eight-syllable noun.

emotional responses are part of our heritage. the postmodern turn to the emotional fails to specify how (pre)(neo)(primitive)modernity emotionally crippled not only The People but The Newcomers too.

inclusiveness discourses.

the possibility?
interviewer: so you would conclude that postmodernism will remain sanitized as only a string of (dys)(u)topic adjectives without (re)presentation of stories (legal, political, military, etc.) as told by The People?

interviewer: yes, some of our stories and teachings hold lessons about the two-legged capacity to dance in codependent dysfunctionality. so let us put our stories together, put our heart-minds together and try to tell these stories. for some reason the emphasis always seems to be on telling cultural stories, collecting the legends. production of texts which detail a shared ourstory – warts and all – could activate the emotional possibility of postmodernism's (re)exploration of the enlightenment, christianity, capitalism and conquest.

perhaps, deconstructing this epistemological-affective (that is intellectual and emotional/psychological) foundation of emotional pride, which rationalized stripping the emotional dignity and security from The People, must also identify crimes against all beings. (re)legitimation of emotions means we must act with/on/within them to either finish the project of modernity or move into a postmodernity or beyond into a time, perhaps, labelled by The People and not by The Newcomers. as long as the emotional horror remains feared and denied, the land, the two-leggeds and all beings will be troubled. all cultures have proficient storytellers. the trick will be to begin to tell a shared ourstory which emotionally cleanses, strengthens and rehabilitates. i look to the justice of actions, not of words.

an indian person has a right to justice. it is no more than other canadians receive as a matter of course (cardinal, 1970, p. 39).
interviewer: so, before we get to that eight-syllable word, do you propose to address modernity? is it self-evident that the modernity and post you react to is erected as if by the newcomers solely? you note that the habermasian sensibility (1987) of modernity is endlessly quoted as that era which can and will no longer borrow the criteria by which it takes its orientation from the models supplied by another epoch: it has to create its normativity out of itself which had a difficult birth from the debates of their ancients (ancestors) and their moderns (pp. 7, 8-9).

interviewee: yes, yes, and that’s when i start asking over&over&over&over again: it did? i am becoming read in pfna-lit and there’s just too much i ‘know’ now to contradict these euroized assertions, yet here i am still spitting out these ‘guys’. i feel like i am witnessing hegemony and cultural repro101 in action before my face on the page. oren lyons (1992), a traditional chief of the onondaga nation, argues that modernity is not solely the property of european invention, but "the confluence of many cultures [with] origins in many" geographical locations, with this history systematically denied" (see, lyons, mohawk, deloria, jr., hauptman, berman, grind, jr., berkey and vnebles, 1992, pp. 14-42). john mohawk (in jaimes, 1992) in his "epilogue, looking for columbus: thoughts on the past, present and future of humanity," makes similar points (pp. 439-444).

interviewer: i should have a glance at those texts too?

interviewee: if you’re interested. you must have enough to do with this interview. where was i? oh yes, so, i’m yelling back at the textbooks," hey, whataboutus?"

interviewer: yes, i see your point. if this is going to be a pluralist postmodernism, then why aren’t the text inscribers taking the effort to include The People?
interviewee: in this text-fort, modernity is also of our making, be it snowshoes or democracy or pharmaceuticals. i agree with lyons' assertion that all Others Beings do all have agency in events and conditions manifesting. the anthropocentrism is incredible! the rock people and the plant people contributed to this modernity too. yet (un)conscious selection (re)constructs stories which support this euro-linear progress, ah, pageantry, which "proposes human history as a story of mankind's inexorable advance toward a more perfect society," which is "still being written in the passions of the times and being written subjectively by the 'winners' " (op. cit., pp. 17, 16). i feel both amused and frightened as euro-credit legitimates euro-capital as the prime currency of (re)(de)(con)struction carving out textual territory as illegitimately as was geographic territory.

postmodern deconstruction of the structural family tree of philosophical constructs proceeds in order to understand what family skeletons, secrets or seductions are concealed in outward (re)presentation. such deconstruction (may)(can)not be able to accommodate the marginalised or the (neo)colonised because this is not a pfna family tree – not our skeletons. i find it ironic that north america is littered by thought from the distant homeland when such thought is attacked as a globally totalizing currency. few of the newcomers formulate localized answers of place to detect questions of micro-politics, (humanization, emancipation, ecological healing, etc.). not enough of the newcomers listen keenly to those caretakers or protectors who are permanent residents of Turtle Island - here since time immemorial. if we both (do)(can)not examine more closely how our heritage is becoming/has always been ideologically entwined - despite our differences with regard to issues related to land rights, aboriginal fishing and hunting rights, self-government rights, education rights, & etc. and outstanding issues of dehumanizing brutality - then, reconciliation and healing remain weighted with heavy shadows. i revolve back to the need for an ourstory.
interviewer: but won't pfna lose with an ourstory? what's to protect or to keep the pfna version from becoming as you say one-world-massified?

interviewee: i am not suggesting destroying anyone's stories; particularly, as the pfna story exists in this place since time immemorial. i'm looking for this ideal where pfna and n.c. story are not distinct texts, with the standard regurgitation of "indians" for the opening 25-50 pages of a text before starting the 'real' story of canadian history, art, literature. i am questioning the necessity for and firmness of distinct discourses known as native studies and white studies. will these be useful in the 22nd century? how useful are they now? what - and whose - needs do they serve? we just keep disappearing in mainstream text, and i find my (dis)(non)appearance up here on this eurocampus, situated on the traditional territory of the musqueam, to be unnerving, maddening, frustrating, and delusional on the part of the n.c.

so i coin this word: euroheritageization

interviewer: of course, then you're stuck with defining the term? you state in 1995 that positively euroheritageization can be a cozy foundational enculturation. in a less positive sense, euroheritageization continues to sanction and privilege only particular author(itie)s. the unconscious hegemony of culturally reproductive frameworks will only continue to obscure or to consume us, unless we courageously try to look through their reflective surfaces (calliou, 1995, april-september version, p. 4).

interviewee: yes, i worked-thought-felt-struggled very hard to also coin a positive side to euroH. however, euroheritageization connects, for me, the textual colonization with the continuing Four Realm colonization and genocide occuring on Turtle Island with the (un)conscious predominance of the euroized schooling i am receiving. in my serious study of
postmodernism, i find that reason is attacked and the emotional realm i thought might be asserted is turned into pornography. the secular nature of postmodernism is necrophilic fascination with spectacle and carnival burlesquery. this is so without reverence, without unconditional loving respect, without compassionate-mind. i am horrified as i read further, and i do concede to dr. c. that, 'no, i am not a postmodernist'.

interviewer: of course, you still struggle as postmodern textifiers appear to be unable to quote anyone outside of their textual domain?

interviewee: there's always that. i feel like i am witnessing a one-sided conversation. also, the emphasis on fragmentation is disturbing to me. the Medicine Wheel is functioning as a heuristic for me to think-feel wholism -- integr(ity)(ation).

this sensibility of fragmentation is more splintering-sickness and just one more reason why i come to reject pomoism. fragmentation is viewed as both a goal and a fact in postmodern theory. as a goal, some theorists propose that the will to inclusive pluralism will expand the current explanatory narratives available; but, nowhere in the texts are 'alternative' narratives provided. as a fact, that is, as a result of modernity, references are numerous. for example, jameson (1994) describes the fragmentation of beingness, related through lacan's description of schizophrenia as a "breakdown in the signifying chains," as a world where textual (print, media) disjunctures is stressed to the point that the postmodern viewer must attempt the impossible synthesis of rampant diversity (pp. 26-31). when the newcomers have to attempt this synthesis which we've been trying to make sense of, which has us in a stranglehold, since contact, they fear schizophrenia while we talk optimistically of becoming biculturally educated.

if this will to seemingly "impossible synthesis" is to begin, perhaps, i think-intuit, they are desirous of our story; but they see the synthesis as threatening fragmentation, not a possibility of wholism. this is not logical to me. does the dismantling of the euro grand narrative mean, suggest, imply that no grand narratives as possible? we are one species?
the exclusion of pfna or other intellectuals through absence while professing such ideals, such intellectual dishonesty. this offends me. harvey (1993) observes that such a notion of fragmentation suggests we "can no longer conceive of the individual as alienated in the classical marxist sense, because to be alienated presupposes a coherent rather than fragmented sense of self" (p. 53).

the Medicine Wheel stresses wholism.

i did not come here to view and accept myself as "fragmented" - (neo)marxist, or otherwise.

**Interviewer:** so you become very disenchanted and code this disenchantment as euroheritageization?

[light sigh punctuates tape. sounds of rummaging for a pack of cigarettes.]

**Interviewee:** yes, another love affair terminated.

*a disenchantment of the pomo-universe*

**Interviewer:** the areas which intrigued you – relegitimation of emotion, localism and local agency, not to privilege reason and spirituality – become sore places for you then? will you be speaking to these findings directly? **Interviewee:** you know i don’t want to write off pomo just yet. i got disenchanted. once i ploughed through the furrows of their texts i could see the logical progression; but i did have some turnarounds. as usual, all is nought as it seems.
The Postmodern Invitation to (Re)legitimate Emotion

Interviewer: Why did you go back and read Descartes (1596-1650)? How does that connect with your interest in PFNA schooling?

Interviewee: There's a big quotation market for Descartes' maxim: I think, therefore I am. However, I know as a Catholic-schooled child, that Descartes is Catholic and I can't quite match my Descartes, looking to prove his faith in God's existence, with everyone's emphasis on his responsibility for the mind/body etc. split. For example, he states, "I have always thought that two topics - namely God and the soul - are prime examples of subjects where demonstrative proofs ought to be given with the aid of philosophy rather than theology. For us believers..." (Descartes, trans. by Cottingham, 1986, p. 3, para. 2). His maxim is becoming a sloganeered denunciation, too exemplary of the falsification of dichotomies of mind and body, masculine and feminine, reasons and emotion and etc. To 'read' Descartes, I believe you have to understand-accept that "this present treatise contains everything he has been able to accomplish" in the areas of God and the soul (Ibid., p. 4, para. 4). I'm into Descartes as well because some postmodernists react against what is perceived to be the hegemonic rationalism of modernity. And, genealogically, some seem to track back to Descartes. It's a mystery to me how Descartes' struggle to keep his faith in God eludes some readers.

Interviewer: Yes, but Descartes isn't quite so firm in his assertion: I think, therefore I am, et cetera. He concludes, "but what then am I? A thing that thinks. What is that? A thing that doubts, understands, affirms, denies, is willing, is unwilling, and also imagines and has sensory perceptions" (Descartes, trans. by Cottingham, 1986, p. 19). Descartes continues his mental wondering through a "free rein" examination of how he perceives and comprehends a piece of wax from a honeycomb, and he concedes his amazement at "how prone to error [his] mind is, for language can also contribute to the trickery of knowing" (Ibid., p. 21).
interviewee: yes, descartes is saying so many thoughts here. he admits the vulnerability of the 'lowly' anthro thinking. he admits to doubt. also, he's onto the language business before wittgenstein in, ah, 1922. considerably sooner. but, again, there are pfna who also note the skillful use of language to disguise.

interviewer: so, what happens? do the pomos exercise emotion?

Interviewee: no, it's carol pope's all touch and no contact. carol pope is a canadian songbird from the group rough trade. are they still about?

interviewer: ah, don't know.

interviewee: re. emotion - no. the postmodernists' first move is to denounce the unhealthy co-dependency we two-leggeds have with reason -- proof, legitimation, evidence, et cetera. this is illustrated in the search for alternate methods of knowing -- or unknowing, or antiknowing, or anti-reason, pick a term -- which are beyond positivism's technical precision or fixed empirical validit(y)(ies). lyotard (1993a), for example, views legitimation efforts, formulated in western language games, as actively destroying "traditional knowledge of Peoples, perceived from that point forward as minorities or potentially separate movements destined only to spread obscurantism" (pp. 23, 30-31). my reading of pomo confirms his assertion. i'm here obscured; overshadowed by a very sturdy fort. second, there is rejection of reductionist, overarching explanations -- known as grand narratives or mastercodes.

interviewer: these are now being viewed as cases of privileged euro-intellectual hegemony. this is why i feel, think, believe that it's important that we hear from your voice.

interviewee: [frowns audibly.] right. third, the discourse is awash with signifiers which present alternate viable modes of human discovery, exploration and expression. these include, among others, creativity, desire, empathy, fantasy, feelings, imagination, intuition, introspection, play, relativism, and subjectivity. finally, the language suggests, to me, that an emotional reaction strengthens the will to deconstructively undermine modernity as observation nullifies
modern, scientific pageantry and civilization. too many anomalies of inequity, brutality and cruelty exist in the 'modern' world and challenge the rationalized ideals of the enlightenment, secular humanism or christianity.

however, the stress that emotions be (re)legitimated as proposed postmodern substitution for the scientific method is weakly described and not new.

interviewer: a similarity to the feminists’ challenge that emotional knowledge be more prominent in a patriarchally established discourse?

interviewee: yes, because the loss, lack or exclusion of feelings from modern discourse is harmfully arrogant. for example, grosz’s (1990) description of phallocentric knowledge illuminates how keenly this denial is felt by some:

phallocentrism . . . is a discursive or representational form of women’s oppression. phallocentrism conflates the two autonomous sexes into a singular "universal" model which, however, is congruent only with the masculine. whenever the two sexes are represented in a single, so-called "human" model, the female or feminine is always represented in male or masculine terms. phallocentrism is the abstracting, universalising and generalising of masculine attributes so that women’s or femininity’s concrete specificity and potential for autonomous definition are covered over (p. 94).

phallocentric and gynocentric epistemological separation emotionally affects all members of the species, bloating the species through repression or denial.

interviewer: so, postmodernism reminds us to remember the emotional realm, but it is presented as a separate(d) sanctum; whereas, a Medicine Wheel understanding is not compartmentalized. the promise is not materialised.
emotionally laden contact

**interviewer:** the deconstructive promise of postmodernism to replace the hegemony of reason with emotion is, however, often a sanitized invitation for you? textual (re)excavation overlooks and obscures the emotional content of the arrival of The Newcomers to the lands of The People?

**interviewee:** yes, porno lit just accepts and reproduces that the state of this continent, under siege, as a fait accompli – they don’t look under their feet! in the Circle of Life, no one of The People or The Newcomers remains untouched. contact brings The Newcomers many resources (gold, lumber, oil & etc.) which gives material life to material culture particularly the progress (not meant here in any hierarchical, evolutionary sense) of capitalism and industrialism. they don’t even begin to (re)examine their own his/her/ourstory.

for example, in 1503, columbus remarks that "gold is a wonderful thing! whoever owns it is lord of all he wants, with gold it is even possible to open for souls the way to paradise!" (cited in wright, 1993, p. 11). weatherford (1988) chronicles how gold, as an economic – and, emotional – desire, fueled european imperialist expansionism into north and south america and brought socio-economic changes to spain and then to The Continent (weatherford, 1988, pp. 1-20). sitting bull comments that "the love of possession is a disease" with europeans (cited in Black Elk, Jr., 1982, p. 144). greed, ambition, covetousness, pride, arrogance are all powerful emotions which rationalize many actions and disable respect and compassion. yet, these emotions are not given specific enunciation in pomo-lit. these emotional times are not often analyzed in texts, and certainly not examined emotionally. pomo-lit is every bit as evenly rational as any other eurolit. although the allusions are clever, they still write as moderns - even with upper-case quaintly present.
anyway, black elk jr. (1982) invites us to consider the implications of a tradition which

(im)(com)pelled The Newcomers
to march across half a continent, engage in a major war to steal the land from my
[Lakota] people, engage in genocide in order to preserve their [european]
conquest, and all primarily so they can dig gold out of a small portion of that
land, transport it back across the continent, and bury it again at ft. knox! the
virulence of the disease sitting bull spoke of is truly staggering! (p. 145).

let’s talk about how our desire and greed fuel our rationality, inhibit our rationality. this desire
for and extraction of commodities extends into the present as foreign u.s. and canadian
governments seek to expropriate previously relocated families of The People in order to take
wood and oil as in the case of The Lubicon (see chuchill, 1982, pp. 217-258); or uranium as in
the case of the Navaho (see churchill, 1982, pp. 143-195; or, guerrero, 1992, pp. 189-216 re.
Navaho water rights) and so on.

The People were also willing to over-hunt animals as commodities to sell to and trade
with The Newcomers.

**interviewer:** so critiques of capitalism which often discuss the socio-economic impacts but
fail to discuss our all too human failings and feelings are not enough for you?

**interviewee:** to think that this material world is the only world is not enough.
commodity. commodities. knowledge as commodity. land as commodity. not land as mother.
i don’t know.

[interviewee sighs. long, long pause on tape. sounds of michael bolton. interviewer
wonders if she should break the silence.]

**interviewer:** commodification is an important theme in pomo-lit. fredric jameson’s (orig.
1984) oft cited essay, "postmodernism: the cultural logic of late capitalism," is used to argue that
an escalating perception and use of everything as a transactable commodity is the inevitable
trajectory of capitalist ideology (pp. 59-62). Previously, Lyotard (1993a) argues that such commodification extended to knowledge as the production and sale of proof (pp. 44-46).

Originally in 1968, Jean Baudrillard, who declares himself not to be a postmodernist, asserts that capitalist production was no longer just about competition for consumer products, but rather a means of self-actualization (1992, p. 12), although his observations question the 'logic' of capitalism.

**Interviewee:** still there is a lack of confrontation with the emotional, spiritual, ecological damage, violence and other carnage of capitalism, which harms the producer, the worker, the seller, the buyer and the Earth Mother. thus, the ultimate harm is to ourselves for we are of the Earth. i do not see this appreciation that we need our Mother in postmodern text.

perhaps, more than she needs us.

again, all touch, and no contact?

**Interviewer:** so, while reading postmodernism, this becomes an exercise in looking for yourself. this postmodern invitation fails in two crucial ways. first, the events of dehumanization are seldom specified, with the emotional power to motivate or paralyze individuals eliminated. second, postmodern literature is an incestuous (re)telling of voices already constantly (re)privileged as the voices to be heard, which is just more white noise.

**Interviewee:** yes. the time of contact varies from location to location on Turtle Island. there are those Newcomers who think we have vanished or lost all sense of ourselves. therefore, the pain is forgotten or denied, and The People are told to get on with their lives. not all contact was emotionally devastating, for some Newcomers readily understood the welcome presented,
saw and heard The Land, and chose to live as The People or as brothers and sisters of The
People (see, for example, sioui, 1992; trans. by fischman). however, some emotional codes -
racism, superiority, disgust - gain superiority and sanction(ed) actions and policies which
denigrate The People as less than equal, and therefore, worthy of herding, murdering, kidnapping
(our children to residential schools and hospitals) and other acts of emotional dysfunctionality. to
come with such fine enlightenment ideals and then to witness the resultant late 20th century
horrors would surely result in the nihilistic angst or anomic despondency written-spoken of in
this literature. yet, events are only alluded to quite clinically as adjectives with details of
specific events seldom presented from the point of view of the (de)centered, marginalized,
peripheralized, victimized and/or oppressed. the indexes are a catalogue of the language
violence used to speak-write about those outside the fort: to speak-write about me.

**interviewer:** do you ever find yourself there at all?

**interviewee:** oh, yesss, once.

[sardonic or hurt laughter?]

rosenau (1992) includes reference to a first nations incident in a camouflaged retelling of
canadian oppression. she states that

neo-colonialism was humanist in that it asserted a responsibility to educate
primitive peoples [my Ancestors and Elders] to teach them to read and write. but
in most cases, education translated into assimilation to the culture of the colonial
power, teaching the reading and writing of a foreign language. similarly, native
people in America [The People] were moved to reservations because it was said
they could not take care of themselves. but along with this "humanism" went a
dramatic change in life-style, a decline of population, reduced pride in ethnic
identity, and increased disease (p. 49).
this smokescreened paragraph, in a 229 page text, acknowledges The People, but simultaneously reduces my emotional experience to moments of misplaced humanism. my self-esteem is reduced because of population decline, not because of genocide.

any postmodern invitation to eschew reason and look to emotion, but which fails to allow two-legged emotional baggage to ever surface in textbook style renderings, replicates the patriarchal objectivity of rationale retelling. first, neo-colonialism is - not was. the canadian government continues to administer a 119-year old act of wardocracy known as the indian act. (re)assertion of indigenist self-rule is greeted with varied emotional outbursts by The Newcomers. second, acculturation was more than a literacy campaign; a genocidal invasion reduced the numbers of Turtle Island from 20-25 million to about 5 million. where were 20 million people relocated? to literacy camps. i mean stop making sense. be honest. do some research! for a challenging investigation into the fabled smithsonian number of 1 million authochthonous citizens at contact and the need to manipulate indigenist population numbers to camouflage genocidal interpretation of population decimation, you should have a look at stiffarm and lane, jr. (in jaimes, ed., 1992, pp. 23-53). third, The People were not moved to reservations. when they weren’t forcibly relocated, they were negotiated with as nations which involved The People and The Newcomers in treaty processes which supposedly set out conditions of land and resource exchange for long-term fiduciary responsibilities and self-government. fourth, i find it difficult to argue their intentions with so many of my people dead and dying.

rosenau’s (1992) example is indicative of the lack of specific evidence from The People which would concretize the postmodern deconstructionists’ agenda to return the gaze to themselves 474 years after Magellan circumnavigated the globe. i know she is not writing as a postmodernist, but for me the absense is as glaring. postmodernism is a form of euroheritageization in that once again western historical traditions selectively code events which denude any sense of real historical or contemporary uncomfortableness.
interviewer: so in the the relegitimation of emotion, or call for such, no one actually gets to feel too much of anything? no one seems to be feeling too uncomfortable but you?

interviewee: right. they don't quote us talking about them; euroegocentrism prevails.

local agency and localism

interviewee: localism seems to appeal to you because of the similarity with community education's emphasis on the local community?

interviewer: yes.

interviewer: you look into the porno aspect of agent potential and find that, in postmodern theory, agency and local action appears as either entropic or reconstructive? by agency or will, you mean the volition and the ability to act on or from or within an emotional response, physical action, mental idea or spiritual insight. for lyotard (1993b), agency is omnipresent, citing as evidence of the vibrant mutability of postmodernism's provocativeness as a form of avant-gardism, which "is not modernism at its end, but in a nascent state, and this state is constant" (pp. 79-80).

interviewee: yes.

interviewer: this is very entropic. but lyotard (1993b) dislikes the militaristic connotations of the term avant-garde, he believes that the innate nature of avant-gardism, with its type of "long, obstinate, and highly responsible work" (p. 79) is his best sense of the kind of creative agency required to resolve the challenges to planetary survival - without sublimating the sublime?

interviewee: yes.

[flustered, the interviewer stops. an adept interviewer tries to avoid questions which only elicit a "yes" or a "no" response.]
interviewee: i was thinking-sensing-mulling. in this characterization of agency, there is, for me, something reminiscent of the euro-spirit of pioneering; 'to go where no (wo)myn has gone before at whatever cost' or the sense of revolution to be attained after labourious struggle. metaphors of labour, work and revolution are being turned. some postmodernists wish to translate such work into a more playful revolution through play, irony, carnival or spectacle to counter-act the jumbled hyperreality of modernity frighteningly alienating with hyperindividualism. to find that in the place one inhabits, rather like bioregionalism, seems improbable?

interviewer: so echos of baudrillard's "simulacra and simulations." baudrillard's (1992) asserts that we inhabit a hyperreality, nourished by nostalgia for what was real wherein the massing of signs and signifiers creates little more than spectacle, that is simulated (re)presentation rather than substance – for example, the orgiastic consumption of billboards for cream pie rather than the cream pie itself (pp. 166-184)?

interviewee: yes, identities created for consumption, like the highly suggestive reification - "Indians." except our nostalgia is land-based. gerald vizenor (1994) challenges reconstructive reifications of the "indian’s" (identi)(authenticity in manifest manners: postindian warriors of survivance. he confronts self-presenting-romanticization, built on textual (re)presentations which can become more self-(dis)simulation. result? creation of antiselves; reaction not action. whereas, others may hunger to (re)invent themselves, some of The People hunger to know who we are as pre-colonial.

interviewer: lyotard (1993b) maintains that postmodernists -- artists and intellectuals primarily -- must be those who would invent and represent the ineffable to inquire "into new presentations -- not to take pleasure in them -- but to better produce the feeling that there is
something unpresentable" (p. 15). have a look at, "answer to the question, what is the postmodern?," translated by peefanis and thomas.

interviewee: i see no need for nostalgia. i was younger then. that is the business of (re)presenting "indians", a supposition that there is a mysterious ineffable to discover and accurately present. thus, the interest in our learning styles, whether or not a whole language approach works with teaching grade one cree, etc. and in some ways i think this is where community education supersedes cultural ethnography, because they emphasize contemporary community. i admire community education theorists for not being hung up on cultural as the best lcd; however, they overlook the land (hampton’s sense of place) (hampton, 1995, pp. 39-41) and his/her/ourstory.

interviewer: but the postmodernists acknowledge one’s agency to reject or create identity?

interviewee: yes, but some theorists undo agency with a sense of bleakly deterministic entropic overshadowing, which destroys any possibility of (re)establishing balance: four realm, thepeople&thenewcomers, etc. a slippery postmodern slope of despair posits that life is emotionally meaningless, hopelessly entangled and without possibility to (t)(m)ake one more action to honour and respect life. life is too unreal, too real, too hyperreal. chaos is viewed as the possible outcome; a chaos devoid of social or moral or ethical responsibility or agency.

[Pause on tape. the sound of match striking a sony walkman.]

more fragmentation.

responsibility nor relativism

interviewer: so agency is really hope(ful)less(ly) not possible?
interviewee: yes, and through a neat trick, without responsibility. rosenau (1992) relates an example where a postmodern parent/guardian might explain that they are not "responsible for how their children turn out" for they "did not author their lives" nor "author(ize) their efforts" nor "have author(ity) over their choices" (p. 33). she extrapolates her argument to arenas of national (treaty-making) or international actions (rosenau, 1992, p. 33). such loss of author(ity) or agency could produce a vacuum of amoral estrangement, not answerable to any ideals (democratic, egalitarian, humanist, socially-contracted, religious, spiritual & etc.) - always a choice, of course. these relativist stances provide, perhaps, endless opportunity for freedom, but freedom as exercise of license does not always honour life. freedom cannot be just equivocated with anthropocentric privilege. there are a number of other lifeforms we share the planet with for sustenance.

interviewer: so you cannot accept this fanciful postmodern dismissal of agency. you have encountered enough examples of how the newcomers have actively used their power to effect their will on The People. some two-leggeds (not the ideological -isms) did stick needles through the tongues of some of the children of The People as punishment for speaking a heritage language, some did beat some with open hands, fists or handy objects turned weapons, some did lock some up in darkened rooms, some did force some to actively kneel on kernels of corn with arms outstretched and author(ized) further acts of physical, sexual, legislative, military, emotional, spiritual, intellectual and other violently genocidal actions. some two-leggeds did choose to exercise their will in ways not to author(ize) or perform such basing and brutalizing act(ion)s. some did choose to be subjects who could dehumanize "others' as objects of sickening pleasure. chrisjohn and young (1995) enumerate some of these sick pleasures (pp. 23-25).

interviewee: that's where i think there is a more significant distinction than ethnocultural, gender, sexual preference and etc. i would make the distinction between those Who Honour Consciously All Life-Energy and those who do not honour consciously all
Life-Energy. every moment is a free will invitation for honour-reverencing or dishonouring-dereverencing life. but, the postmoderns do not talk about honouring life.

agency as a sense of place, but be skeptical

interviewer: but other postmodernists (re)affirm agency and site localism’s ideological epistemic foundations as an optimum starting place to erosively deconstruct mastercodes.

interviewee: yes. locale implies, for them, that the petite recite will emerge; seemingly unaware, it’s already there under their feet. remember the story of the forks’ development? this isn’t so new. community education theory emphasizes this sense of place-community again&again. the petite recite will be a smaller, more manageable narrative, preferable to totalising narratives. community education theorists were here too.

i guess the suggestion is PFNA narratives are not to be welcomed. lyotard (1993a) asserts that the totalising explanations are now untenable "regardless of what mode of unification is employed," whether "speculative or emancipatory explanations" and that immunization against such can be found in incredulous skepticism (p. 37). why skepticism? lyotard (1993a) argues that new information technology exposes too many loopholes and omissions, and the very scientific methods used to "advance" western progress and modernity now create a legitimation crisis which serves to delegitimate any proof for the proof (pp. 25-30). thus, the crisis of faith is replaced by a crisis of reason, the crisis of proof: rationality stalemated. checkmated by lack of evidence.

interviewer: you sound suspicious?

interviewee: well, who wouldn’t be? pomo invites our marginalized stories, but the extrapolation here is to put on a stance of extreme incredulity. we haven’t been believed much all along (e.g. current ongoing land claims in British Columbia should tell anyone something) and
in the porno worldview, any petite recite will run into the same crisis of proof. that’s more white noise - no proof? proof. whose proof? whose method acceptable to find the proof?

agency is recognized as available at local levels through use of local narrative(s) – Whose? – local (anti-)reason, local activism and so on. however, the sites of The People – reserve-bound, rural or urban cultural-community – are always seemingly overlooked as legitimate examples of localism in action for survivance. agency is employed in transprovincial/territorial (re)assertions of the Creator-given gift of autonomy (free will to be who you are, what you must be) in self-government negotiations. now agency is contaminated as suspect and, if exercised, free of consequence production.

place theft

interviewer: you even manage to politicize the porno sense of place? via landclaims? his/herstorical conquest? do you think that’s fair?

interviewee: is it fair to critique ignorance? no. but, i don’t believe-think i am just endlessly lobbing grenades. what i am sharing is the sense of absense i begin to endure in reading for courses up here. i (re)turn what i find in text onto the world.

‘place’ is coded as political, which is not natural, not a gift of our Mother, not a reverential place. i started mulling this over in my construction of community education theory. community education theorists, predominantly white-male construction, are also seemingly oblivious to land ‘ownership’ and ‘reverence’ issues in their hearty endorsement of starting educational activism in the ‘home’ community. for some of The People, diasporic disjuncture is enmeshed in this very absense of place. this theft of geographic space, resulting in physical, spiritual, emotional diaspora is a theft which postmodernists generally fail to acknowledge. for example, luke (1989) argues for a postmodern view of socio-political activism as linked with
place and a (re)new(ed) politik of identity and possibility for those marginalized (pp. 209-210 & 235-236). luke operates as if PFNA are invisible. yet, place, and, hence, identity, is itself a contested terrain. for example, ward churchill’s (1992) text documents cases of The People, like the lubicon, lakota, navajo-hopi and shoshoni, to re(sist)(claim) territorial, resource and human, amongst others, rights.

**interviewer:** you are not suggesting that this exclusion from postmodern texts, i mean, that postmodernists appropriate stories of the struggle by The People and recode them as ‘postmodern’?

**interviewee:** hardly. instead, there is a need to recognize that what is visualised to exist as theory has consequence-production which might result in arduous and sometimes dangerous practice, with unexpected, unknown effects. in reading, i can’t understand why contact did not result in harmonious relationships, more so than attempted by some brave individuals; why the ‘Otherisation’ is so necessary. we and our children’s children are going to live with this ourstory, so we need to start talking about it, not unconsciously censoring it out of consciousness’ reach. for example, deloria and lytle (1984) note that modern social reality and historical political reality are rarely consonant with each other. contemporary indian communities, both reservation and urban, represent the continuing existence of a particular group of people who have traditionally had a moral and legal claim against the united states. the fact that many indian tribes continue to exist unassimilated is not due to the practice of traditional ceremonies as much as it testifies to the complex of legal and political ideas that have surrounded indians for two centuries and made them understand the world in much different terms from any other group of american citizens (p. 2).
interviewer: are you suggesting that postmodernists need to understand that analysis which excludes the contestation of terrain (place) supports the totalising fiction of colonialist discovery and settlement?

interviewee: yes. any theorizing has to go beyond homage to those displaced. spare me reading about heartfelt calls to include me – without actually including me. harvey (1993) observes that there occurs within a pattern of uneven geographical development socialist or working-class movements in the face of universalizing capitalism which are shared by other oppositional groups - racial minorities, colonized peoples, women, etc. - who are relatively empowered to organize in place, but disempowered when it comes to organizing over space (p. 303).

harvey does not identify who is colonized. i take exception to the term as indicative of some homogenous event or group of people for there are those who resist, since time immemorial, being positioned as colonized. harvey (1993) displays no knowledge of the land theft then and now. harvey might consider adding some 'meat to this statement. for example, hauptman (in lyons, mohawk, deloria, jr., hauptman, berman, grinde, jr., berkey & venables, 1992) provides this background his/herstory to any attempt to organise in place.

the age of termination, which waned in the late 1950s and finally came to an end in 1970, had another more disastrous effect on Indian communities. the doctrine of plenary power was used to condemn substantial Indian lands. in the postwar era, the congress, with the judicial acquiescence, allowed the army corps of engineers and/or the interior department's bureau of reclamation to condemn sizable parts of fort mohave, chemehuevi valley, the colorado river, and the yuma and gila band reservations in arizona in order to harness the power and manage the water of the colorado river basin . . . in each case, the federal government
uprooted Indian peoples and relocated them from their homelands, disturbing sacred sites, seriously affecting the ecology of each region, and showing too little concern for treaty and human rights (hauptman, 1992, p. 332).

encounters with this kind of text, which purports to be welcoming to pluralist rupturing, that unnerves me up here. the truth is still like looking at a vacant lot for me.

[pause on tape, punctuated with sounds of fuming.]

perhaps, we see you as displaced? alienated?

**interviewer:** displaced? ah?!

**interviewee:** not in the homelands of ancestors since birth. look what happens with cross-atlantic travel with the pilgrimages to the old country. with the aeroplane's invention, annual trips are possible for people to connect with family, roots, et cetera. i don't have to make cross-atlantic trips to (re)connect. some of The People may resist capitalism's overarching reach; however, authentic coalition building requires legitimation of The Peoples' struggle for human, resource, land and other rights. not to do so renders postmodernism a neo-colonialist form of deja vu.

**RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE**

**but the primitive is acknowledged**

**interviewer:** but, at least, the postmodernists recognize those marginalised, even embrace the need to embrace the primitive, know their folk wisdom.

[**interviewer possesses the tactfulness to look a smidge uncomfortable using those words-- marginalised and primitive -- now.**]

**interviewee:** yes, but look at the language. the struggle of The People is not neo-primitive. baudrillard (1991, in best & kellner) desires a radical rupture to a form of
neo-primitivism, a break "between symbolic societies and capitalism which would constitute a return to symbolic societies as a revolutionary alternative" located within "oppositional ideals in the revolt of marginal groups like blacks, women and gays, who supposedly subvert the code of political economy" (p. 116). Multi-voiced 'politics' are proposed "whereby groups affirm their own values and needs over and against those of the dominant society" (p. 193). These proposals are very perturbing. What do they think PFNA have been doing for 500 years?

Interviewer: So, any opportunity for shared contemplation, dialogue and reconciliation continues to be (re)coded in exotic "other-ness" as the marginal are equated, without their permission, as neoprimitive, symbolic societies, without genuine appreciation of what you think-feel-believe they are doing anyway as an engagement in (resist)(surviv)ance?

Interviewee: Yes. Capitalism is too fraught with symbolism and metaphoric power, and it's not as if there aren't any PFNA involved in capitalist projects right now. Resistance to efforts of The People to (re)assert indigenous autonomy in areas of child care, education, health, government, resource management, economic development, & etc. indicates that power is still considered the vested privilege of a 'dominant' society. Resistance is intelligent, not the romanticized acts of neoprimitives.

Re theorising

Interviewer: The acknowledgement is clumsy? But the acknowledgment is there. Best and Kellner (1991) propose that the (re)construction of critical social theory could level subjectivities through the articulation of multiple positions as these can provide new insights, from labour, from feminists or "race, ethnicity, and various marginal standpoints" (p. 266). There is possibility to (re)construct new theory here: "new capitalist economy, new democratic revolutions and forms of class struggle, new sciences and technologies, new ideas and
ideologies, new forms of art, and new forms of experience of space, time and everyday life" (pp. 266-267).

**interviewee:** yes, but look-listen harder: the pioneering continues. the adjective new is so important. and, the pioneering continues still without The People. does it occur to best and kellner (1991), for example, that their people might have to adopt old ideas they weren't savvy enough to invent to create an old communitarian economy reverentially connected with all life forms, an old democracy of the Haudenosunee of the Iroquois confederacy, of old ideological epistemology grounded in this land and gifts of the creator? their (post)modernity appears to conspire that we leave unremembered the original sites of the forts -- and the bodies and lessons buried beneath -- and to not leave uncontested and unfinished the emotional, physical, intellectual and spiritual story begun at contact?

**interviewer:** so it's more euroheritageization again, unless - wow - postmodernism reifies again a singular view if other 'local' epistemological or affective or historical or philosophical constructs, narratives and insights are not seriously included in analysis, or if such are continually (re)encoded as marginalised or neoprimitive. as well, to understand agency as only anthropocentrically endowed is a form of euroheritageization. all beings have agent autonomy which must be respected. therefore, micro-politics needs to extend the circle of analysis towards inclusive interspecies (re)presentation. not to do so sanctions a sensibility that the planet is here for our taking and that advocates for endangered plants, trees, birds or animals are outside the realm of the more 'serious' political work of social justice.

respectful interspecies mutuality is more than (wo)man to (wo)man relations, no matter how finely nuanced or non-synchronously identified. as caretakers and protectors of a planet, we are forgetting our quotidian interdependence with all beings: plants, animals, rocks, and so on. to continue to discuss social change without a more inclusive ethically ecological 'politic' will (re)produce relations of imbalance.
interviewee: [nods.]

maybe.

[interviewer looks disappointed that her summary analysis is not more heartily positively reinforced.]

as well, the postmodernist challenge to (re)assert the legitimacy of local knowledge, identity, action, et cetera will retain a psychological paralysis as long as first nations issues remain denied and buried. we are guests in this territory and still more -- we are guests of this Mother and Our Creator.

interviewee: yes, localism must extend heart-mind to the autochthonous People to understand where historical threads of imbalance may have begun. for example, acts of discovery recast as acts of invasions will illustrate how the forts are built on and into the sacred Land gift of our Mother. exclusion of collaborative exploration only extends the sense of (dis)(un)ease within the disquietude of these (post)modern times. finally, stress on localism omits a Medicine Wheel understanding that intra-community and intercommunity (highly pluralist and highly mobile populations connected through nearly instantaneous communication) are too contingently connected throughout time immemorial and by place/land/Mother to merely suggest we can shift to "other" sites in isolation. we all live downwind or downstream of another site of local action. thus, interactions must be considered as both simultaneously local and global in effect and consequence for no one is powerful enough to disconnect one's self from this multidimensional equation of interrelationality - no matter how playful, carnivalesque or ironic one is becoming.
interviewer: so there's knowledge in these sites from time immemorial which you feel is continuing to be excluded?

interviewee: yes, i believe so. the referencing is always back to euroexistence. this feels intellectually dishonest to me or indolent or enigmatic i mean. we have access to the same libraries. maybe, they don't catch these things because all the "Indian" books are at E.92-E.98 and their books about political science, philosophy, etc. are in their own sections. fragmentation: ours and theirs. more pronouns. the physical separation is very obvious to me. there is an attack on enlightenment ideology as fallible, but they scarcely look at the ourstoryness of this euroenlightenment.

interviewer: you're suggesting First Nations people were there? antecedent to pomo, but pomo gets the glamour of publication?

interviewee: yes. depends on who you believe, who you read, i guess. however, there are simple examples of trade given in the book, indian givers (weatherford, 1988). there's avocados, gold, potatoes, snowshoes and democracy. look at the enlightenment again. this reexamination for me leaves me breathlessly wondering how pomo architects continue to construct textual reality from within their own fortress. i am going to venture back into the 1700s, The Enlightenment, to illustrate the intellectual marginalisation, dishonesty or lack of homework. for me, this illustrates there already is evidence for ourstory - they, the euros just keep forgetting to mention our 'old' ideas and 'revolutionary' forms of thought, democracy, ideological understandings. eurohis/herstorical study often emphasizes a period of time which is labeled as THE ENLIGHTENMENT. i imagine euroschool children illustrate this in their notebooks with a big, smile-ridden sun shining down on the largely illiterate, unschooled proletariat.
interviewer: the enlightenment is often described as beginning with 1688 when the english overthrew their monarch-style of government, trashing their belief in hereditary kings, with powers given to this king by - ?

interviewee: by their, the Creator. yes, the mists of avalon have already closed. other key events in this period include the formation of the u.s. of a. in 1776 and the french revolution of 1789. in france, during the enlightenment and before the french peoples' revolution, a number of thinkers called, broadly, philosophers are very intensely discussing a more ideal form of life for all members of the community of france. france is almost financially bankrupt (due to warfare). the people live in poverty (with rents in some cases increasing by 900% in a year), with taxes outstripping needs, and with a form of governmental rule which involved a hierarchical style of government by a King, Louis XVI. france is feudal and Catholic. they have a surplus of thinkers.

interviewer: yes, i read somewhere that there are about 200 thinkers in France involved in the development of the period of the ENLIGHTENMENT. in 1739, don't these philosophers produce one of the first encyclopedias?

interviewee: yes, and in the encyclopedia they describe the individual's human nature as essentially ethical, er, honourable -- perhaps, principled. they also state that human nature was developed by nature - the great outdoors - and history; a very radically uncatholic belief. they state humans were "feeling, deliberating, thinking being(s) who walked freely the surface of the world, ...the first... among all other animals, who live in society has invented the sciences and arts, has a goodness and malevolence (badness) quite his own, has given himself masters, has made laws for himself." i forget who stated this.

interviewee: rousseau?

interviewee: maybe. anyway, these thinkers have a great deal of feeling-compassion for the situated injustice of the ordinary french individual, who is not yet known as a citizen. they
shudder at the horror of their city where individuals were incredibly poor, and there are accounts of individuals having no food and being reduced to eating roots and grass. i am always amused at their citing of this diet. we were living on roots and grass quite well, but, i guess with a side dish of buffalo. these people live in cities. these thinkers did not believe humans could change human nature (a sense that there will always be good and bad), but they did believe that if institutions could be changed, then the quality of life could be changed. they proposed that a more democratic form of self-rule was necessary and that, in france, education for everyone could be the best way to bring about social change.

**interviewee:** education is often identified in a number of fields -- environmental awareness, governmental change, health, etc. -- as a positive means to bring change to our communities to propose a more socially just form of living together as humans.

**interviewer:** yes. that mechanism seems to be such a focus for acculturation, enculturation, social change or not, re-education. by 1739, contact had been made with indigenous peoples of north and south america. one of the most consistent themes discussed by eurowriters is their interest in and amazement at the freedom, personal liberty and autonomy that First Nations people had, "in particular freedom from rulers and social classes based on ownership of property" (weatherford, 1988, p. 122).

**interviewer:** contact? how?

**interviewee:** well, they are kidnapping PFNA and taking them to europe as hostage showpieces. and they are inscribing their adventures. for example, as early as 1516, a british theologian and philosopher writes *utopia*, which more bases on the letters of spanish explorer amerigo vespucci. more describes an ideal world where all individuals would be equal and money would not be the qualifier for power, having a voice or the ultimate determiner of who one would be in human society. thus, observations made about forms of life observed in pfna countries influence their ideological foundations.
such influences, not difficult to track through the text, puzzle me. the absence in, for example, postmodernist thinking, Eurocanus thinkers seem oblivious to influences extant actively shaping the thinking-praxis of the genealogy of their thinking with effect on individuals like more's book or the French revolution. Incidentally, more's book is translated into many eurolanguages and shared with illiterate, oppressed, economically marginalised peoples throughout Europe.

**interviewer**: I see what you mean. Referring to people with those terms. The books are, I imagine, widely distributed, with the invention of metal printing plates in 1451, the same year Christopher Columbus is born.

**interviewee**: Yes, Gutenberg had printed an experimental mass book in 1450 using wooden plates. Another example of how contact influences philosophical and political thinking in Europe is that of Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592). In 1588, this French thinker writes the essays, followed with *On the Cannibals*. This is his foil-device to criticize Eurocivilization as being unable to improve human nature or morals. His study of indigenous peoples is an early example of nature portraiture as he categorizes pfna as 'wild', just as the flowers and berries were coded. Montaigne saw PFNA as not better or worse than Europeans, but just different. He contrasts the idyllic life he views abroad with 16th C. Europe and finds Europe wanting.

**interviewer**: I don't recall anything like this in history courses that I have taken.

**interviewee**: Well, have a look at Veneables chapter in Lyons, Mohawk, Deloria, Jr., Hauptman, Berman, Grinde, Jr., Berkey & Veneables (1992, pp. 86-88). Actually, that's a text I recommend reading to supplement social studies history courses. One might not be convinced — in fact, doesn't have to be convinced — but, the (de)colonialised curricula could start including other perspectives than the standard account of the history of North America.

**interviewer**: So you don't think the pfna are 'wild'?
**interviewee:** no, maybe undomesticated. just kidding. the language, the language, the language. the codes, the codes, the codes. how codes stick. anyway, another example i locate is from 1580 when the jesuits — that’s edmund campion and robert parsons — started a mission. these jesuits are often coded as missionaries, but they are also tremendously curious great idea gatherers. in 1548, they gather ideas and converts on their mission to japan; in 1556, to prague; in 1582, to china; in 1585, to austria. they are rather like early mike schlesshingers or cnn reporters and recorders. and boy, do they like to inscribe-record-document. lots of global contact - in ideas trade and not just consumables or religion – is happening through the observations, interviews and writings of the early jesuitanthropologizing. jesuits are also information gatekeepers and are responsible for the formation of some early media images - some negative, of PFNA - particularly, the presumed paganism.

**interviewer:** i vaguely recall de montaigne. he explains that PFNA people are able to live without trade, letters, mathematics, courts of justice, political rank, servitude, riches or poverty, contracts, legacies, agriculture, metallurgy, wine or grain. he observes that they seem to possess no words for lying, treason, avarice, envy, belittlement, pardon or misunderstanding. he comments on how healthy they appear, rising with the sun and seeming to take a genuine enjoyment in life (hauptman, op. cit., pp. 88-90).

**interviewee:** yes, hauptman does valorize the idyllic lifestyle. he’s revisionist in that he rebuts remarks made about the savagery or barbarous nature of these indigneous peoples. he believes that these people are no worse than that of europeans. in terms of cruelty, he cities an example of the portugese who would bury their captives waist-deep and then shoot at them with arrows. although some of montaigne’s descriptions are inaccurate — for example, no agriculture and no ability yet to see a form of natural gardening and harvesting. i think he also has a flare for the over-romanticisation of pfna. gee, we’re not easy to please are we? miserable if we’re coded as savages and then miserable if we’re too perfect.
however, he is another who introduces the sense of autonomous freedom which can be actively enjoyed by members of a community (Hauptman, op. cit., pp. 88-90).

**interviewer:** so these absences puzzle you?

**interviewee:** yes, puzzle and engage. puzzle and see openings for interventionalist text. examples just seep through the pages of text i read while here. i mean here are postmodernists professing rejection of grand narrativization, their disenchantment evident, but they neglect to excavate thoroughly what they desire to reject. the fact that they perceive a need to reject themselves and their own teachings puzzles me. there is one other important example. in 1683-1694, Louis Arman de Lom' d'Arce, Baron de Lahontan stayed with the Wendat, who inhabited the area known as Quebec City today (see, Sioui, 1992, chpt. 5, pp. 61-81).

In Lahontan's book, *Curious Dialogue with the Savages* (1694), he translates the philosophical, ideological understandings of Adario, a Wendat. He quotes Wendat as saying that we are born free and united brothers, each as much of a great lord as the other, while you are all the slaves of one sole man. I am the master of my body. I dispose of myself. I do what I wish. I and the first and last of my Nation ...


Lahontan introduces to Europe a sense of the Wendat understandings of freedom, autonomy, and the use of Liberty tempered with the understanding and belief that the Great Spirit is the ultimate authority (see Sioui, 1992, chpt. 5, pp. 61-81).

**interviewer:** who is Lahontan? i don't believe i have read him.

**interviewee:** not surprised. in my earlier eureouniversity-led studies of the French revolution, no one mentions him. remember how i mentioned charleston's (1994) exclusion. if not for publication of his treaty proposal of 1992, in years to come, others might well be looking for something or someone else and (re)locate [recherche, eh?] his peacemaking thoughts. sioui states that lahontan's work has been criticized, denounced as fabrication, forgotten or used by
scholars to try to see the influence contact had on Europe, especially in the area of philosophical and political developments. Sioui, who is doing some serious archaeological excavation of text, resurrects Lahontan and brings us Adario. Sioui (1992) comments of all the literary works that reached Europe over the three centuries of European 'conquests' of America, that of Lahontan unquestionably enjoyed the greatest success. According to Réal Quellet, a Lahontan specialist at Université Laval, twelve years saw the production of 'eight new editions of forgeries, translations into English, Flemish and German, as well as several reviews and discussion—often controversial and very different perspectives'. Yet, he notes, his work is 'barely mentioned in intellectual or literary histories' a punishment his French compatriots inflicted on Lahontan for his sin of sincerity. He was seen as a traitor to his country and his church (p. 63).

In fact, those Jesuits code him as a bad and dangerous writer (Sioui, 1992, p. 64). 

**Interviewer:** Oh! Oh! More euroH in action.

**Interviewee:** Yes, more invisibilization. What a simple-minded argument to dismiss connection. What a world. Text and people disappearing all the time. There is strong argument that Lahontan doesn't exist. Equally, I could claim Rousseau did not live; that these are all fabricated fictions from, perhaps, an extremely clever woman.

**Interviewer:** So, these writing of Montaigne and Lahontan illustrate self-rule involving a very well understood and displayed form of self-rule evident to some observers of lifeways in North and South America. These books provide a form of education about PFNA which counters the overwhelming depiction of PFNA as merely primitive or savage. Writers are using their new discoveries about the spiritually motivated ideology, which they code as political, as a way to expose the hypocrisy of their eurosocieties which are economically inequitable, inflicting great
suffering and forms of government which were not democratic but run, according to them, by corrupt hierarchies of monarchs?

**interviewee:** yet, at the same time that lahontan is writing, the jesuits are also describing their encounters with the iroquois as nonmaterialistic and in possession of human dignity and rights which are distinct from the powers of state forms of governments. their books, the relations, are widely circulated and read in europe -- rather, i suspect like textbooks about 'foreign' lands -- and some individuals are very interested in these foreign lifeways which seemed to possess a more egalitarian form of natural living. lyons (in lyons, mohawk, deloria, jr., hauptman, berman, grinde, jr., berkey & veneables, 1992, pp. 13-42) states that the colonization of the americas and the engagement with her peoples also opened an intellectual floodgate that stimulated dramatic changes in the way europeans viewed the world. the old world ontology was effectively swept away by these events. new ideas about human potential poured into europe and anglo-america from the previously unheard of peoples and places. europeans and euro-american historians usually describe american history as a story of europeans and anglo-americans evolving in a democratic tradition from inspirations that had exclusively european roots. missing from their accounts [historical, modern, postmodern] is the story of how egalitarian american Indian societies stimulated the thought of european philosophers of the enlightenment (p. 31).

**interviewer:** more euroforgetfulness?

**interviewee:** or, whitewashing. for example, sometimes i read the (mis)teaching that the mohawk are descendants of ancient greek or trojan societies. such speculations, arising from a need to see fn like europeans, often leads to false teachings in schools about the origins of fn peoples. but as comments from fn show,
all the history books have been written by the white man, and it is slanted to justify his behaviour in our lands. the sin of omission is rampant throughout the history books (1971, onadaga council of chiefs of the iroquois confederacy in akesasne notes, 3(2), p. 36).

pomolit may eschew grand narratives, but they don’t specifically illustrate the absenses.

interviewer: thus, for you, ah, you feel-believe coding is also one of those devices to consider in terms of consequence-production?

interviewee: yes, i think-believe mitchell (in richardson, 1990), quoted earlier regarding the canadian attempt to code mohawks and other PFNA as canadian, would agree with you.

there is one final example i wish to share to illustrate what i call the euroH syndrome.

RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE-RATTLE

my rousseau

interviewee: i have been interested in rousseau’s ideas since i was an undergrad doing his emile. his ideas seemed very iroquois-like in the conception of freedom. of course, the university courses certainly don’t seem to examine rousseau’s influences. he just exists out there in space, well, ah, in france – somewhere spontaneously generating these ideas related to the social contact and the need to be unchained. if a pfna influence was located, then the iroquois were compared "to the romans, the greeks, and the celts in the areas of natural rights, statecraft, oratory, and public consensus" (grinde in lys, mohawk, deloria, jr., hauptman, berman, grinde, jr., berkey & veneables, 1992, p. 231).

when i located this text, something fell into place for me. by 1721, a young playwright named delisle de la drevetiére adapted lahontan’s version of wendat philosophy and ideas about freedom, liberty, self-rule and autonomy, among others, for a play he wrote called arlequin
sauvage. In this play, a real romance adventure, a young Parisian woman, named Violette, falls in love with a male and runs away with him to live in the liberty of America where there are no laws (true anarchy = self-rule), and lives unhampered with money and therefore no class system. This play became a form of educational exchange about ideas of organizing political life. The play inspired other playwrights.

Interviewer: What are you basing this on?

Interviewee: Ah, see, Weatherford (1988), pages 123-124. Anyway, when I read about the young man watching this play, I saw the way he was influenced by the ideas Drevetiere presented via Lahontan on behalf of Adario, a Wendat thinker, philosopher, idea-maker, who could explain his cultural way of knowing, viewing the world and relationships therein. This young man watching the play is known as Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Rousseau is valorized as an important member of the philosophers’ group of the French Enlightenment I mentioned earlier. Rousseau believes that humans are naturally rational, ethical, free and innocent. This is antithetical to Catholicism. According to Rousseau, society corrupts and religion is hypocritical. He feels that morality – ethically responsible ways to live collectively – are not the product of reasoned thinking, but of a natural (innate, inside, intrinsic) feeling or beingness.

Interviewer: Cross-atlantic-ideological-fertilization? You’re suggesting Adario predates Rousseau? Gee, usually, classes seem to start with Rousseau as an independent promigenitor. But, in 1754, he writes The Discourse on the Origins of Inequality, outlining his lifelong concern with the contrast of the freedom of life that indigenous people possessed to the mental, physical, emotional, spiritual slavery of eurilifeways, particularly France. Rousseau doesn’t cite Adario in his bibliography. Rousseau is usually presented as one of the first to question the legitimacy of the king and aristocratic forms of government where power and money generate inequity. He considers inequity as corrosive, detrimental, in that people lose their ability
to think when a slave-master relationship (inequality of any sort) is set up. individuals start to think, act and feel as the master desires and lose their dignity.

**interviewee:** yes. as well, rousseau advocates a form of egalitarian self-government of enlightened citizens whom he believes have the ability, the right and the power to rule themselves in a locally democratic fashion. again, rousseau creates misconceptions. for example, he did not give pfna credit, although corn was grown throughout iroquois territory and in the southwest. he also faults pfna for remaining savages because of their seemingly lack of 'agriculture'.

ah, hhmmm...coding, categorizing, and judging. analysis reified with code labels. makes anyone aspire to be extremely careful with the coding business? pfna are living with such an inheritance of research and resultant codes. thus, some of these mistaken perceptions and beliefs lead to judgements that pfna are badly in need of agricultural training. remember my mention of the file hills colony earlier?

**interviewer:** ah-huh.

**interviewee:** yah. again, the influence of contact can be seen in terms of influence on the development of ideological thoughts and desires. some of rousseau's ideas and the ideas of other enlightenment philosophers are enshrined (honoured and written down) in the french declaration of the rights of man in 1789. in this declaration, there is the understanding that individuals have certain "natural, inalienable [cannot be denied, taken away] and sacred rights which include the understanding that everyone is "born and remains free and equal in rights," and that political association is to preserve "liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression"(see tierney, kagan & williams, 1976, p. 169).

in 1762, two of rousseau's important books are published: the social contract and emile; two books fondly recommended to teachers in training. these two texts influence the eurofrenchepistemology of a democratic egalitarianism. but, i don't believe teachers in training
are often told that rousseau’s progressive visions of the child resurrected are a product of Turtle Island caretakers.

**interviewer:** so here you see some beginnings for the ourstory you refer to as eurosettler communities throughout the enlightenment are influenced by PFNA in a kind of mutual education about governmental structures and philosophical thoughts about the nature of human nature, freedom, liberty and self-rule. the colonies formed a confederacy in 1776, with English colonization starting in 1607 and lasting until 1682 for a variety of reasons. however, the eurosettlers did not adopt all FN ideas encountered, for example, gender equality. neither in canada nor the u.s. are women given a voice in council or a vote (see, for example, mohawk & lyons in lyons, mohawk, deloria, jr., hauptman, berman, grinde, jr., berkey & veneables, 1992, p. 9).

**interviewee:** yes, european observers see-comprehend that power and decision-making came from power seen, honoured, respected and understood from the people themselves. but, they somehow miss understand-accepting the deeply spiritual nature of politics; the need for reverencing relationships – all relationships and not just those among the two-leggeds, about life, security and the right to enjoy property. in the book, basic call to consciousness, i am wrote-told that the Haudenosaunee believe that the Creator/Great Spirit/Giver of Life/BIGHOLYMANIFESTING "did not intend that human beings abuse one another – he proposed that human societies must form governments which will serve to prevent the abuse of human beings by other human beings, and which will ensure peace among nations and peoples" (Akwesasne Notes, 1986, p. 7). the highest form of political consciousness is not just about honourable, responsible, rational representative government. the highest form of political consciousness, economic consciousness, architectural consciousness, educational consciousness, or any other discipline of consciousness is spiritual (Akwesasne Notes, 1986, p. 49). there’s a
summary about this consciousness in "the Haudenosaunee address to the western world, geneva, switzerland, autumn, 1977" (Akwesasne Notes, 1986, pp. 45-53).

for the iroquois, self-government -- consensual, mutual, involving discussion of all people -- would need to be based on the thoughts, feelings, actions, spiritus of all people who were striving to be righteous, to be peaceful, to be reasonable, to be individually and collectively honourable and to be compassionate and caring in order to produce inherently honourable self-government. but, my world is not about governance. the hardest governance i will ever have to maintain is governing myself. i am hearing about rousseau, dewey, democracy, progressive education, etc. here, but i am not hearing anything iroquois; no knowledge of, no acknowledgement. this is a euroized purview. i can't look through this looking glass. when i do, i get awfully dizzy.

[long pause on tape. interviewee wonders where interviewers go after a day of listening to someone else.]

interviewer: thus you feel university is this assimilative process again? more acculturative euroheritageization because even though you're discussing rousseau and dewey and others, there is no acknowledgement or knowledge of inter-nation-al contact's influences on eurofrenchu.s. government development and understandings. this is silenced, obscured or just forgotten.

interviewee: yes, i feel i am watching a culturally reproductive ideological apparatus in action, and the frameworks are so sturdy that respectful inclusion of other voices just seem impossible some days. i feel like i am back in elementary school again. there are days i panic and i think-fear i am losing myself, losing myself. the first nations house of learning becomes more and more a refuge. here i don't feel i am going crazy. i am safe in my beliefs inside this longhouse. as well, the secular nature of the journey is very alienating for me. i could not have made this journey without the spiritual energy of that house.
i can see-feel you’re tired. why don’t we close here today? that was a long, rambling --
that is, discursive -- example to illustrate euroheritageization and mental (re)(self)colonization and
my intellectual digging to know myself and not be euroized some more. i have free will. i can
stop this for myself.
[The interviewer arrives for the fourth day of the interview with a rather thick briefcase. The researcher begins to organise the usual paraphernalia -- papers, field notebooks, cassettes, recorder, pens, pencils, pencil sharpener, post-its, index cards, tape, glue sticks, et cetera.

The interviewee watches and waits quietly. Today she's wearing a jumper (?) skirt (?) with some sort of First Nations print, male Indians with headdresses, tipis, horses, swirl about in a colourful pattern. She's also wearing an old sweater, with turtles running up and down the front. Looks homemade. She calls this, affectionately, "her lucky sweater."

**Interviewee:** Let's go for a walk. Do you feel like a walk? Let's de(text)(compress).

**Interviewer:** Ah, it will be rather difficult to lug all this stuff about. [Coaxing] We're so close to finishing.

**Interviewee:** I feel finished.

**Interviewer:** Oh? Oh? Oh? You do? I mean, we have to finish the eastern door -- it's beckoning. That's the spiritual realm, often symbolised with the Eagle and the colour red.

**Interviewee:** I thought there'd be more too. But, when I reread my transcripts of yesterday, I realised that we left off at the "Haudenosaunee Address To The Western World, in Geneva, Switzerland, Autumn 1977" (Akewesasne Notes, 1986, pp. 45-53). I would feel redundant adding anything to those strong teachings.

**Interviewer:** So, you are suggesting that there are these elements which could be coded as 'spirituality' woven throughout the interviews?
Ah, much of what we’ve discussed has been more about the politicisation of research, of education, of post-secondary awareness, of ‘Otherisation’?

**Interviewee:** No. [Interviewee’s emphasis] I am not seeking a political consciousness, nor to politicise. In fact, I used to meanly tease my husband that "politics is pigshit." However, I know now that was disrespectful to speak that way about his interest in communities of people organising. I was young then. I didn’t really understand what respect (Self, Family, Nation, Plants, Planets, Stars, Rivers, and all else) meant. And, even now respect feels like too small a word. I like the sensibility within the word reverence, a sense of awe-gratitude for the sacredness-wonder-beauty-mystery-spirit-power of every interconnected molecule in the cosmos. I am only learning to understand, let alone practice, the behaviour suggested inside a phrase I heard, read or was told. I was told that, "When you get older, you’re going to want to start making everything a prayer." For me, this suggests that every word, thought, action, moment must be like a prayer. The enormity of this ideal – to make everything like a prayer, like an act of reverence – is something I am only coming to find my way in(to)(side) of, contemplate.

I would repeat myself if I tried to create some articulate statement about spirituality. I could construct some sort of theoretisation of a postcolonial form of post-secular research; but, ah, throughout the transcripts my sense of alienation with a secular (without Creator) post-secondary environment is evident. I really don’t know what I could add. That I have made the 40 days of Lent twice in my life? That I liked starting the day by going to Mass? I just know that I’m back at one of my initial reservations and questions: How does one research the sacred? Where do I go for that permission? How do I bring "compassionate-mind" (Sunchild in Lightning, 1992) into research paradigms? When I am ‘doing’ research, interviewing someone or counting something, I am in relationship, and that relationship is sacred, spiritually imbued. Everything I choose to do will affect the sacred web of relationships. If careless or thoughtless
about the spiritual-sacred nature of all molecules of the universe, I could cause harm. What an enormous responsibility to be a two-legged researcher. For now, maybe, it’s better I just think-feel-speak-write for myself.

**Interviewer:** Well, perhaps, we could begin with a definition of ‘spirituality’? Would you like to comment on section 8 of the First Principles (Bopp, Bopp, Brown & Lane, 1988)? They state,

> We develop the spiritual aspect of our nature in four related ways:

*First, we have the capacity to respond to non-physical realities like dreams, visions, ideals, spiritual teachings, goals and thoughts.*

*Second, we have the capacity to understand that these non-physical realities can teach us about our own potential to do or be something more, or different, than we are now.*

*Third, we have it within us to express these dreams, visions, ideals, spiritual teachings, and our own goals and thoughts by using symbols like language, mathematics and the arts.*

*Fourth, we have the capacity to use these symbols to guide our future actions. These actions will make it possible for us to ‘enter into’ the vision, or goal we have set before ourselves in the form of symbols, and thus to develop our true potential (p. 32).*

**Interviewee:** I’ve been taught that we construct, come-to-know (in all Four Realms) the sense of the spiritual for ourselves, but this sensibility must be integrated within everything we are-do. Spirituality is not a fixed understanding, not a collection of sequential symbols I can give you like a recipe of action. For me, this is about being and not about doing. I am only beginning to realise what a gift my life is. What else to do with this life, then to make use of
these gifts that I have been given as gifts? What a wonder to be born, eh? What gratitude and reverence I owe to those before me for doing whatever it took to survive so I can be here today.

**Interviewer:** Ah, I don’t know if it is O.K. to ask you this, but are you a traditional?

[Interviewee smiles.]

**Interviewee:** That question is such a perplexity to me. Sometimes when I am teaching and this question arises, I have some wool on hand. I ask a student to take the wool and stretch the wool in a line - linear, circular, don’t matter - and I invite the students to cut the wool wh(en)(ere) they believe traditional ends and contemporary begins. No one has done it yet.

**Interviewer:** Ah, right. Next question. Have you ever been to a sun dance?

**Interviewee:** No.

**Interviewer:** Inside a sweatlodge?

**Interviewee:** Yes.

**[Very long pause on tape.]**

**Interviewer:** So, Lather’s (1991) description of postpositivist empirical practice (see chpt. 4, pp. 70-85), or a postcolonial form of speaking, these won’t do it for you?

**Interviewee:** How about precolonial, (pre)(post)secular nonempirical contingency? Or, postcolonial dialogical mutually reverential spiritus? Or, how about (re)spiritualised post-technointersubjectivity?

[Interviewee turns her gaze from the window to the Interviewee and witnesses her making quick, hasty notes.]

We’re only using a collection of nouns and adjectives here. For me, the sense of reverential responsibility to go out there, to collect and to ‘take’ is just not done. These things we have talked about are about taking, taking without permission, without care, creating an imbalance. Maybe, now it’s time to give in a mutually reciprocal way, respectfully conscious that we are trading teachings and learning.
I have to be-do with the recognition of the sacredness of this shared journey -- ourstory -- rebuilding a story in language-feeling-action-spiritus which reverences life. I only hope I can live my life well, a life lived like a well-lived story, full of the lessons I needed to absorb-learn while here. I am grateful if I get these lessons. I am grateful that people will care enough to tell me what I need to learn. And, a ‘good’ story doesn’t mean like a Disney story or a perfectfully moral life. I’ve made many mistakes in my life. As a young girl, I was stupid many times over. I can still be stupid, blind to my own ignorance, ego, pride. I hurt myself. I hurt people. I hurt the planet. I had no right to hurt anyone; there was no need. I refer to a meaningful story, one I can make sense of when I am dying and say, "Oh, that’s what I needed to learn here this time. Thank-you." A story where I don’t leave feeling ashamed of what I may have consciously done to hurt or harm any other life form. I am saddened. There is so much hurtfulness in the web of relationships. I regret how and when I contribute. That’s the hard part of staying awake; not a political consciousness, but a spiritually reverent consciousness -- to be kind, to be caring, to be compassionate, to be honest. All those things my mom, dad, the Catholic Church, the Elders have said to me, I treasure them now. People cared enough to talk to me. Tell me about the sacred. Talk to me about how to live. Talk to me about how to be human. I don’t know much.

**Interviewer:** I don’t think there’s much literature in this field.

**Interviewer:** Me either. Let’s go outside of these pages for a walk.
This disparity between our [Euroanthropological] definitions of life story made me reassess my approach to our interviews. Mrs. Sydney seemed to be ignoring the questions I was raising, yet her patient efforts to direct me with stories added a bewildering variety of characters and events, some from historical memory and others from a timeless repository of myth. We agreed to begin each session by my reading back to her a transcript of our previous interview and together making corrections, additions, and deletions. There were always aspects of the interview I hadn’t understood, and my questions arising from the transcript would propel our interview in a new direction, usually culminating in Mrs. Sydney’s telling of a story to explain a particular point to me. By the time we had recorded enough stories to produce two booklets, I had a clearer sense of how her narratives did indeed reflect back on the original questions I had been asking [Her italics] (Cruikshank, 1990, p. 25).
WHAT THEN MUST I DO

WHAT THEN MUST I DO?

What then must I do?

Do. Do. Do.

DO DATA/DO DATA/DADA-DADA-DADA

WHAT THEN MUST I DO?

WHAT? WHAT? WHAT?

What then must I do?
I Did Not Come Here To, But I Did

I did not come here to be a researcher. I did not come here to be the "Indian."

I came here to answer a few questions for myself. I did not come here to produce theory. I did not come here to be a revelatory case study of one.

I can't (re)(en)code these revelations to produce theory. I know theories do not produce constant forevers. The horizons shift and snap from the press of 'pioneering' efforts. For example, scientific 'explanations' detected through Baconian procedures collapse through what Cohen (1985) narrates as a series of "scientific revolutions" (see, for example, chpt. 2, pp. 26-39). When theories collapse, paradigms shift (Kuhn, 1974). What is a known set of shared beliefs, methods, standards and modes of explanation is sufficiently challenged (through anomalies) and then overturned. However, the theoretic infrastructure of materiality escapes clarification of the more ineffable qualities of two-leggeds; for examples, racism, genocide, passion, vanity, love & etc.. And, we appear not to have surpassed some of our uglier paradigms – like racism, like genocide, like classism, like ecocidism – not just yet.

These disrespectful paradigms of the heart seem to be particularly persistent. The more intangible spiritual-philosophic life forces-events is part of our ourstory too; not just facts and figures collected to formulate conclusions and predictions.

Storytelling

Stories (also called fable, myth, legend, ballad, fairy tales, anecdote, parable & etc.) also provide explanations in what is considered – and sometimes denigrated – as unscientific
approaches to enlarging epistemological-affective schema, often characterized as more objective and often associated with masculine (as opposed to feminine) ways of knowing. Masculinist epistemology, however, may be overstatement with such epistemological sensibility unnecessarily limited, supposedly grounded on 'tricky' reasons related to gender-based ways of knowing/not knowing - although we may unthinking-feelingly valorize gender as oppositionally legitimate (see Code, 1990; pp. 6-18). Stories also address the affective domain more than 'objective,' secularized theor(y)(ies). Code (1990) explores the seemingly afeling, privileged, masculinist paradigms of cognition and contrasts such with "our basic and crucial" need to know other people" as this knowledge "develops, operates, and is open to interpretation at different levels; it admits of degree in ways that knowing that book is red does not" (Ibid., p. 37).

Cognition in emotion - and much, much more. I agree with Code's attempt to collapse subjectivity and objectivity to explicate that cognition and emotion need not be in dialectical opposition. She states that in the construction of knowledge "[e]motion and intellect are mutually constitutive and sustaining, rather than oppositional forces in the construction of knowledge" (Ibid., p. 47).

We may weep or laugh through a story; but seldom admit to such practices when reviewing genetic algorithms. This story now told is emotion-laden. If told with emotion, will the story be any less true? If told with grace and good humour, is that O.K. too? If told kinda muddled, is that allowed?

This is a story; mine to tell. The story is a form of compressed, coded knowledge-experience-observation. Sometimes I am (il)logical and sometimes I am (an)emotional; sometimes I am seriously scholarly; and sometimes I am outrageous and humorous. I attempt here to speak-write reactions; not theorise about causations and correlations - for who knows where and when these events truly begin? I now perceive-understand-collapse theory as story; story as theory. A primary element of explanation is present. Yet, stories may or
may not resonate (illogically, psychologically-emotionally, kinesthetically, spiritually); whereas, theory seems to be constructed to be utilized, monitored and then accepted or rejected (proven or disproved). In their own ways, (theo)stories are testable. This time, I choose stories.
Stories can be like medicine. Some medicines make some people splutter and choke. Some medicines go down like milkshakes, cool but with coldness that can startle or numb. Read the directions. Use judiciously.

Stories have power.

Power to Heal.

Power to Harm.

Stories can be life enhancing.

Stories can be life degrading.

Story is conveyed through/within text.

Within/without text is Power.

Power can be used like Medicine. Power with reverential compassion is life-enhancing. Power without, is life-destroying. Read the directions. Use judiciously.

Stories are like Power-Medicine.

Stories (en)(un)folding.

Paradigmatic landscapes challenging & shifting. Stories engaging.

Stories enduring.

Like rattles, stories can soothe us or stories can startle us; stories can frighten us, or stories can heal us.

I cannot predict the rattle—rattle—rattle—rattle of this, my story.
EPILOGUE: POSSIBLE BOOK JACKET REVIEWS

Written with ‘grace and good humour’, this nonEuroCanadian female member of the Michel Band (Alberta) answers the question:

"If you are nearing the end of your doctoral candidacy and it's a little late to decently assemble another committee (unless heiress to substantial funds), and, then two of your committee members (humorously) threaten to quit your Ph.D. committee (not their careers entirely) if you do not (re)consider composing a self-reflexive written (& typed) exploration of your thoughts-feelings about the research process, would you then (re)consider this self-reflexive exercise as a legitimate endeavour to articulate some of your observations already shared in previous papers and conversations about the research process from your point-of-view rather than rewrite the his/herstory of First Nations schooling as such original research might precipitate the risk that they will 'make good' on their hypothesis-promise, which is only testable upon their leaving?" Her answer, "Yes." [Anon. Reviewer.]

& More

Like a snowstorm unexpectedly blanking a West Coast city, a lone wolf (re)examines the Euroresearch process and finds a straitjacket, which, she only just barely manages to wrestle off.

[Reviewer not wishing to be identified.]

&& More, More

With John Trudell, Lorraine Code, Sunbear, Black Elk Jr., Vine Deloria Jr., Plato, Hammersley & Atkinson, McMillan & Schumacher, Geertz, & others (invited or not) all jostling about on these
pages, this invisible woman from the margins forces us, with ‘grace and good humour’, to look
again at the initiation of the uninitiated into the ri(te)(ght)s of
recherche-ing.

Do-See-Do!

because you may never, ever ethnographize quite the same

ever again.

[Reviewer’s identity withheld by request.]
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