Decolonizing Education in Canadian Universities: An Interdisciplinary, International, Indigenous Research Project

Marie Battiste, Lynne Bell, and L. M. Findlay
University of Saskatchewan

Despite several decades of work on educational equity in curriculum and research and bridging and access projects, Aboriginal peoples' achievements, knowledge, histories, and perspectives remain too often ignored, rejected, suppressed, marginalized, or underutilized in universities across Canada and beyond. Although promising to make postsecondary education accessible to Aboriginal peoples, universities express an Aboriginal agenda in mission statements, priorities, and projects that reaffirm Eurocentric and colonial encounters in the name of excellence, integration, and modernity. Addressing these challenges is the purpose of a research project undertaken by a team of investigators at the University of Saskatchewan, building on the theoretical foundations of postcolonial Indigenous consciousness emerging from Canadian Aboriginal scholars and from Aotearoa (New Zealand) in the scholarly work of Graham and Linda Smith. This article offers a process of animating postsecondary education that can generate methods and practices for the more thorough decolonization of research and policy development and the experience of Aboriginal students and teachers.

Contexts of Colonialism

Displacing systemic discrimination against Indigenous peoples created and legitimized by the cognitive frameworks of imperialism and colonialism remains the single most crucial cultural challenge facing humanity. Meeting this responsibility is not just a problem for the colonized and the oppressed, but rather the defining challenge for all peoples. It is the path to a shared and sustainable future for all peoples. (Erica Irene Daes, United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Peoples at the UNESCO Conference on Education, July 1999)

The destiny of a people is intricately bound to the way its children are educated. Education is the transmission of cultural DNA from one generation to the next. It shapes the language and pathways of thinking, the contours of character and values, the social skills and creative potential of the individual. It determines the productive skills of a people. (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples [RCAP], 1996, vol. 3, p. 433)

Introduction

During the last three decades, Canadian universities have made some progress toward a postsecondary education system accessible to Aboriginal peoples. Registered Indian and Inuit student participation in higher education steadily increased from the 1970s until 1995, when enrollment peaked at 27,183 Indian and Inuit students enrolled in postsecondary institutions (approximately 7% of total enrollment) who had received funding from the Department of Indian and Northern Development (DIAND, 2002). Enhanced accessibility has not, however, been accompanied by a comparable change in the presumptions and content of university curricula and disciplinary knowledge. Instead, programmatic initiatives have remained at the level of improving access and retention of Aboriginal students through add-on program innovations, much like addenda to a preexisting treaty enforced to the advantage of the colonizer. In acknowledging these educational initiatives, the RCAP emphasized that these efforts have not achieved the needed breakthrough and that Aboriginal people must continue to "negotiate an ever-widening space to implement their vision, pushing against the confines of such restrictions" (vol. 3, p. 443). Moreover, the injustice of this situation is aggravated by postsecondary institutions that persist in offering a fixed menu of European heritage programs and courses toward which everyone is expected to gravitate "naturally" or be force-marched in the name of "real" knowledge and intellectual nourishment.

The broad and entrenched assumption of most postsecondary curricula is that Eurocentric knowledge represents the neutral and necessary story for "all" of us. This discourse of neutrality combines with the universities' serial obstruction or evasion of Aboriginal knowledge and its producers so as to shelter and sanitize a destructively colonial and Eurocentric legacy. Both Eurocentric discourse and anti-Aboriginal resistance attempt to impose cognitive assimilation on Aboriginal students while denying the reform required to achieve a respectful and productive liberation for Aboriginal peoples from the educational apparatuses of colonialism.

Although Canadian academics have regularly acknowledged the formidable challenge they face in self-education as they reframe their institutions to be inclusive, such acknowledgement, as in the University of Saskatchewan's recent *Responding to the Needs of Aboriginal Peoples: A Conceptual Framework* (2001), tends still to be primarily about the insiders and how much or how little they will have to adjust their practices and share their privileges in order to "respond" to (by once again determining) outsiders' "needs." Universities have largely held onto their Eurocentric canons of thought and culture and sapped the creative potential of faculty, students, and communities in ways both wasteful and damaging. As the prominent scholar Ivan Illich (CIDA, 2002) noted, "so persuasive is the power of institutions we have created, that they shape not only our preferences, but actually our sense of possibilities ... we have embodied our world view into our institutions and are now their prisoners" (p. 11). Aboriginal initiatives may have the term *Aboriginal* in many of their titles, but without animating consultation with and plenary participation of Indigenous peoples—indeed without honest acknowledgement of the history of colonial education's privileges and benefits—university programming will continue to be paternalistic, promoting a gendered, classed, and racialized politics of knowledge production and dissemination. This production of knowledge amounts to cognitive imperialism, a form of mind control, manipulation, and propaganda that serves elites in the nation. The RCAP (1996) called on Canadian academics to decolonize their traditional presumptions, curricula, research, and teaching practices in order to live up to their obligations, mission statements, and alleged priorities for Aboriginal peoples. The consequence of academic affirmation of colonialism—currently undertaken in the name of global competitiveness and excellence—has been to diminish the value and potential relevance of Indigenous knowledge in education, and hence to forestall economic prosperity and social justice in Canada by failing to provide effective and sustainable mechanisms for the alleviation of poverty. Cultural, economic, and political enfranchisement for Aboriginal peoples continues to be expressed in the future tense, or as a tense future for Canadian taxpayers.

The most significant problem facing Indigenous peoples in the Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples, 1995-2004 has been to restore Indigenous ecologies, consciousnesses, and languages after Eurocentric colonization and the destruction it authorized from its viral sources, and to understand how this history continues to imprison the thought and constrain the conduct of colonizer and colonized alike. Our initial dialogues and collaborations have led us to explore more thoroughly the tenets behind decolonizing theory and praxis in postcolonial thought and to animate sites of decolonization. Although there are many local and national examples of good work in this regard in Indigenous communities, the work of the Maori in their resistance, conscientization, and theory-making is particularly informative and inspiring and helps to animate the agenda of transformation in Aboriginal communities worldwide (Smith, 1997, 2000). Bringing both Graham and Linda Smith to the University of Saskatchewan, together and individually, provided us with invaluable opportunities to bring their experiences and lessons learned from transformative praxis to the attention of large and diverse audiences. Our interview with Linda Smith reprinted here was but one means of addressing our questions and revealing the underpinnings of her and Graham's work. Their theorizing and use of a model of animation is in keeping with the holistic and comprehensive processes of transformation that we see as necessary foundations of change in Aboriginal communities and in educational institutions that claim to serve them.

Under the aegis of animation thus understood, the task of decolonizing education requires multilateral processes of understanding and unpacking the central assumptions of domination, patriarchy, racism, and ethnocentrisms that continue to glue the academy's privileges in place; second, decolonizing requires the institutional and system-wide centering of the Indigenous renaissance and its empowering, intercultural diplomacy. But how can scholars develop, record, and most effectively utilize available skills, knowledge, and tools of willing change agents and share successful decolonizing practices across disciplines, institutions, and regions? In response to this set of challenges, we first hear from Graham Hingangaroa Smith and then from Linda Tuhiwai Te Rina Smith in an interview conducted in March 2002 while on a visit to our University organized by the Humanities Research Unit.

Decolonizing Education

The Animating Scene in Teepee #33

In a crowded teepee at the Sixth World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education (WIPCE) held in Stoney Park, Alberta, Graham Hingangaroa Smith has to stand to deliver his talk. He jokes about having nowhere to plug in his Power Point presentation. Now he starts to speak with Maori power. Rocking back and forth on the balls of his feet, he hunches a little so as not to knock his head against the teepee wall. Respectful of this place, he is also fearless in dealing with the obstacles in the way of respect, opportunity, and justice. The abstract that has brought us here states that his talk will focus on a number of new responses developed by Maori. His presentation is entitled "Transforming Education: Indigenous Reclaiming of Tertiary Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand." It deals with core elements that move beyond the distraction embedded in the "politics of engagement" to more "self-determining" pathways. A further theme is an institutional piece of the puzzle, the development of the Maori University (Waananga) as a model of transformation. Smith displays and extends some of the major strands of his work as an educator (giving his audience a sequence of reasons to read the body of his writings—his doctoral dissertation and invaluable essays). Everyone is energized. The teepee and the bodies it accommodates remain in place; our minds and spirits soar in anticipation of achieving similar change in our institutions and territories. We have shared a site of animation. We are resolved henceforth to get past the "politics of distraction." To this end, we will keep before us WIPCE's motto, "The answers are within us," and Graham's parting question, "What are you going to do about it?"

Travelling with Teepee #33, Nationally and Internationally

How to animate a postcolonial university is the question at the heart of a program of interdisciplinary research undertaken at the University of Saskatchewan with funding assistance from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). The work is a shared interdisciplinary project that foregrounds the value of diversity and creativity. We—a Mi'kmaq specialist in Indigenous education, a visual historian, and a literary scholar—are already at work where we think we can make the most headway: in education, visual culture, and the humanities. The project entails our exploration of decolonizing methodologies in our disciplines in a three-year undertaking of archival and applied research, discourse analysis, community dialogues, pedagogical innovation, and policy analysis and formation. We recognized early that efforts in this protracted process must be collaborative, interdisciplinary, and intercultural in method and diverse in their intended research outcomes: in curriculum design, teacher education, capacity building, cultural theory, and modes of dissemination. This article is, then, a preliminary report on our project, a discussion of the theoretical foundations of this decolonizing effort that proceeds from the rich theoretical work of Linda and Graham Smith and identifies several sites of struggle that our collaborations animate according to an interdisciplinary and participatory research methodology. Ultimately, this research will expand on RCAP (1996) and in particular will build on our current researching and testing of decolonizing practices the benefits of which we expect will be broadly felt across Canada and beyond.

Despite the massive recent outpouring of creative and scholarly work that deals with or claims to exemplify a version of the postcolonial (Spivak, 1999; Prakash, 1995; Noël, 1994; Ahmad, 1992; Williams & Chrisman, 1999; Rahmena & Bawtree, 1997; Willinsky, 1999), universities have not featured prominently as an object of anticolonial or actively decolonizing inquiry (compare, in the case of India, Symonds, 1986; Viswanathan, 1989; Majeed, 1992). Thus although the University of Saskatchewan where our research team is located has been recognized for its achievements in educating Aboriginal teachers and training Native lawyers, its experience has also revealed deeper assumptions and practices that despite an ostensibly impressive summary of "Aboriginal Initiatives at the U of S," reaffirm Eurocentric and colonial encounters in the name of excellence, integration, and modernity. Here too Aboriginal peoples' achievements, knowledge, histories, and perspectives have been ignored, rejected, suppressed, marginalized, or underutilized. As university educators who have been working toward a postcolonial education, we find our current efforts underscore and animate RCAP (1996) research recommendations adopted by us as a postcolonial agenda of writing back and teaching back to established research and institutional practices, and in this way beginning to reveal how institutions can transform themselves and their capacities to affirm and achieve justice. At the same time, we are experiencing how Indigenous communities can utilize these transformative decolonizing methodologies in multiple sites of struggle and animation.

Animation is the key term employed in this study to address processes of change. From our perspective, animation is ripe for reclamation from the Eurocentric grip of Judaeo-Christian theology, classical philology, modern anthropology, and Jungian psychology: in other words, from spiritual and intellectual traditions wherein Indigenous knowledge is dismissed as ignorance or valued as an exotic addendum or romantic access to the primitive and pristine. Nor can animation be reduced to a set of technological competences designed to bring cartoon figures and puppets to life on a cinema, television, or computer screen. We are not interested in the Disneyfication (or narrow de-Disneyfication) of lived experience, especially not in the name of *Pocahontas*. Our version of animation enacts process principles whose educational force inheres in recognizing and honoring the abilities and gifts of Aboriginal peoples. It derives from a living archive of observation and experience firmly embedded in the linguistic structures of Aboriginal languages and the shared resource that makes possible those languages' expressive diversity and precision. Animation recognizes that Aboriginal education requires a process of participation, consultation, collaboration, consensus-building, participatory research, and sharing led by Aboriginal peoples and grounded in Indigenous knowledge rather than the (neo)colonial command economy that imposes programs, courses, and information generated in the university by academics and administrators to "assist" Aboriginal students. The processive principles of animation require everyone to respect Indigenous knowledge and commit to developing coherent ethical research standards and equitable frameworks for its use.

However, important United Nations documents acknowledge that a serious lack in the discussion and pursuit of global development is precisely the animation of Indigenous knowledge and sustainable development. Sad to say, international standards for respecting Indigenous knowledge as expressed, for example, in the Coolangatta and Kalinga statements in (1999) are better developed than Canada's national, provincial, or university educational standards. Among others, the "Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous Peoples," Convention on Biological Diversity and the continuing efforts of its Secretariat, the World Conference on Science for the Twenty-First Century: A New Commitment, have urged the animation of Indigenous knowledge and its sources as integral to the responsible search for knowledge. Accordingly, the animation of Indigenous knowledge remains central to the formulation and implementation of balanced and transformative curricula in Canada. Our learning communities and institutions themselves still have much to learn.

Indigenous scholars and human rights experts in the United Nations Sub-Commission on the Elimination of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities elaborated the "Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous People" (Wiessner & Battiste, 2000). These principles provide a holistic context and related research agenda for Indigenous knowledge and its production. Here is an exemplary recognition that the heritage of every Indigenous people is a complete knowledge system with its own concepts of epistemology, philosophy, and scientific and logical validity. The diverse elements of an Indigenous people's heritage can be fully learned or understood only by means of the pedagogy traditionally employed by these peoples themselves. It comprises all knowledge the nature or use of which has been transmitted from generation to generation, and which is regarded as pertaining to a particular people or its territory. This knowledge includes "all kinds of scientific, agricultural, technical and ecological knowledge, including cultigens, medicines and the rational use of flora and fauna." The principles have been incorporated in International Labor Organization Convention 169, by the educational sector of UNESCO, and the Indigenous Treaty on the Declaration of Indigenous Rights, the proposed American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Populations, and the Quebec City Summit of Americas Action Plan (2001).

We are also building on the earlier work of the 14-day International Summer Institute at the University of Saskatchewan (1996), where alliances nourished among Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars stimulated the initial dialogue and collaboration for restoring Indigenous knowledge and heritage and for subsequent published work. As organizers and delegates to the Institute, we acquired multiple layers of experience and knowledge about colonization that through our sharing, listening, empathy, and analysis, we reanimated as critique of the trauma of colonization and the frameworks of meaning behind it and imagined a postcolonial society that might much more fully embrace and honor our diversity. The legacies of that event—including stronger bonds with the Linda and Graham Smith and other leading Aboriginal educators, the production of a video of a special convocation at which Chief Ted Moses of the James Bay Cree gave a riveting address, and the development of new courses and research initiatives within our immediate group—underscored the fact that our university and others across Canada have great need of and selective enthusiasm for such animating work, but still suspect it and wish to centralize, coordinate, and control it in new knowledge reservations and "semiotic stockades" (Findlay, in press) rather than facilitating its bursting forth from locations like Teepee #33.

Postcolonialism and Decolonization: Indigenous and Third-World Theories

Although the term *postcolonial* has been defined in various ways and from a number of distinct perspectives—historical, political, economic, theoretical, cultural (Brydon, 2000, and Schwarz & Ray, 2000, offer the best overviews; Linda Smith, 2000, the best sense of work to be done)—it remains at root a strong signifier of resistance tied to past and present experience of colonization and imperialism.

In much of the literature the postcolonial is defined as liberation from colonial imposition and from colonists taking over a territory physically or administratively and telling the traditional people of that place what to do. However, even for those no longer formally subjected to colonization, euphoric freedoms coexist uneasily with a sense of the indelible aftermath of oppression, the arduous, incomplete convergence of what South Africans know as Truth and Reconciliation. The consequences of dispossession and devaluation, and instruction in the legitimacy or inevitability of both, persist in modified or unmodified form well beyond effective declarations of political independence and settlement of land claims. Even more ominously, in too many parts of the world postcolonialism still signifies for Indigenous peoples brutal oppression, domination, and other forms of treatment traditionally reserved for and perfected on "disposable people" (Bales, 1999).

This being said, and all the various disincentives and disfiguring prohibitions and mediations notwithstanding, postcolonial writers, artists, cultural workers, and educators effectively raise awareness of the colonial genius for injustice and how it can be superseded via Indigenous animation of public understanding. Postcolonialism, then, is not just about an ambivalent temporality called *post*, situated at the end of one form of ultranational empire and the emergence of a postnational successor (Hardt & Negri, 2000) that is proving no less predatory toward Indigenous peoples, no less reliant on control of education to promote acceptance of new ways of stealing from the poor and making even more injurious demands on our planet. As well as being a reflexive pause or transition in the so-called First World's story about itself, the postcolonial is distinctly situated to unsettle (where it cannot as yet replace) imperial institutional structures imposed on colonized peoples. To writers and educators in the humanities and social sciences, as well as to producers and interpreters of visual culture, the postcolonial is about rethinking conceptual, institutional, cultural, legal, and other boundaries that are taken for granted as "natural" or "proper," or assumed or asserted to be universal, but that function in fact as structural barriers to justice for marginalized and dispossessed peoples. In addition to promising the deconstruction of politics and power, the postcolonial represents and needs to be taught as an aspirational practice, goal, or idea used to imagine and advance toward a new form of society. It is a symbolic strategy for shaping a desirable reality that we recognize currently does not exist (Battiste, 2000). The conceptualization and strategic realization of the postcolonial among Third World and Indigenous writers and artists are then acts of hope, a light in the long night of educational and political failure.

Such illumination requires the reforming of educational institutions as exemplars of justice as well as excellence, as participatory and aspirational communities such as they have never yet been. In one aspect of our project, therefore, we have initiated a review of university mission statements and how these missions have been implemented in their university structures. Mike Fralic, the doctoral student in English who undertook as part of our SSHRC decolonizing project a survey of 80 such statements across Canada, was as astonished as we were at how little explicit reference to Aboriginal matters of any sort they contained (in only 10 of the 80 consulted). He was also concerned about what explicit commitments to Aboriginal education mean in particular cases, but recognized that the answer to this question requires more detailed investigation and analysis, which we will undertake as soon as possible. However, even preliminary evidence suggests a strong correlation and consistency with the structural issues raised by the RCAP and helps to identify the demographic and institutional preconditions necessary for the development of something other than a blithely or grimly assimilationist educational agenda.

The shift from Third World to postcolonial discourse during the last three decades has made clearer important distinctions between, on the one hand, national entities and populations that have achieved political independence, and on the other, Indigenous peoples who remain in large measure colonized, even or especially in sovereign states that lay claim to all the qualities of mature nationhood. Indeed, the uneven achievement of decolonization, although attended by the specter of restoring neocolonial elites at the level of the former colony as newly independent state, is still more satisfactory than is the case for most Indigenous peoples who continue to live with or succumb to the old endangerments of "classical" colonialism. Successful independence struggles in Africa, India, and Asia have functioned on a level of political and territorial generality that speaks still of the 19th-century high-handedness of the imperial powers in carving up the world for themselves. For Indigenous peoples, in contrast, any version of the political nation is usually bad news: new forms of liberty and prosperity that will at best trickle down to them, or democratic numbers games that drown their concerns in the clamor of the majority. What, for example, did a newly independent Canada, New Zealand, or Australia do for the Indigenous peoples of those territories? What are these former British colonies doing for them now, and at whose urging? Where is "the honor of the Crown" in all this?

Much academic literature across many disciplines is actively examining the diversity of colonial experience, deconstructing the colonial gaze and methodologies and the consequences for subjected people, cultures, and nations; their terrain, territories, and ecology. In education, history, literature, visual arts, anthropology, feminist studies, the critique of the colonial experience has produced new ideas and theories, but much less of a practical agenda, and affect school curricula and the public understanding and public policy shaped and underwritten by education. More recently postcolonial critique has expanded to the physical sciences, including ecology and biotechnology (Shiva, 1993, 1997; Hirsch & O'Hanlon, 1995). But economics is perhaps the most formidable remaining sanctuary of an open or coded colonialism. The former colonies that comprise most of the Third World countries remain subject to First-World values and agendas through the routing of advice and ultimata via the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and many other harbingers of aid tied to fiscal responsibility and democratic practices: an arrangement designed to produce the illusion of compassion, the reality of failure, and the entrenchment of exploitation with a new face and name, but the usual victims and collateral damage. Meanwhile, Indigenous peoples have to fight in the courts against legal dream teams assembled by states and corporations to wear them down or legislate them out of distinctive existence in the interests of development. Yet both postcolonial movements, the Indigenous and the Third World, share a common consciousness of living with abject poverty and experiencing "success" as a wrenchingly temporary pause between setbacks or a freshly inflected version of defeat. For both, prosperity remains elusive, the distribution of opportunity and reward remaining as diffusionist as colonialism itself, as intent as ever on advantage to the mother country or the mother company. In new regimes and modes of dispossession and subjection, the Third World seems resolved to pass with the new imperialists by insisting on accelerating its own assimilation to the values as well as the opportunities of the First World, using the "good" news of debt forgiveness and the straight talk of stiff economic medicine to make its citizens eager supplicants and would-be cosmopolites: English-speaking consumers and inadequately protected producers of what the world "really" wants. Indigenous peoples, by contrast, seem less keen on passing and much more determined to retain their cultural traditions, languages, and educational practices and themselves manage changes to these crucial sources of individual and collective identity. Third-World postcolonialists seem to emphasize emulation as much as resistance, whereas colonized Indigenous peoples resist more concertedly by reconstructing, rebuilding, or enhancing nationhood, communities, and individuals through multiple strategies and methodologies.

For those of us who have been educated in colonial, Eurocentric environments and had our Aboriginal identities revised or our white armor polished, we have needed to unpack Eurocentric processes to reveal the cognitive assimilative regime that has done such damage and what can be done to effectively change it. Henderson, Benson, and Findlay (2000) argue that the use of stereotypes and caricatures was a necessary precondition for establishing Indigenous peoples as incompetent, landless primitives who needed the colonizing superior cultures, religions, and governments to raise them to a level of civilization. Using both a theory of universality (all things derive from one) and a hierarchy of differences, colonizers justified their aggression and vindicated and enriched the homeland as they maintained control and dominance over Indigenous peoples worldwide. These strategies remain in our institutions and in our society, most boldly exposed and contested perhaps in Native studies, cultural studies, women's and gender studies, antiracist education, with assistance from other margins and borders.

Colonialism has never employed only physical force to achieve its ends: it has always depended on cultural and educational instruments to fortify its own troops, administrators, merchants, and settlers and to induce the colonized to accept and internalize the illusion of their own inferiority (Noël, 1994; Viswanathan, 1989). Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, among others, have rethought military domination as hegemony, understood as operating through many sites and channels (schools, government, media, courts, prisons, universities, research, etc.), constructing a pastoral regime through which it seeks to control its subjects by (re)forming them and in so doing making them conform to their place in the social system as objects of power rather than agents in their own right and according to their own lights. In examining the connections between Western culture and imperialism, Edward Said (1978, 1993) has pointed out how all Western systems of cultural description are contaminated with the politics of appropriation, projection, and domination. This has occasioned an anti-Saidian backlash led most recently by no less a figure than David Cannadine (2001), Director of the Institute of Historical Research at the University of London, and an effort to return the gaze to "how the British [and other Euro-imperial powers] saw themselves." Still, despite the work of scholars like Said or Linda and Graham Smith, we have the marinating and pickling of the oppressed in the values of dominant groups. However, with more reason than most to suspect and scorn the choice between passing and passing away, Indigenous peoples are perhaps best positioned to inspire and lead others in implementing a radically different human future.

Seven Sites of Animation in the Exclusionary/Assimilationist Nation

We have lived long enough with the limitations, injustices, and wastefulness of Eurocentric education on behalf of the exclusionary and/or assimilationist nation, whether at the elementary, secondary, or postsecondary level. Public education has meant prolonged marination in colonialism and neocolonialism for every formally educated person today, both here and abroad. Here are a few of the multiple sites of animation where we see real potential for the change that would benefit all Canadians by addressing the deficit in public understanding that stems from the evasion or denial of Indigenous knowledge.

The Elders. Ethical animation of a truly postcolonial university must begin with guidance from Aboriginal Elders and with the honor of sustaining an ongoing relationship with them. Our decolonizing work cannot be undertaken otherwise, except in a manner both opportunistic and neocolonial. Our efforts to date have been blessed and enriched by Elders, whether we have assembled dialogues at the Saskatchewan Treaty Office, the Native Law Centre of Canada, or other venues across our campus.

Ethical guidelines. Ethical research requires the development and respecting of guidelines for Indigenous knowledge. The worldwide losses experienced by Indigenous peoples and the current resource rush on Indigenous knowledge require that a uniform policy or set of practices be used by nation states and multinationals to guide research practices that seek to access and commodify Indigenous knowledge and communities' current resources. In addition, as Indigenous peoples pressure universities to be inclusive and the interest in Indigenous knowledge grows, the need for protective practices intensifies. Educating both the institutions and communities about protective measures and practices is part of our project, including assembling an archive of such guidelines and protocols for our emerging Web site and engaging dialogues and symposia on the topic of protecting Indigenous knowledge.

Educational materials. Any educational agenda requires materials. Indigenous knowledge is not sufficiently and appropriately available through books, journals, monographs, theses or dissertations, or from teachers and university professors. Yet little effort has been made to develop new interdisciplinary methodologies to integrate European and Aboriginal knowledge on a basis of respect and equality, which makes the appearance of Cathryn McConaghy's (2000) monograph on the Australian situation all the more welcome. Our emerging Web site is developing extensive bibliographies.

Sui generis curriculum. One of our strategies is to adapt to educational settings concepts that have proven useful in other areas. Accordingly, we have imported for legal and constitutional debate the idea of distinctive (sui generis) citizenship, both to draw attention to the importance of Indigenous knowledge and culture to the Canadian judiciary in its attempts to educate itself, legislators, and the Canadian public, and to oblige ourselves to pursue equivalent gains in a sui generis curriculum with teachers and administrators who envisage themselves as postcolonial leaders. A properly understood and broadly appreciated notion of Indigenous educational citizenship is key to discrediting unfair criticism of the so-called advantages Aboriginal students enjoy in terms of funding support, and key also to remedying the deficiencies in existing curricula. We are promoting "the Indigenous difference" (Macklem, 2000) as legitimate and potentially enriching, if only curriculum keepers and designers will recognize both obligation and opportunity in traditional and innovative forms of Indigenous knowledge.

Critical Indigenous mass. Human resources are crucial while discouragement and burnout prevail in the meager sprinkling of Indigenous faculty in Canadian universities. Educational institutions in general cannot depend on a few Aboriginal scholars to lead them along the bumpy community road to reveal all that is needed for educational reform: it needs an ethical, creative community effort (Battiste, 1986, 1998, 2000). We are making the case in every policy and hiring venue we can access as faculty or as special advisors for the hiring and effective support, mentoring, and valuing of Indigenous faculty. However, we do not concede the absence of supply without at the same time underscoring the limited appeal of the current milieu. This double strategy of self-criticism and self-help proves animating indeed.

Dialogues and networks. Our interpretation and application of the RCAP (1996) report includes mapping new and necessary capacities for postcolonial research, teaching, training, and public education. We draw on our experience of working together in a variety of combinations, formats, and for Aboriginal talking circles, participation action research (PAR), interdisciplinary dialogues developed by Bohm (1996) and Isaacs (1999), and collaborative archival projects. Consistent with the notion of Indigenizing are the processes of animation, which reflect an Indigenous emphasis on processes and understandings and are intended to position our activities in inclusive animism characteristic of Indigenous knowledge and the role of dialogues as the basis of effective Indigenous knowledges and teachings. Our teaching, scholarship, and professional practice include, and have benefited significantly from, speaking with teachers and administrators at the AWASIS Conference in Saskatoon organized by the special subject council for Indian and Metis Education of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, and with multidisciplinary international scholars at WIPCE in Calgary. In both settings we participated in and learned from transformative praxis in Aboriginal education. Individual teachers know much of what needs to be done, but feel isolated, vulnerable, and unheeded except by their students. Meanwhile, administrators often feel out of touch with what is happening in the classroom and in the academy beyond educational administration programs. WIPCE allowed us to gain a sense of the global challenges and the mobilizing capacities of Indigenous peoples worldwide.

There is no single answer to these challenges, but their diversity is being increasingly matched by Indigenous diversity coupled with the ability to share knowledge of what works.

The Indigenous renaissance. In the ongoing process of decolonizing the visual arts curriculum at the University of Saskatchewan, the animating work of the Saskatoon-based Aboriginal arts organization Tribe has provided inspirational leadership. Tribe, "a centre for evolving Aboriginal visual media and performing arts," was created in 1995 as an artist-run center catering to Indigenous artists who were excluded from or marginalized in the white gallery and educational system in Canada. Intervening locally in art education, Tribe has produced training, mentoring, networking, and exhibiting possibilities for young Indigenous artists. This partnership between Tribe and the Department of Art and Art History has created a more Indigenous-friendly learning environment for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students, creating spaces of animation for Indigenous students in the university educational system as well as cross-cultural spaces for anti-racist coalition work. These spaces, from cyber-powwows to conversations with artists about their work to festivals, exhibitions, and live performances are stimulating, enjoyable affairs as much occasions for a radical pedagogy of animation as criticisms of existing academic models.

Coda. As this article goes to press, a report is being released by the Canadian Race Relations Foundation in Toronto. An Associated Press preview of "Learning About Walking in Beauty: Aboriginal Studies in Canadian Classrooms" appeared in the Saskatoon's *Star Phoenix* (Associated Press, 2002) under the misjudged headline, "Students get failing grade on Native issues." Of course, it is the educational system and not the students that should be singled out for criticism. The AP report goes on to state that later that week the Canadian Federation of Teachers would be hosting in Ottawa "a first-ever symposium on Aboriginal education." Matthew Coon Come toward the end of the report makes crucial observations about deficient curricula, ineffective implementation, and the need for "course materials that go beyond historical conflicts or social studies." Indigenous experience of education and its outcomes can be transformed only through the appropriate recognition and teaching of Indigenous knowledge. We can and must make this happen, speedily and effectively, for the benefit of all Canadians. Otherwise, we will have disappointed not only Linda and Graham Smith and ourselves, but also every child and adult learner in every instructional venue across this land. Moreover, what kind of stewardship would that be?

References

Ahmad, A. (1992). *In theory: Classes, nations, literatures.* London: Verso.

Associated Press. (2002). Students get failing grade on native issues. *Star Phoenix,* November 18, p. A9.

Bales, K. (1999). *Disposable people: New slavery in the global economy.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Battiste, M. (1986). Mi'kmaq literacy and cognitive assimilation. In J. Barman, Y. Hébert, & D. McCaskill (Eds.), *Indian education in Canada: The legacy* (vol. 1, pp. 23-44). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language, and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education 22,* 16-27.

Battiste, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue* (L. Nichol, Ed.). London: Routledge.

Brydon, D. (2000). *Postcolonialism: Critical concepts in literary and cultural studies* (5 vols.). London: Routledge.

Cannadine, D. (2001). *Ornamentalism: How the British saw their empire.* London: Oxford University Press.

CIDA (2002, September). Draft—*CIDA Policy on Indigenous knowledge and sustainable human development.* Ottawa: ACDI/CIDA, Human Resources Division.

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. (2002). *Overview of DIAND program data—Education—2001.* Retrieved November 15, 2002, from http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/sts/ove_e.pdf

Findlay, L.M. (2000). Always Indigenize! The radical humanities in the postcolonial Canadian university. *Ariel, 31,* 307-326.

Findlay, L.M. (in press). Print culture and decolonizing the university. In P. Stoicheff & A. Taylor (Eds.), *The future of the page.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Henderson, J.S.Y., Benson, M., & Findlay, I. (2000). *Aboriginal tenure in the constitution of Canada.* Toronto, ON: Carswell.

Hirsch, E., & O'Hanlon, M. (Eds.). (1995). *The anthropology of landscape: Perspectives on space and place.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon press.

Macklem, P. (2000). *Indigenous difference and the constitution of Canada.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Majeed, J. (1992). *Ungoverned imaginings: James Mill's "The history of British India and orientalism."* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

McConaghy, C. (2000). *Rethinking Indigenous education: Culturalism, colonialism and the politics of knowing.* Flaxton, Qld: Post Pressed.

Noël, L. (1994). *Intolerance: A general survey* (A. Bennett Trans.). Montreal, QC & Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Prakash, G. (Ed.). (1995). *After colonialism: Imperial histories and postcolonial displacements.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rahmena, M., & Bawtree, V. (Eds.). (1997). *The post-development reader.* London: Zed Books.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. (1996). *Report* (5 vols.). Ottawa: Author.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism: Western conceptions of the Orient.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Schwarz, H., & Ray, S. (Eds.). (2000). *A companion to postcolonial studies.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Shiva, V. (1993). *Monocultures of the mind: Perspectives on biodiversity and biotechnology.* Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.

Shiva, V. (1997). *Biopiracy: The plunder of nature and knowledge.* London: Zed Books,

Smith, G. (1997). *Kaupapa Maori theory and praxis.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Smith, G. (2000). Maori education: Revolution and transformative action. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 24,* 57-72.

Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Spivak, G. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Towards a history of the vanishing present.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Symonds, R. (1986). *Oxford and empire: The last lost cause?* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

University of Saskatchewan. *Aboriginal Initiatives at the U of S.* [Online] Available: http://www.usask.ca/vpacademic/programs/aboriginal/initiatives.shtml

University of Saskatchewan. (2001, December 13). *Responding to the needs of Aboriginal peoples: A conceptual framework*. Presentation to the University Council. [Online] Available:http://www.usask.ca/vpacademic/programs/aboriginal/initiatives.shtml

Varadharajan, A. (1995). *Exotic parodies: Subjectivity in Adorno, Said, and Spivak*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Viswanathan, G. (1989). *Masks of conquest: Literary study and British rule in India*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wiessner, S., & Battiste, M. (2000). The 2000 revision of the United Nations draft principles and guidelines on the protection of the heritage of Indigenous people. *St. Thomas Law Review 13*, 383-414.

Williams, P., & Chrisman, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Colonial discourse and postcolonial theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Willinsky, J. (1999). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.