HAUNTINGS ON BLACKFOOT LAND: THEORIZING THE HINTERLANDS OF NATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE

EMILY KIRBYSON
B.A., University of Lethbridge, 2014

A Thesis/Project
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
of the University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology
University of Lethbridge
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

HAUNTINGS ON BLACKFOOT LAND: THEORIZING THE HINTERLANDS OF
NATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
LETHBRIDGE

EMILY KIRBYSON

Date of defence: March 28, 2017

Dr. K. Granzow Supervisor	Assistant Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. K. Mair Thesis Examination Committee Member	Associate Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. W. Ramp Thesis Examination Committee Member	Associate Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. J. Newberry Chair, Thesis Examination Committee	Associate Professor	Ph.D.

Abstract

Shortly after the 1967 establishment of the University of Lethbridge (U of L), a Native teacher education program was developed in collaboration with First Nations communities. This collaboration, the program, and the U of L's location on Blackfoot territory feature as selling points in contemporary promotional materials designed to recruit Indigenous students. My reading of the U of L archives, however, suggests that the partnerships required to build the NEp were haunted by colonial logics and practices. Following John Law (2002), I juxtapose and theorize the tensions and correspondences between stories told by the promotional texts and counterstories that correspond to my reading of the archives. I suggest that in these two textual sites, the U of L is variously and contradictorily enacted as a place beset by ghosts, invested in keeping with particular colonial projects, and as a place committed to supporting the success of Indigenous students.

Acknowledgements

To my brilliant supervisor, Dr. Kara Granzow: It is impossible to satisfactorily express my deep appreciation and respect for you and all you have invested in my life and in this work. Your thoughtful feedback has consistently breathed new life into my writing process, taking my work in directions I could not have anticipated. And to my committee member Dr. Kimberly Mair: You have been so generous with both your words and your time and I am exceedingly grateful. I especially want to thank you for recommending John Law's *Aircraft Stories* (2002) and for encouraging me to write an account that is just coherent enough for haunting to occur. I must also thank committee member Dr. William Ramp. Bill, I have been so happy to be on the receiving end of so many e-mails filled with helpful bits and pieces. I am thankful, too, for your insightful comments during committee meetings, especially on the topic of ghosts. And to Tanya Harnett: Thank you for engaging me in productive and challenging conversations and for introducing me to the Buffalo Treaty.

Thanks to Mike Perry for all of his help in the U of L archives and to Jenny Oseen for her consistent support, encouragement, and administrative magic. I thank my parents, Nyla and Howard, and my sister, Naomi, for lovingly listening to me whine, boast, cry, and think out loud. Their support and patience are unwavering. Thanks to my perfect office mate, Dan, for all of the coffee breaks, lunch dates, and time spent on the hill. And finally, I want to thank my dear friends Dakota and Erin, not only for their late-night help with assembling the reference list for this work but for asking delightfully curious questions about my writing and for keeping me afloat in every other way imaginable.

Table of contents

List of abbreviations

FNMI — First Nations, Métis, and Inuit

INAC — Indigenous and Northern Affairs

IRS — Indian Residential Schools

MOU — Memorandum of Understanding

NAS — Native American Studies

NEp — Native Education program

RCCC — Red Crow Community College

U of L — University of Lethbridge

Introduction — Beginnings

> When a ghost appears, it is making contact with you; all its forceful if per-
> plexing enunciations are for you. Offer it a hospitable reception we must, but
> the victorious reckoning with the ghost always requires a partiality to the liv-
> ing
>
> - Avery Gordon (2008, p. 208), *Ghostly Matters*

The University of Lethbridge (U of L) is located on Treaty 7 land in Southern Alberta. It

is nestled in the bold and rolling coulees that make up a small portion of Blackfoot terri-

tory which extends across contemporary borders demarcating the Canadian province of

British Columbia and the American state of Montana. This year, the U of L is celebrating

its 50th Anniversary. This anniversary comes so soon after the release of the final reports

from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Canada, and so soon after the Univer-

sity's public commitment to reconciliation. As part of the celebrations, a special exhibit

has been curated in the U of L's Helen Cristou Gallery, located on either side of a heavily

traveled hallway. Several of the pieces in the small exhibit emphasize the University's

natural surroundings. There are vases crafted from wood that can be found on our five

acre campus, there are 50 photographs of the coulees that partially swallow University

Hall, and at the end of the hallway, there is a giant illustrated 50, also embedded in the

hills. These artistic ties between the U of L and Blackfoot territory are beautiful to look at

but they are also insistent in their repetition and they give me a strange feeling.

In writing this introduction, I am wrapping up a research and writing process that

began a few years ago with a similarly strange sensation. As an undergraduate student, I

had been experiencing an uneasy feeling in relation to the University's Native Education

program (NEp). This program got its start in the 1970s and serves now to equip preservice teachers to work in majority First Nations, Métis, and Inuit (FNMI) classrooms.[1] My unease began while I was enrolled in the program myself and simultaneously taking a Sociology course on 'race' and ethnicity, then titled *Minority Group Relations*. In that class, I was required to historically and socially situate what I thought was an individual and innocent desire to 'help' First Nations communities through my presence as a teacher in an on-reserve school. I will return to this topic in Chapter 2 but for now, it is only important to note that after completing that course, I unenrolled from the NEp. A few of my friends, who will remain anonymous here, continued on in the program and it was not uncommon for me to hear those friends express fear, and seemingly a sense of innocence, about carrying out their teaching practicums on-reserve as 'a little white girl.' In another anecdote, an acquaintance from the Siksika Nation explained to me that while his white peers would frequently devalue his in-class contributions, they would anxiously come to him after receiving on-reserve practicum placements with questions about how to deal with Native students. I also heard stories from an on-reserve school where, for at least one teacher, U of L practicum students had proven to be difficult to supervise. Those students reportedly had a tendency to undermine the supervising teachers' knowledge and pedagogical practice. It seems that local Blackfoot students in on-reserve schools sometimes struggled

---

[1] A note on terminology: When it makes sense to do so, I will refer specifically to Blackfoot or Niitsitapi peoples. Niitsitapi, used interchangeably with 'Blackfoot,' translates to the "the real people" (Goodstriker, 1996, p. 4). When I am not referring specifically to the Niitsitapi, I will use whichever title is given to Indigenous groups in the texts I am drawing on in that section (Cote-Meek, 2010, p. 21). For example, if an archival document refers to the Native Indians of Canada, so will I. When promotional materials refer to FNMI peoples, I will do the same. I recognize that there are a range of connotations associated with various titles but I will treat them with some equivalency given that they all have homogenizing effects and none of them are the names by which Indigenous peoples called themselves in their own languages (Belcourt, July 1, 2013).

with the presence of practicum students, too. A friend who identifies as white and was assigned to one such school for her practicum placement recounted an-in class experience to me wherein after giving some unwelcome instruction to a pupil, the student did not comply and protested that 'this is just like residential school.'

While I also heard more positive stories, including one about a kind and supportive letter written by a teacher supervisor to be given to her practicum student and another about the exchange of food and gifts between reserve school staff and U of L students, the accounts from the prior paragraph became for me what Walter Benjamin calls the "the shocking parallel" — an unexpected and troubling link between 'past' and present moments in Indigenous education (as cited in Gordon, 2008, p. 66). I suspect that all of the accounts I heard were true but the stories that countered my prior understanding of education as benevolent and powerful for making enlightened and caring teachers were the ones that haunted me. I thus follow Dian Million (2014) who knows that "the agony of the child in (name community) now is not the same experience as the child raised forty years ago in the confines of (name a residential school)," but cannot "shake the feeling of 'déjà vu'" (p. 31). She says that she is not a typical historian because her "desire to feel/link these experiences" is stronger than her knowledge about their historical specificities (p. 31). My thesis research is similarly informed by the stories I've heard and a(n unpopular) desire to attend to those that enact education as other and more than singularly good through juxtaposing historical and contemporary representations of the Native Education program against one another and against a history of residential schooling in Canada.

What I have endeavoured to partially and provisionally understand are what John Law (2004) would call the hinterlands of the NEp. The term 'hinterland' conventionally refers to uncharted territories or an area located somewhere beyond what is known or familiar. Law's use of the word evokes something like the Foucauldian episteme. A hinterland is comprised of "pre-existing social and material realities" from which new worlds and knowledge about them must be drawn if they are to be considered meaningful or be taken up as truths (Law, 2004, p. 143). So hinterlands place limits on what we can know and on what kind of worlds we can make. But, perhaps more flexible than the episteme, Law's hinterlands are defined as a bundle of "indefinitely extending" relations which are "more or less routinized" and which interfere and resonate with each other "to keep each other in place" (p. 141, 160). These relations are so complex and so extensive that they could never be captured or known in their entirety (Law, 2004). In this way Law's definition of the word hinterland lines up beautifully with more conventional usages. This convergence allows me to ask: what are the wilds, the unknowable and unfamiliar, the inhospitable regions of the NEp? And for whom are they more or less hospitable?

Theorizing the hinterlands of the Native Education program has meant saying something about: 1) present-day accounts of the program, including those featured in promotional and informational materials, 2) the development of the program, which occurred in tandem with the creation of the Native American Studies (NAS) Department and B.A. program at the University of Lethbridge, 3) the *alternative* relationships, routes, and programs that might have been pursued and developed at the U of L but were not, and 4) the histories of assimilatory education for Indigenous students in Canada. Certainly the colonialist and racist assumptions that underpinned the Indian Residential Schooling system

4

and a whole host of other projects, including land theft, matter to the contemporary NEp in multiple ways. Finally, I have detected archival silences regarding the U of L's rationale for initiating the NEp and I have written a story about a later moment in the University's history into the hinterlands of the program in an attempt to make those silences speak.

The Native Education program at the University of Lethbridge may have been one of the first of its kind in Canada but conventions and workshops designed for teachers of Native children, especially at residential schools, had been happening on a smaller scale long before the program materialized. In 1924, four of the Grey Nuns working at St. Mary's Indian Residential School on the Blood Reserve that neighbours the city of Lethbridge, took a summer course through the Alberta Department of Education in Edmonton. The content of the course is not specified in the archives but its purpose was to help in making "better qualified teachers" (*R.C. Indian Residential School*, Nov. 17, 1924, p. 497). In 1957, the Lethbridge Herald reported a convention of over 200 teachers "from Indian schools," including St. Mary's, organized to "discuss common teaching and education problems" (*Indian School Teachers*, 1957, n.p.). And the Sundance Echo published a 1965 article on an "Indian Education Convention" at which "Four professional men of Indian ancestry took part in a panel discussion during the Alberta Indian Education Association Convention in Edmonton" (p. 4). The panel was organized so that "teachers of Indian children" might be made more familiar with "the traditional forms of training which the Indians gave their children before the formal system of schools was introduced" (*Indian Education Convention*, Jan 1., 1965, p. 4). In 1970, for the first time in Canada,

O.M.I. missionary Father Andre Renaud "set up a Chair at the University of Saskatche-wan to orientate teachers going to Reserves about Indian Culture" (O'Reilly, March-April, 1970, p. 14). By 1971, the U of L was hosting its own "Preliminary meeting on the proposed inter-disciplinary program for teachers of Indian children" (*Preliminary Meeting*, Feb., 16, 1971, p. 1). Present at this meeting were several U of L faculty who had gathered to think about how a week long program in late August, 1971 might address some issues in Indian education, including "Parent-Teacher Relationships . . . The Relationship of White Teacher and Indian Student . . . [and] Changing Self-Concept" (*Preliminary Meeting*, Feb., 16, 1971, p. 1). By 1978 Native American Studies was listed as a possible major for Education students to select at the U of L (*Calendar 1978-1979*, 1978, p. 41). I suggest that the hinterlands of the NEp include each of these moments, beginning in 1924 when 4 residential school nuns traveled to Edmonton to improve their qualifications.

At the time of confederation in the country now so commonly referred to as Canada, residential schools had already become a part of the government's Aboriginal policy which ultimately sought to absorb all Indigenous peoples in to a white, middle-class, and English speaking body politic (Comeau, 2005; *Honouring the Truth*, 2015).[2] In 1867, "churches were already operating a small number of boarding schools for Aboriginal people" and by the 1930s, eighty residential schools were officially in operation and today it is estimated that approximately 150,000 children passed through the Indian Residential

---

[2] While residential schooling is often treated as a synecdoche for colonialism, the residential schooling system was one part of a larger colonial regime which centered on the theft of land, something I aim to address through this work (Mackey, 2013).

School (IRS) system (*Honouring the Truth*, 2015, p. 3). Residential schools were funded and administered by both church and state until 1969 when the partnership between various denominational Churches and the Federal Government formally ended (*Honouring the Truth*, 2015, p. 3). The last residential school in Canada did not close until 1996 (Regan, 2010, p. 4) and seven federally-controlled on-reserve schools remain open in Canada today (*Kindergarten,* 2016). Residential schools were just one element of education-for-nation building. The same assimilationist logics that undergirded the IRS system also informed education for non-Aboriginal children in Canada (Comeau, 2005, p. 11). Sarah de Leeuw (2009) and Lisa Comeau (2005) explain that for white children, becoming Canadian adults depended upon an education that would foster the development of an *inherent* set of favoured characteristics, including white*ness* (2009, p. 132). Educators of Aboriginal children, on the other hand, could not merely foster qualities that already existed. Indian childness had to be done away with entirely so that Indian adultness could be avoided (de Leeuw, 2009, p. 132). Aboriginal children were to become the de-Indigenized Canadian citizenry (de Leeuw, 2009, p. 133). So for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children, schools in the 19th century were organized around and reproduced white-supremacist convictions and the valuation of white ways of being.

Indeed, all Western institutions for education were in the service of bolstering the colonial project. Universities did not escape this trend but have been and continue to be very important sites for the reproduction of Western ways of knowing, generally, and knowing about the Other, specifically (Cote-Meek, 2014; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012, p. 68). Scholars contend that education *at all levels and for all students*, continues to be embedded in a larger colonial regime, reflective of "white, Western, or Eurocentric interests"

(Schick & St. Denis, 2005, p. 298; see also Cote-Meek, 2014, p. 46). This problem of on-going colonialism is sometimes translated into talk about the crisis in Native Education for which there have been a range of attempts at reparations and fixes. I think of symbolic gestures like the Harper government's 2008 apology for Canada's involvement in Indian residential schools, new developments in education such as the turn toward multicultural educative practices and theories, and seeming advancements in teacher-training through programs like the NEp. *Much has been done* across the nation but at the post-secondary level, the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous folks in educational attainment has been increasing rather than decreasing since the early 1980s (Mitrou et al., 2014). Indige-nous scholars continue to name post-secondary classrooms as "space[s] under siege" (Cote-Meek, 2014, p. 64). Tuck and Ree (2013) might refer to the apology, multicultural education, and Native teacher education programs as tiles from "The ceilings I'm think-ing about — the ones . . . that slowly brown with leaky stain marks" (p. 652). The tiles, sitting in aluminum grid and held in place by gravity, are "swappable" and good for hid-ing leaks (Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 652). "Simply replace evidence of water damage with a new clean tile" (Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 652). For Tuck & Ree (2013), leaks and our "inabi-lity to keep up with them . . . unsettle our sense of space" and are haunting in that way (p. 653). Persistent seepage points to ghosts which trouble all of our attempts to replace old tiles for new in the Canadian education system.

While the IRS system, the history of training for teachers of Native children, and the Harper government apology are all a part of the hinterland of the Native Education program, they cannot be assembled into a linear, coherent, and complete story that ex-

8

plains the failures and successes of the program and show us where to head next for a better future. What follows in the coming chapters is not a history or a narrative about factors, causal relationships, or events in the past. Instead, "the work and the power of [this] story lie in giving all the reasons why the reasons are never quite enough" (Gordon, 2008, p. 142). That is, I aim to write (about) worlds that are not entirely quantifiable or knowable, worlds that are excessive, complicated, and haunted. And so, part of theorizing the hinterlands of the Native Education program has become a matter of paying attention to those ghostly forces that shape our worlds. Who or what do I take up as ghosts in my work? The answer is twofold. First, I refer generally to the ghosts of the residential schooling system. This gestures toward the unquantifiable remnants of the schools, and the colonial logics that informed them, which resonate in the present. I had considered describing the children who died in those schools, or as a result of the trauma of IRS experiences, as spectral presences. This was inspired in part by a cartoon published by the Globe and Mail's Brian Gable (2015) whose eerie rendering of a closed residential school building features the glowing ghost of a young girl, still sitting at her desk in an empty classroom (p. 11). Further, I had heard visitors to Red Crow Community College, a tribally-run college operating out of the old St. Mary's school, explain that the building was haunted. I also knew from reading Avery Gordon's (2008) *Ghostly Matters*, that ghosts often take the form of people who have died at the hands of state-sanctioned violence. Two things got in the way of my plan, though. The first was Gordon's (2008) claim that being haunted is not like picking a book to read (p. 190). *We do not choose what we are haunted by* (Gordon, 2008, p. 190). Emilie Cameron's (2008) work on "the politics of de-

scribing Indigenous peoples as ghostly" gave me pause as well (p. 383). Cameron, draw-

ing on Bentley, suggests first that spectral Aboriginal presences have been a part of at-

tempts to "connect Aboriginality with settler history" since the 19th Century and that

those presences have been represented as the only remaining trace of the Indian, naturally

and rightfully disappeared in the onslaught of settler colonialism (p. 388). Moreover,

Cameron (2008) argues that attuning to ghosts and attempting to craft a hospitable

memory for them can have the effect of dismissing the claims and demands of Indigenous

peoples who are living.[3]

Aside from the troubling persistence of some versions of the Indian residential

schooling system over two decades since the school was closed, I write about a second

ghostly figure, or series of figures, that haunted my research process. I did not intention-

ally seek them out, but I experienced the constant reappearance of the buffalo throughout

my research process as uncanny and unsettling. Interestingly, writing spectral buffalo into

my work initially had one of the effects that Cameron warns about. I was writing about

buffalo cleared from the plains as part of a larger, though not necessarily coherent, colo-

nial project. I had to be reminded that the buffalo live still, that there are ongoing efforts

by Indigenous tribes to repatriate them to the plains, and that where they roam, they are

doing their own kinds of work to bring new worlds into being. And so I follow and write

buffalo ghosts, yes, but I follow and write fleshy ones, too. I do not offer tips and tricks

---

[3] For engagements with Indigenous ghosts that do not feature the pitfalls Cameron warns against, see
Granzow & Dean, (2016) and Tuck & Ree (2013).

for exorcising the spectres that unsettle (Tuck & Ree, 2013) but I hope that in my learning/writing, I might have said something meaningful about how to be unsettled and what it might mean to be a settler researcher operating in a state of disorientation.

Much of this thesis is about responding to a research process that made the University, an institution that has become a second home for me over the last five and a half years, a place that I "no longer understand" (Abbas as cited in Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 646). See, while I was learning to identify my (mostly) racist and colonialist desire to 'help' FNMI people during my undergraduate, I was also under the impression that I was becoming an enlightened and progressive person of the kind that we imagine Universities to make. I was also in the habit of walking the same hallways over and over again and happily feeling myself a natural part of the fabric of the University. Freud (1955) would characterize this "familiar, friendly, intimate" feeling as *heimlich* (p. 225). Yes. For a while, the University was experienced by me as *heimlich*, "a place free from ghostly influences" (Freud, 1955, p. 225). But as Freud (1955) brilliantly explains, if *heimlich* refers to that which is "homelike" then the idea might be expanded to refer to that which is private, "concealed, secret . . . inaccessible to knowledge" (p. 226). In this way, the meaning of *heimlich* "develops in the direction of ambivalence, until it finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*" (Freud, 1955, p. 226). The *unheimlich* is nothing "new or alien, but something familiar and old" (Freud, 1955, p. 241). And, indeed, though the University may always have been a haunted house, it has only become obvious to me as such as I have engaged in a process of writing it as *unheimlich*. In the case of this thesis, the *unheimlich* University is not the progressive, enlightening institution of my imagination but

one that is invested in the reproduction of whiteness as a position of power and privilege, and deeply implicated in a number of colonial endeavours, both historically and today.

In what follows, I explore the U of L's relationship with Blackfoot peoples and lands using the Native Education program as a case to think through and with.[4] This work is in large part made up of the juxtaposition of various textual materials including contemporary promotional materials for the NEp and archival sources ranging from the late 1960s to the early 2000s regarding the development and life course of Native teacher education programming at the U of L. The promotional materials explored include what will hereafter be referred to as the FNMI-Viewbook (2015) which was designed for the purpose of recruiting FNMI students to the University. This booklet and a 1972 proposal for the Native American Studies and Native Education programs, authored by Leroy Little Bear and Menno Boldt, feature prominently as materials that perform the U of L's FNMI-focused programming in very different ways. Indeed textual materials often seem to tell multiple and contradictory stories about the institutions, programs, and subjects they represent. For example, the details of an attempted but unsuccessful partnership between the U of L and Red Crow Community College, stands in contrast with the characterization of

---

[4] Throughout this thesis, I refer to the actions, perspectives, and accounts of the University of Lethbridge. Of course I recognize that the U of L is not an individual that thinks and does things but the University does have an institutional life of its own. I think here of the fact that the Department of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) is of the legal opinion that education is not a treaty right and that this opinion *is not shared by all of the public servants* that work in the Education Branch. INAC is made of a body of public servants, yes, but it also has a particular history that is attached to its operations today and it has an institutional Mission and Mandate. 'The University' is made up of all of these things, too. To speak of the U of L as a "collective without individuals" might mean that no one can or will be held responsible for particular decisions (Ahmed, 2004 , n.p.) but I think that merely holding individuals accountable also runs the risk of enacting an innocent University that has merely suffered from the unsavoury actions of a few autonomous actors. I propose thinking of the University as a haunted house in which faculty, staff, and students are variously positioned in relation to ghosts.

the University's relationship with Blackfoot peoples in the FNMI Viewbook. I do not make the various materials tell a coherent story or attempt to secure my position as a researcher-knower. Instead, I have actively tried to remain unsettled by refusing to resolve every conflict or appoint the story told by one set of materials as the Truth. I do, however, theorize the possible effects of the tensions I identify, just as I have made an effort to listen and attend to the seething of ghosts whose desires I cannot know completely. In sum, then, I ask how the hinterlands of the Native Education program matter to its operations and while I refuse a straightforward answer to that question, I do contend that exploring it can point toward important implications regarding the University's relationships with and responsibilities to Blackfoot peoples and territories. I write generally toward decolonization, land repatriation, and learning to live differently with that which haunts us.

Chapter 1 — Paths taken and disavowed

> the whole situation cries out for clearly distinguishing between truth and lies, between what is known and what is unknown, between the real and the unthinkable and yet that is what is precisely impossible
>
> - Avery Gordon (2008, p. 64), *Ghostly Matters*

In the first version of this first chapter, I wrote about my methodological approach to 'the project.' John Law (2002) made me change my mind by illustrating how the research project can be rather like the modern project, both embracing a EuroAmerican cultural bias toward singularity. The research project has an object of study that exists somewhere out there for the researcher to develop a perspective on (Law, 2002). That perspective can be ranked; is it culturally authentic, biased, objective, emotional (Law, 2002)? The research project makes singular objects (of study) and (researcher) subjects through a process that defers discontinuity and interruptions (Law, 2002, p. 87). After the abandonment of projectness, an alternative approach to doing research emerges. It involves the "narratives, practices, relations" that make me and my object of study, multiply. Research becomes more about understanding how those narratives, practices, and relations accomplish this task through their overlaps and their noncoherences (Law, 2002, p. 186). It might not come as much of a surprise that an approach to research that lacks projectness would also lack a very orderly, systematic, or structured methodological approach (Law, 2002).

Part of articulating one's methodological approach is making a statement about what it is that methods are supposed to do. For research heavy with projectness, methods are taken up as tools for accessing the reality about an object of study (Law, 2002). Again, Law (2004) offers an alternative assumption: methods are tools for producing real-

ity. Note that Law's ideas about method are both ontological and epistemological — having to do with reality, not just knowledge (Law, 2004, p. 40). Much scholarship, Law explains, is rooted in EuroAmerican ontological assumptions, namely that reality is 'out there,' somewhere beyond ourselves and independent of our actions and perceptions. Reality thus comes before us. It is fixed and it is the same everywhere (Law, 2004, p. 24).[5] If reality is independent of what we do, then methods must be tools for discovery rather than production. It also follows that if reality is singular, then good methods should produce good results (i.e. the Truth) (Law, 2004, p. 40). Latour and Woolgar, in their ethnography of a science laboratory, suggest that the lab was invested in making unqualified claims (Law, 2004). The scientists understood that "Similarities, overlaps, stabilities, repetitions, or positive relations between statements tend to increase their authority" (Law, 2004, p. 28). By making statements without qualifiers, reality could be pinned down and definite (Law, 2004). In practice, though, Latour and Woolgar found that most statements were qualified and uncertain, "[n]ever achieving a modality-free existence" (Law, 2004, p. 28). There are strategies for making reality stable, though. In some cases, research results that do not appear to make sense according to knowledge generated prior, are dismissed as effects of faulty procedure (Law, 2004, p. 21).

---

[5] Law's (2004) specific language for the characteristics of the 'really real' according to EuroAmerican metaphysics is as follows: First, there is an assumption that there *is* a reality out there, beyond ourselves. Law refers to this simply as '*out-thereness*.' Second, whatever the character of the beyond may be, it is *independent* of our actions and our perceptions. Third, just as it is external to us, it comes before us. This is *anteriority*. Next comes *definiteness* which refers to the conception that whatever is out there, it is fixed. EuroAmerican conceptions of the beyond also understand it to be *singular* or the same everywhere. Last, whatever is real, it is not enchanted but *passive*.

Because I aim to do research that is informed by other-than-EuroAmerican onto-logical assumptions, I begin with an alternate understanding of methods as tools that participate in making realities that are multiple. I also begin with the assumption that different methods make different realities and that there is some choice about which kinds of realities to enact (Law, 2004, p. 13).[6] Indeed, the realities enacted by a set of methodological practices may be obviously contradictory or non-coherent with other realities. I am particularly interested in making worlds where what counts as fiction according to the realist and positivist method assemblages of EuroAmerican metaphysics can be taken up as actual (Gordon, 2008). Similarly, I aim to work outside of a EuroAmerican frame with regard to allowing, and even fostering, non-coherence, against the compulsion to craft grand narratives, singular and stable realities, the Truth.

Whichever realities *are* crafted are necessarily partial because not everything can be gathered together at once (Law, 2004, p. 83). For Law (2004), this partiality can be constructed in particular ways through what he calls method assemblages — a term that speaks to the *practices* involved in making particular presences or crafting boundaries between presences and absences (p. 161). Indeed, anything made present *depends* on absences and Law (2004) delineates between two kinds of absence on which presence rests. The first absence is manifest absence which is "enacted along with" and is "represented in" presence (Law, 2004, p. 157). The second kind of absence is Otherness which is

---

[6] I use the word multiple as defined by Annemarie Mol who does not refer to postmodern plurality but to the ways in which the many versions of each of subjects, objects, and the world, are made to hang together or are simply contradictory, in a state of noncoherence (Law, 2002). Mol (2002) uses the phrase "more than one — but less than many" (p. 55) as a means of thinking between the "singularities and pluralities of modernism and postmodernism," respectively (Law, 2002, p. 115).

equally necessary to presence but is disappeared, hidden from sight (Law, 2004, p. 162).

Take the promotional materials for the Native Education programming, introduced in the

previous chapter, as an example. The realities the Viewbook enact (*presence*) depend on

but are not equivalent to the FNMI-focused programming that they purport to represent

(manifest absence). And there are certain conditions that make the materials possible and

intelligible (*Otherness*). So, a method assemblage crafts boundaries or sets up particular

relations between presence, manifest absence, and Otherness and my example of Other-

ness above is only one of an endless number of possibilities. Some Othernesses, I argue,

are seething and angry and demand to be attended to even when they cannot be attended

to in any complete or final sense. I refer here to Avery Gordon's (2008) ghosts.

In her seminal text, *Ghostly Matters*, Gordon (2008) critiques what she calls a

"postmodernist positivism" or a postmodernism haunted by the ghosts of modernity. This

particular breed of positivism is one in which "everything is on view" and where "every-

thing can be described" (Gordon, 2008, p. 13). When all is white noise, hypervisible,

there can be no distinction between presence and absence, which Law (2004) argues is an

impossibility due to the buzzing and dazzling of hinterlands, all of the "potential patterns"

that are "too complicated to condense or to make present except "in the most selective

ways" (Law, 2004, p. 117). The sort of postmodernism that Gordon (2008) refers to thus

"displays an antighost side that resembles modernity's positivities more that it concedes"

(p. 13). And so I have attempted to craft method assemblages that might detect "and am-

plify particular [ghostly] patterns that would otherwise be below the threshold of detecta-

bility" (Law, 2004, p. 116). But what do I mean by ghosts or ghostly patterns? These are

"the repressed, in the form of . . . countervailing systems of value or difference", which

return from the past to haunt the present (Gordon, 2008, p. 16). Gordon (2008) and I do not refer only to dead or missing people but to those "echoes and murmurs of that which has been lost," (Radway, 2008, p. x) which tie "present subjects to past histories" (Radway, 2008, p. viii) through haunting. Gordon (2008) suggests that while ghosts are not immediately visible, or are Other, using Law's (2004) language, they constitute a seething presence that "ought to have remained secret and hidden but [have] come to light" (Schelling as cited in Freud, 1955, p. 224).[7] Pulling Law (2004) and Gordon (2008) together now, I suggest that writing ghost stories is the same thing as detecting those barely-perceivable patterns mentioned above.

Now, haunting has some important methodological implications because it is very much about *how we come to know* in the context of a "political and economic system that depends essentially on practices of social disappearance and enslavement" (Radway, 2008, p. ix). Knowing through haunting is an appropriate methodological approach when history fails to capture the buzzing and dancing that "charges" the now (Gordon, 2008, p. 142). I contend that this was absolutely the case in my exploration of the University of Lethbridge and it's FNMI-focused programs in relation to the residential schooling system, the buffalo, and Blackfoot land. I began writing this work as a traditional historical narrative but that form placed limitations on my ability to creatively explore how residential schooling impinges on the University which "despite [its] ideology of invention, does

---

[7] I do not mean to say that making Otherness *present* is the same task as making it *visible*. In fact, I attempt to return to earlier sociologies where the objects of study were "precisely those phenomena that cannot be adequately explained through exclusive examination of what is visible" (Granzow, 2016, p. 29).

not like too much of it" (Gordon, 2008, p. 20). So I have attuned myself to ghosts, something standard method assemblages can not do for their obsession with discovering the real. Bill Ramp suggested that I might not only attune myself to ghosts but that I might ghost, as in the verb 'to ghost' — actively conjuring up that which has been Othered (personal communication, May, 2015). I lean toward Ramp's articulation of the work that must be done here because it more clearly eludes to Law's (2004) contention that it is only according to EuroAmerican ontological assumptions that Reality is always already 'out there,' anterior, independent, definite, and singular and that it does not have to be so (Law, 2004, p. 26). That is, because I am attempting to work according other-than-EuroAmerican assumptions, I do not assume that ghosts are already Real, out there, just waiting to be discovered. I also recognize, however, that I cannot just conjure up whichever realities I like. I hold on to elements of that first articulation of *attuning* to ghosts because ghosting is only possible if ghosts are somewhere within the limits of Law's (2004) resonating hinterlands. The hinterlands of Native education in Canada, excessive and unknowable though they are, constitute "a set of potentials" from which to craft stories about a University haunted by the ghost of residential schools past (Law, 2004, p. 116).

There is at least one distinction between ghosting and any other articulation of a reality and there is at least one similarity. The similarity: *all* method assemblages detect and amplify particular realities (Law, 2004, p. 116). Law (2004) illustrates how this is done in Latour and Woolgar's ethnography of Salk Laboratories and in religious Quaker meetings. The distinction: There are more and less conventional method assemblages or method assemblages that produce more and less conventional boundaries around presence and absence. Law (2004) gives the example of unconventional Aboriginal enactments in

which "what is present is not strongly divided from the out-thereness it condenses" (p. 130). That is, an out-there Reality is not thought to inhere in the features of a specific case. I think that being guided by ghosts can craft similarly flexible boundaries because haunting mediates between "institution and person" (Gordon, 2008, p. 142). Gordon (2008) gives the example of Toni Morrison's *Beloved* in which Morrison tells the story of a once-slave-woman named Sethe. Sethe's life is not described in the book as the effect part of a cause and effect relationship with Slavery (Gordon, 2008, p. 142). That is, the story of Slavery is not enacted as an out-there reality that manifests without complication in Sethe's life. Slavery *is* made to matter to the conditions of Sethe's being but Sethe is not wholly subjected *as a slave, finally* (Gordon, 2008, p. 149). While I am not princi-pally attempting to tell a story about how colonization has mattered to the lives of indi-viduals, I do aim to illustrate how the past is present without telling a cause and effect story that enacts the cause as a singular historical reality and the effect as a wholly deter-mined representation of that Reality. And none of this is attempted just because. Part of conjuring ghosts or enacting a haunted reality is a response to a long history of positivist and violent research conducted on Indigenous communities. More on this later.

First, how and where will ghosting appear in the following pages? I conjure ghosts by proposing that, despite its self-promotion as Native-people-and-culture-friendly, the University of Lethbridge's Native Education program is haunted by colonial histories of the present and I attempt to illustrate what the contours of that haunting might look like. That is, I make ghosts where they have been made absent through the University's pro-motional claims. Further, throughout the text, you will stumble upon a number of inter-ludes, or what I am calling Buffalo Disarrangements. The buffalo, which wander in and

out of this work just as they did my research process, interrupt and unsettle the grounds upon which my claims, and the University, rest. Through these ghostly (and "fleshy and real, with wants, and a fierce hunger" (Gordon, 2008, p. 139)) buffalo, I articulate research as something like Freud's (1955) uncanny where "every attempt to find the marked or familiar path may bring one back again and again to one and the same spot, which one can identify by some particular landmark" (p. 237). I attempt to do some justice to the ghost's persistence, not by clearing the ground of its spirit or memorializing it, but by making a hospitable memory for it (Gordon, 2008, p. 58).

Making hospitable memories means asking how things might be otherwise, imagining alternative-to-settler-colonial worlds, and bringing them into being (Gordon, 2008, p. 57; Simpson, 2014, p. 8). Gordon (2008) suggests that a first step in such an endeavour might be to "insist not only on the unavoidability of dealing with" racism or colonialism but "also on the unavoidability of reckoning with . . . a haunting . . . by which worldly power is making itself felt in our lives, even if that feeling is vague" (p. 202). For Gordon (2008), a haunting is not only intellectual uncertainty but a feeling or unsettling sense that gets in the way of our ability to clearly distinguish "reality and fiction, . . . savage and civilized, self and other" (p. 53). Hauntings are transformative and involve making our selves into strangers (Gordon, 2008). The transformation has implications for how we come to know which can no longer be a process marked by "a detached know-it-all criticism" but must be characterized by a going beyond what "you already know just so" and a "passion for what is at stake" (Gordon, 2008, p. 203). Following Patti Lather's (2000)

writing practice,[8] I suggest that using Buffalo Disarrangements to interrupt the rest of the text is precisely a means of disturbing "the feeling of being on top of a situation through knowledge," thereby attending in some small way to Gordon's call (p. 287). Of course bringing new worlds into being is a task that already requires going somewhere other than what is familiar. To know in advance what these worlds might look like would be to miss the point. Andrea Smith (2014) suggests, though, that Indigenous peoples in Bolivia know that these worlds *are possible* because they are already being enacted through cere- mony (p. 224). The Tjurkpa of Australia contend that they exist in dreams and stories (Verran in Law, 2004, p. 129). And it has been suggested to me that the same is true for Blackfoot peoples (Harnett, personal communication, May, 2015; Ramp, Feb. 27, 2015). Law (2004), citing a personal conversation with Helen Verran, suggests that in these worlds, white folks are rendered ghostly (p. 135). Because the two worlds share little, communications between them are hampered by ontological disjuncture and by the Eu- roAmerican impulse to make coherence by granting just one enactment the status of Real- ity (Law, 2004, p. 136).

I, like Law (2004), contend that communication between worlds in not necessarily a good. But when these worlds are required to come into contact with one another, the consequences of disjunction paired with structurally and historically informed power im- balances often include the denigration or dismissal, or maybe even the recognition, inter- rogation and containment of Indigenous ontological resources. It is not my hope that this

---

[8] Lather and Smithies' 1997 text built from stories of women living with HIV/AIDS is interspersed with what they call "Angel InterTexts" (Lather, 2000, p. 286). These interruptions, along with the "interludes" Law (2004) places through his work in *After Method*, instruct my use of Buffalo Disarrangements.

project will serve to teach the U of L how to 'include' Indigenous worldviews or "how to act better towards racial others" (Ahmed, 2004, n.p.). I am not interested in improvement initiatives that do not change the landscape of power. Relatedly, I am not calling on Indigenous peoples to make themselves or their realities known to the University (Smith, 2014). I do hope, however, for a change in relations that is rooted in the kind of settler uncertainty that is necessary for decolonization (Mackey, 2014) and, more specifically, in ontological negotiations "about what there is" (Law, 2004, p.138). I do not conceive of this as a necessary step only for institutions that are serious about decolonization, but for settler-researcher-subjects who are serious about the same (Law, 2004, p. 138).[9]

How we do our research matters to the kinds of worlds our research enacts. So if we wish to enact worlds different from settler colonial worlds then EuroAmerican logics alone cannot inform our research practices. It is also important to attempt to step back from EuroAmerican modes of conducting research regarding Indigenous peoples because in colonial contexts, the disciplinary conventions and research methods associated with the social sciences and anthropology specifically, correlated well with the goals of Empire in that they were excellent tools for constructing and defining differences between colonizer and colonized (Simpson, 2014, p. 95-7). These methodological tools helped to contain, rank, and govern difference for the sake of obtaining space and resources, among other things (Simpson, 2014, p. 95-7; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012). Integral to projects designed to manage difference is a conceptualization of Indigenous peoples as fully knowable. Smith refers to these fully knowable research objects as dead subjects and placing Native

---

[9] I follow Tuck and Yang (2012) for whom decolonization refers to the "repatriation of Indigenous land and life" rather than to a metaphor for "other things we want to do to improve our societies and schools" (p. 1).

peoples under colonial lenses has been more strongly named a practice of genocide (Viego as cited in Smith, 2012, p. 214). A parallel can be drawn, I think, to any approach to researching Indigenous education and its messy relationship with colonizing efforts that assumes singularity and stability for the sake of crafting appropriate interventions. If probed carefully enough, charted meticulously enough, if researchers would just design their methods scientifically enough, then the crisis in Native education could be fixed. Such an approach relies on a realist ontology and positivist epistemology, a paradigm inextricably tied to colonizing research practices and Western ways of knowing (Tuhiwai Smith, 2012, p. 44). It brings to bear "a cultural orientation, a set of values, a different conceptualization of such things as time, space and subjectivity, different and competing theories of knowledge, highly specialized forms of language, and structures of power" (Tuhiwai Smith, 2012, p. 44). Not only would such an approach distort complexity into clarity, it would also constitute the reproduction of the myth that a EuroAmerican lens is equivalent to neutrality or objectivity, two key characteristics of scientifically valid research (Law, 2004, p. 2). That is, it might appear that the truth had been told about Native education, but that truth value would have been made possible only by privileging EuroAmerican ontological and epistemological resources, which is tantamount to a reproduction of the conditions that made and continue to make colonial violences possible. I want to make the "silences of Euro-American metaphysics" speak which is precisely why I have opted to enact a haunted University and to position myself as a haunted researcher (Law, 2004, p. 118). This is an ethical and political decision and one that acknowledges that truth might not be the gold standard in research (Law, 2004, p. 13). Law (2004) suggests that what is more important are our ontological politics or our "*political* reasons for

24

preferring and enacting one kind of reality rather than another" [original emphasis] (p. 13).

Now you know that I do not seek truth alone but to bring worlds that are non-correspondent with the current social order into being (Smith, 2012, p. 22). Perhaps this is the point at which you might be inclined to ask me, 'Okay, but *what is your method*?' (Gordon, 2008, p. 38). Gordon (2008) calls this a bloodless question (p. 40). It presupposes an account that will clean up the mess (Gordon, 2008). This kind of call and response glosses over the "least methodological portions of our work . . . where our discourse is unauthorized" and where our involvement is unruly (Gordon, 2008, p. 40). Law (2004), too, recognizes that the question of method is one that summons up "a relatively limited repertoire of responses" (p. 3). What Gordon points toward but Law explicitly articulates is that our methods-in-practice are complicated. When we account for our methods in our shiny, polished publications, however, we craft coherence and rely on abstractions (Gordon, 2008, p. 41; Law 2004, p. 4). Gordon (2008) is interested in what happens when we leave abstractions behind and provides her readers with an alternative question to ask: "what paths have been disavowed, left behind, covered over and remain unseen" (Gordon, 2008, p. 41)?

I did not conduct a series of semi-structured interviews with participants in the development of the NEp. I did not perform an ethnography of the Native Education classroom. I did not write an autoethnography based on my experience of enrolling in and then un-enrolling in the NEp. In fact I did not do anything that would allow me to claim expertise on Native education at the University of Lethbridge or on any other topic, for that

matter. It was not simply that these ideas did not come to mind. My original project trajectory did include conducting qualitative interviews with students of the program and the program's developers. It also included in-class observation, both in Native Education courses offered at the University and in on-reserve schools where Native ed. practicum students were teaching. In-class observations at the U of L were not possible because my timeline for completion conflicted with the timing of course offerings. Going on-reserve to do my research was interrupted and ultimately disavowed as a suitable method because of ethical concerns. While designing my project, I read too many descriptions of well-intentioned white researchers entering into Indigenous communities and doing more harm than good (see Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012). My supervisor also urged me to think of my potential presence in a Blackfoot middle school as something akin to the interventions of social workers or the practicum teachers themselves (Granzow, personal communication, April, 2015). 'Helping' professions have strong colonial foundations and continue to produce whiteness simultaneously as normative/unmarked and as a morally superior subject position (Badwall, 2014). Harjeet Badwall (2014), drawing on Barbara Heron, explains that helping professions are "built upon the professionalization of white femininity," historically defined as good and secured through "acts of helping others who were established as underdeveloped" (p. 6). I did not want my presence to generate the bitter aftertaste of the colonial (Gordon, 2008, p. 161). I was also hesitant to enter into a project where I might be more prone to talking about Native students and White practicum teachers in an oppositional and binary framework or to treating Indigenous children and their 'cultural difference' as a source of truth about the Native Education program. I was warned about this, again by Gordon, who refuses to render colonized subjects as simple, uncomplicated, or

26

accessible (Radway, 2008, p. viii). She follows LaRocque (2010) who knows that "colonization cannot explain everything" about who Indigenous peoples are and have been (p. 155), granting a "rich and contradictory subjectivity" to all (Radway, 2008, p. vii).

These are the paths I disavowed. I left interviews behind, too. I would have needed to conduct them if I wanted to clear up my confusions about why the NEp was initiated at the U of L or if I wanted to know how members of First Nations communities who participated in the making of the program felt about the consultation process. If I wanted to know whether talk of colonialism or residential schooling came up in meetings while the NEp was being developed, I would have needed to conduct interviews. Interviews would have been necessary if I wanted to know the content of some Blackfoot buffalo stories and how they contribute to the revival of Native paradigms. The list could go on a long time. But it seems to me that efforts to know Native education more clearly, more precisely, more scientifically, toward concrete 'steps forward,' have not yielded racism-free schools and lower rates of FNMI student attrition, for example. This is not to say that all existing research on Indigenous education is found wanting or even that lowered attrition rates is a good policy outcome. I am suggesting instead that because research that operates according to the principles of ontological realism and epistemological positivism is not only highly pervasive but highly authoritative, it is often taken up as the only kind of scholarship that decisions can be based on or that something can be done in response to. During my brief time as a student policy analyst at the Education Branch of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, my superiors relied on 'evidence-based research' to make their decisions but post-positivist, theoretical, and often Indigenous research was not treated as actionable or, in the words of one of my colleagues, was not 'digestible by

the Federal Government.' I am not upset that my work will not be taken up by future public servants as real scholarship. Interviews, especially if coded and analyzed quantitatively would have been an effort, in my case, to obtain certainty and firm grip. Moreover, I am in agreement with Ryan McMahon and Christi Belcourt (March 1, 2016) who know that the government cannot 'program and service' its way out of the crisis in Aboriginal education.

It was not only the character of the interview as a tool for smoothing out rough edges that I refused. Throughout the course of the last few years, I have briefly explained my project to a range of folks from both inside and outside of the academy. Many of them have asked me questions like these: Are you making use of our Elder resources? Are you talking to Native students? Have you interviewed any members of the Kainai Board of Education? I want to note that, for this project, I did not 'use' the U of L's Elders, I did not interview anyone, and I did not arrange formal conversations with local Indigenous peoples with the exception of my early committee meetings which included discussions with Tanya Harnett of the Carry the Kettle First Nation in Saskatchewan. I did not do these things for several reasons. First, this thesis is not centrally about naming features of Indigenous ontologies and Blackfoot culture is not my object of study. If this had been the case, consultation with Indigenous people would have been paramount. Second, the results of my work will not have any direct effect on Indigenous communities in and around Lethbridge in terms of new school programs or curricula, for example. This, in combination with the fact that Indigenous peoples employed by Universities are already stretched too thin, particularly through being 'invited' to sit on various committees as FNMI representatives, gave me pause regarding what it would mean for me to seek out Indigenous

interviewees (de Leeuw, Greenwood, & Lindsay, 2013).[10] It was important to me to step

away from asking folks to contribute to this project which will advance my academic ca-

reer but would not likely have mattered in a practical sense to the lives of potential partic-

ipants. Answering 'yes' to any of the above questions would *not have made my work in-*

nocent. That said, I recognize the political importance of engaging with the work of In-

digenous scholars, especially considering that part of the point of this work is to critique

and explore the ways in which Indigenous knowledges are unintelligible to or are refused

by the academy. I follow Susan Dion (2007) who attempts to work in community with In-

digenous people by requiring her students to engage with and position themselves in rela-

tion to the work of contemporary Indigenous artists. Similarly, my work is informed by

my interactions with scholarship crafted by Indigenous scholars such as Andrea Smith,

Eve Tuck, Leroy Little Bear, Christi Belcourt, Ryan McMahon, Verna St. Denis, Leanne

Simpson, Sheila Cote-Meek, and others.

So what paths *did* I take? Again, I return to ghosts. My methodological approach

is best described by Walter Benjamin's notion of blasting which refers to "following the

Buffalo disarrangement 1 — Buffalo methods

David Turnbull (2007) reminds us that the term method comes from "the Greek

meta after, and *todos* way or path" and he writes tracking prey as method (p. 142). Track-

ing requires the making and re-making of the landscape through carving new trails or

continuing to use trails already established. Tracking also builds cognitive connections

---

[10] For more on this matter, please refer to the footnote (#20) on page 56 of this thesis.

through the development of regional knowledge (Turnbull, 2007, p. 142). Method-as-following/making-a-trail, produces both knowledge and space (Turnbull, 2007).

Juanita Sundberg, drawing on the Zapatista movement and Turnbull's work, similarly argues that trail walking is intertwined with storytellings that "call forth and enact connections between people, place, and practices in time and space" (Turnbull as cited in Sundberg, 2014, p. 39). Trail walking makes worlds that "'interact, interfere, and mingle with each other' under asymmetrical circumstances" (Blaser as cited in Sundberg, 2014, p. 39).

What paths do I know and walk? What worlds do I enact through my walking and my talking on those trails (Sundberg, 2014)? Who might I run into and who am I unlikely to encounter? How might I walk and talk differently?

My attempts at doing research, at walking and writing archival trails, have continuously been interrupted by buffalo that meet me at various crossroads, their trails interfering with and defamiliarizing my own. Johannes Fabian might say that the buffalo have made me 'go out of my mind,' urging me to leave my "'comfortable psychological, political, and discursive place' to engage others" (as cited in Sundberg, 2014, p. 40). But the buffalo are not only ghostly and doing work on me. No, their fleshy selves are making worlds of their own and in partnership with the several Tribes on both sides of the medicine line that have signed the 2014 Northern Tribes Buffalo Treaty, detailing a commitment to restore buffalo to reserves and other co-managed lands (Derworiz, Sept. 23, 2014). Leroy Little Bear is one of those signatories and explains that the repatriation of the buffalo is both a means of renewing North American Indian paradigms and restoring ecological balance (Derworiz, Sept. 23, 2014).

30

And, indeed, "Buffalo till soil with their hooves and fertilize plants and spread seeds with their waste. They create living spaces for birds, prairie dogs and other small animals and feed apex predators like bears, wolves and people" (Schweber, Sept. 26, 2014). Furthermore, in places where buffalo have been restored to the wild, Buffalo Stories are renewed amongst Indigenous tribes, springing up like shoots from the seeds spread in the buffalo's wake, circulating where they had been quiet for a time (Harnett, personal communication, April, 2015). Because the life of the buffalo *is the life* of the signatory tribes (Ground as cited in Schweber, Sept. 26, 2014), the restoration of the buffalo and the worlds that they make, seem inseparable, to me, from the decolonial worlds enacted through the "repatriation of Indigenous land and life" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 1). *They make trails that are important to follow and to re-make.*

End.

scrambled trail the ghost leaves, picking up its pieces, setting them down elsewhere. Blasting might be conceived as entering through a different door, the door of the uncanny, . . . the door of the shocking parallel" (as cited in Gordon, 2008, p. 66). Though I entered at the U of L's Aboriginal education initiatives, residential schooling emerged in juxtaposition and the U of L became less familiar to me, its connections with a supposedly dissolved education system leading to a search that swept me along "an associative path of correspondences . . . [a] montage-based constructivism" (Gordon, 2008, p. 66). The first pieces I picked up were archival materials collected by the U of L on the development of the Native American Studies and Native Education programs and the U of L's relationship with Red Crow Community College. I also gathered information on the IRS system

31

from various academic texts and from the reports compiled by Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Information for the Buffalo Disarrangements was gathered from a range of news and social media sites and blog posts. The final piece of the montage included a body of University of Lethbridge promotional materials regarding FNMI-focused programming. I thus work entirely with textual materials and I do not organize those materials hierarchically as being more or less valid/accurate sources to engage with (Munslow, 2006, p. 35).

While archival materials might have been privileged as more serious documents to dissect and gather the truth from because of their status as primary documents, I recognize four things counter to the Western tradition of history writing (Munslow, 2006, p. 22): 1. The archival materials, like YouTube clips pertaining to the buffalo, were mediated by me, the researcher, who arrived at every source with "passions that matter" and a body of knowledge already more or less in place (Mol, 2002, p. 155). 2. Researchers cannot gain access to and tell about 'the past' in part because there are "no universal historical truths to be discovered" and because researchers can only craft plausible fictions from the historical texts they read (Munslow, 2006, p. 38). 3. The past is not singular (Law, 2004) and the past is not passed (Gordon, 2008; Granzow, 2016). So much of whatever has happened on days before this day "has not been said, recorded, or addressed . . . [by] others" who act intentionally and unintentionally, consciously and unconsciously (Granzow, 2016, p. 30). And that which is "rendered 'passed' nonetheless exists in the present as palimpsest or as hauntings . . . and can be intervened in in the present" (Granzow, 2016, p. 30). None of the materials, popular, historical, or promotional were passive. They did work on me, surprised me, bored me, and they were all actively engaged in the

enactment of particular kinds of realities (Mol, 2002, p. 49-50). And this is precisely why it matters when I tell you that the archives did not speak to all of my curiosities and could only provide a picture of possibilities. Missing materials "can not function as hinterlands, enacting realities based in part on what they say" (Granzow, personal communication, June, 2015).

Despite that I did not read any source as truer or more legitimate than the other, I did read them differently and for different things. For example, I read the Viewbook (2015) first as a naive reader and then as a reader with access primarily to Eurocentric and mainstream discourses about Indigenous peoples, the goodness inherent in Western education, and the innocence associated with whiteness and settler subjects and institutions (on naive reading, see Law, 2002). I read it also as the public face of the U of L's FNMI-focused programs and as a document that was designed to make the best versions of the programs present. I read it for remnants of colonial discourse and I asked what conditions made the Viewbook and its intelligibility possible. I also read Little Bear and Boldt's (1972) proposal for NAS and Native ed. in juxtaposition to the Viewbook and I asked specifically what the Viewbook left behind— which paths it disavowed and left uncovered (Gordon, 2008). In other words, I asked about how a series of narratives and relations accomplished the making of the Native education program through their overlaps and noncoherences. I asked the same with regard to the making of my personhood. Last, I read/wrote the archives on Red Crow as a counterdiscourse to the story told in the Viewbook about what the U of L is in relation to Blackfoot peoples and land as a means of theorizing the nature of my own embodied and emplaced colonialisms.

Through the Disarrangements, I crafted what Law (2002) calls an academic pinboard. The pinboard, like the logic of blasting as a method, is all about juxtaposition and pastiche. I conceptualize the pinboard as something slightly like Hugh Raffles' (2011) *Insectopedia* wherein each chapter of the book is in one way or another about insects and simultaneously "index[es] a variety of things at the same time," including but far from limited to anti-semitism, post-humanism, and the tensions and correspondences between science and art (Mann et al., 2011, p. 228). My very novice attempt at doing something similar should perhaps not be compared with Raffles' expert writing and thinking but as Mann et al. (2011) suggests, I aim to build a case through which to index many things. My pinboard will feature content ranging from sculptures to blog posts to treaties, all to do with the buffalo. I did not read this content for anything in particular at first. It was only through surprising (dis)associations with several other seemingly unrelated texts that a pinboard began to emerge. For example, a buffalo sculpture would make its way into my thinking during a coffee shop conversation only to reappear again in the U of L archives. And Leroy Little Bear who helped to bring Native American Studies to the U of L was also the signatory of a Buffalo Treaty which signifies a commitment by First Nations to repatriate the buffalo to the plains. Following the buffalo opened up an exploration of the centrality of the repatriation of land in decolonization, the flexibility and renewal of Native paradigms, the enactment of worlds beyond settler colonialism, and even new directions in Indigenous and anti-racist education. So I ask how the case of the appearance of the buffalo in relation to the U of L might matter elsewhere.

In all of my reading for Chapter 2 and the Disarrangements, I attempted to allow poststructural theory to "make a difference" to my research practices by doing damage to

the common practice of "analyzing the 'data'" by "digging up themes or stacking up categories, or finding or enforcing innocence, literal meaning, and uncomplicated goodwill" (MacLure, 2011, p. 998). My approach was indeed disorienting but not only for its lack of structure and order. Trying to break with and challenge EuroAmerican ontological assumptions and colonial modes of doing research regarding Indigenous peoples presents a significant challenge to anyone who has not only been thoroughly steeped in such assumptions and modes but made through them. My response to that challenge has been necessarily limited and incomplete but simultaneously fruitful, I think. It has, in some respects, undone me, demanding a recognition of complicity in ongoing colonial violence and a willingness to continually ask what are my responsibilities as a settler subject to Indigenous peoples and lands. The pages that follow are my ongoing and troubled attempts at grappling with this question alongside my exploration of how the U of L as a settler colonial institution fits in to an Indigenous landscape and how it might be otherwise.

Chapter 2 — On multiple and contradictory institutions, programs, and subjects

> universities are not safe ground
>
> - Taiaiake Alfred (2004, p. 88), *Warrior Scholarship*

The Native Education program is:[11]

1. the Native American Studies program + "in-depth preparation in how to teach" and an opportunity to develop "a strong knowledge base in the subject area they intend to teach" (*Native Education*, 2015)[12]

2. the Native American Studies program + 20 courses in Education (*Native Education Requirements*, 2017)[13]

3. a combined degree + a chance to learn how to "inspire others to discover hidden talents and reach for their dreams" and "to engage FNMI students in the classroom," perhaps partially through the transfer of Elder knowledge (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 14-5)[14]

---

[11] The Native Ed. program is a 50 course, 5-year combined degree program (*Combined Degrees*, 2017). Students that wish to enroll must complete a B.A. with a General Major in the Social Sciences with 7 courses in NAS or a B.A. in NAS alone (*Native Education*, 2015). NAS majors must also complete a 7-course minor in a 'school subject' like Mathematics or Social Studies (*Native Education*, 2015). Upon graduation, students will be awarded two degrees — a B.A. and a B.Ed.. The NAS component is at the core of the Native Ed. program with just 2 of 5 years dedicated to the teacher training component. During that time, students are required to complete 27 weeks of practicum work (*Field Experiences*, 2017).

[12] The content on this webpage falls under the University's 'Programs &Admissions > Our Programs' portion of the Uleth Homepage.

[13] This webpage can be found a few clicks after selecting 'Aboriginal Initiatives' under the 'About' tab on the Uleth Homepage.

[14] The 2015-2016 FNMI Viewbook, developed in tandem by Enrollment Services and Advancement Communications (Sackney, e-mail communication, 8 June, 2016) was a printed source (though also available online), circulated at high schools, career fairs, recruitment visits and the like. It was the last FNMI Viewbook developed. FNMI-focused programming is now inserted into the general undergraduate programming Viewbook toward efforts at "environmental sustainability", making the 2015-2016 FNMI Viewbook a much richer source of information (Sackney, e-mail communication, 8 June, 2016). It contains both a comprehensive list of FNMI-specific programming, including details on NAS (p. 12-13) and the NEp (p. 14-15), and a statement about what/who the University is in relation to surrounding Indigenous communities

4. a program designed to equip Native learners committed to teaching, especially and specifically in Indigenous languages, in classrooms primarily made up of Native children + a means of disseminating alternative-to-eurocentric knowledges, histories, cultures, and teaching techniques (Little Bear & Boldt, 1972)

The first three of the above 'descriptions' of the U of L's Native education program come from three different promotional/informational sources as detailed in the footnotes. The fourth is from the U of L archives, specifically a copy of the initial proposal for the development of the Native American Studies and Native Education programs. Of course, the unquoted wording is my own and every source contained more information than cited here. I constructed the selections of words and phrases above to illustrate what I take to be the range of enactments of the NEp in different locations. The NAS program is enacted variously as well:

1. a nationally sought-after exploration of various disciplines "from a unique Native perspective" + an investigation of FNMI "history, heritage and culture" and "the contemporary issues that face FNMI communities" + an occasion to develop "exceptional written and communication skills" and other abilities that can "be applied to practically any working scenario" (*Native American Studies*, 2015)

2. a range of courses from several disciplines taught from "a Native perspective," "developed jointly by representatives of southern Alberta's Native communities and the

---

(p. 1). This document also provides readers with a rationale for choosing the U of L (p. 4-5) and some short biographies of Indigenous uLethbridge Alumni currently hired as staff at the U of L (p. 2-3). There is a description of the Native American Studies Association as a place where students can meet other folks with the "same cultural background and interests" (p. 31). A list of student support services with descriptors is also provided (p. 32-33) finishing with a message from Leroy Little Bear (p. 35), Special Assistant to the President.

University" + a study of Native peoples, their cultures and languages, and "their var-

ied relationships with other Native [*sic*] and Non-Natives" + a means of providing

students "with an awareness and appreciation of cultural differences" (*Native Educa-*

tion Requirements, 2017)

3. an opportunity to "connect to the culture, roots and language of people indigenous to

North America" + an exploration of "current issues facing Native communities with a

historical Native perspective [that] will provide you with a greater depth of under-

standing" + "a path toward [your] true identity"[15] + an education on how to become

aware of "cultural differences" and "formulate solutions" when they arise (*FNMI*

Viewbook, 2015, p. 12-3)

4. a "Program of Studies" developed for and alongside Native American students and

surrounding Native communities + an opportunity for Native students to gain a Uni-

versity education without fear of assimilation or alienation from their communities +

a means of simultaneously critiquing the U of L's European biases and incorporating

Indigenous peoples, metaphysical assumptions, and viewpoints into the fabric of the

institution toward equality in education and against discrimination and prejudice (Lit-

tle Bear & Boldt, 1972)

It seems apparent that these two FNMI-focused programs are different things at

different promotional and archival sites. On one webpage NAS is oriented toward the *ap-*

preciation of cultural difference while on another, it is designed to help students solve the

---

[15] The materials make use of student testimony here. For one graduate of the NAS program, the only stu-
dent quote featured, years spent at the U of L constituted "a path toward my true identity" (*FNMI View-*
book, 2015, p. 15). The pamphlet, though, relies on her statement to draw in prospective students who
might hope that their time at the U of L will do the same.

problem of cultural difference. Sometimes NAS is about *connection* and sometimes it is about *investigation*. One NAS is *job training*, another is *facilitating deep understanding*. The Native perspective, though always troublingly homogenized, is sometimes *unique*, sometimes *historical*, and sometimes *a tool for seeing more profoundly*. At one site NAS is concerned with '*non-Natives*', in another *Eurocentricity,* and at others sites, white folk or whiteness simply do not feature in any explicit way.[16] One NAS seems driven by the *changing needs, desires, capacities, and complexities* of Indigenous communities while another aims to speak to the *issues* those communities face. In two of the three contemporary, non-archival sites, where NAS and Native education are explicitly paired as a combined degree program, NAS appears not to matter to the education portion of the degree except as a foundation (*Native Education*, 2015; *Native Education Requirements*, 2017). That is, the 'Native' in Native education appears to come from prior courses completed in NAS. First, the student investigates 'Native culture,' and then they learn how to teach but teaching as a discipline does not appear to be re-thought through the lens built in the NAS portion of the degree. This changes in the Viewbook (2015) where Native education is at least partially about Elder knowledge and FNMI student engagement (p. 14-15).

---

[16] In the promotional materials, the term non-Native is taken up as the antonym of 'Native' and while the materials suggest that the differences between the two people groups referenced by these highly dichotomized and oppositional terms are cultural, I suggest that the language of cultural difference often codes for racial difference (Larocque, 2010, p. 138). Eurocentricity refers explicitly to European *cultural* superiority as opposed to some valuation based on 'race' (Steinberg as cited in Smedley & Smedley, 2005, p. 19). But "The social characteristics of race in America" include the assumption that "each race has distinctive cultural behaviours linked to their biology" (Smedley & Smedley, 2005, p. 20). While the promotional and archival materials refer to Eurocentricity, Natives and non-Natives, my own use of the word whiteness refers to a location of structural privilege, a viewpoint, and a set unmarked practices (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 1). White folk are those individuals who are positioned as white and/or take up whiteness as a social position. Whiteness and Eurocentricity are not identical but are connected. Whiteness as a viewpoint might be informed by a Eurocentric worldview, for example.

These various, and sometimes contradictory, versions of NAS and Native Education are the early consequences of my theorizing noncoherent multiplicity by reading naively as a methodological practice (Law, 2002). For Law (2002), the naive reader is what it sounds like — someone who knows nothing about what they're reading or, in my case, simply cannot make many assumptions about the character of the promotional materials, their content, or who they're meant to reach (p. 12). A non-naive reader flipping through the promo materials would tell you that they are written to prospective U of L students with some kind of an interest in 'Native issues' or Aboriginal peoples, generally. An historian scanning the archives might tell you that the Native Education program was designed primarily to equip Native preservice teachers to teach Native and non-Native students. But I do not seek coherence in the form of unified and consistent FNMI-focused programming at a similarly singular University of Lethbridge. Reading naively allows me to think about Law's (2002) idea that because promotional materials do the work of representation, they necessarily communicate something other and more about the programs than whatever is explicitly said. That is, reading naively is a means of thinking and writing the programs and the University as multiple. In the following pages, I will explore what sorts of 'other' and 'more' these materials do and do not communicate with regard to what the University and its programs are oriented toward and which kinds of student subjects they might call out to. I will propose that one might read various and contradictory logics, colonial and anti-colonial, in a single text and I will speculate about what the effects of that contradictoriness might be. What I will not do is make any arguments about which logics, which distributions, constitute the truth about the University or its programs. I am more interested in how coherence gets made, especially through the deferral

of alternative words, images, concepts. To get a sense of this, I will set up Leroy Little Bear and Menno Boldt's 1972 proposal for NAS and Native education next to the promotional materials and ask what the promotional materials leave behind. Finally, I will make an attempt at situating myself as a settler scholar trying to do anti-colonial work from within an institution with colonial foundations. My concluding thoughts are on what might be necessary work for the U of L to do if its stated investments in reconciliation are to be actionable.

The FNMI Viewbook and two logics in tension

The 2015-2016 University of Lethbridge FNMI Viewbook is a particularly interesting promotional source because it embeds representations of NAS and NEd in a narrative about who/what the University is in relation to Blackfoot peoples and lands, because it was designed for an FNMI readership, and because it is especially visually rich. It explains that First Nations culture has been "weaved into" University "programming, teaching and research" from the very beginning of the U of L's life as an institution (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 1). This cultural incorporation has had the effect not only of "enriching" the U of L but also creating a supportive environment for FNMI students who are promised access to self-determination, and power inasmuch as "knowledge is power and education is the key" (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 5). The Viewbook's glossy pages feature stunning landscape photography. The U of L's location "in the heart of traditional Blackfoot territory" is represented with a two-page photo of University Hall nestled in the rolling coulees, pink blooms blurred out just behind the printed story of how the University came to be called Medicine Rock by Blackfoot Elder Bruce Wolf Child (*FNMI View-*

41

book, 2015, p. 1). The opening line, "The Rock is Here", is partially transparent, illuminated with a yellowy tint (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, n.p.). The two pages dedicated to the Native Education program also feature a photo of the coulees, the University located somewhere out of site. The viewer's eye can travel all the way across the Old Man River, the hills impossibly vibrant and impossibly green. As I spent time with the Viewbook I wondered: Am I looking at images that connote an unknowable world, a "howling wilderness," "intuited over the horizon" (DeLucia, 2012, p. 135; Sestigiani, 2014, p. 3)? Or am I looking at land that is already known and has been listened to and lived in relationship with since time immemorial (DeLucia, 2012)? Where the University is visible, I wonder if its presence is welcomed or if it is colonial architecture, a wound in the territory, part and parcel with efforts at dividing the land to come to know it and to own it (Sestigiani, 2014, p. 6)? I wonder - can the colonial logics of "wagon trains and pioneers" and "destiny made manifest" operate at the same time or in tension with a recognition of Indigenous relations to the land (DeLucia, 2012, p. 134)? I think that they can and absolutely do. The Viewbook, when read naively, enacts the U of L and its FNMI-focused programming as only fractionally coherent, hanging together but simultaneously shedding and sticking to 'past' colonial imagery and discourse. And if the objects it represents are decentered or multiple, then I suggest that the Viewbook might make or require a multiplicity of reading subjects as well (Law, 2002).

The Viewbook makes multiple reader subjects

The Viewbook's (2015) version of the Native Education program says that graduates will be gifted with the ability to inspire FNMI children to discover their "hidden talents and reach for their dreams" (p. 14). The Viewbook is the only source examined that

romanticizes teaching in this way, calling on future teachers' well-intentioned desires to do good for the next generation. The imagery is romantic as well, full of light. There are sun flares, coulees that glow, translucent text illuminated with a yellow tint. Certainly there are no obvious signs of ghosts. I imagine a reader who gets lost in the Viewbook's rich and textured photography and inspirational quotes, visioning a future where she 'makes a difference' through warm relationships with challenging students and creative classroom instruction. I imagine that in her daydreaming, she feels fulfilled, assured that her decision to become a teacher was the right one, if it was even a choice at all. She has always felt drawn, even called, to the classroom (Manuel & Hughes, 2006).[17] Manuel and Hughes (2006), in their study of why folks want to be teachers, suggest that despite "the postmodernist tendency to eschew continuities and grand narratives . . . this research, placed alongside that gathered over the past three or more decades, provides some weight to the notion of 'teaching as calling' as a core motivation to teach" (p. 11). The authors argue that the desire to teach comes from somewhere inside the self, deeply attached to "humanistic" or "'social justice' dimensions" like 'helping' and 'making a difference' (p. 11).

Carol Schick (2000a) speaks back to Manuel and Hughes' (2006) claim in her analysis of qualitative interviews conducted with preservice teachers after their completion of a cross-cultural education course. Schick's participants, like Manuel and Hughes',

---

[17] While the two page spread devoted to the Native Education program in the Viewbook does not contain extensive textual fodder for my imaginings, print pamphlets for the Faculty of Education, though not engaged with here, certainly do. Moreover, the intelligibility of the Viewbook depends on what readers already know to be true and my imaginings fall squarely in line with popular (and sometimes academic) discourse on teaching.

talked about teaching as "part of something that's been in me" or as "something I always was anyway" (Schick, 2000a, p. 91). Schick (2000a) departs from Manuel and Hughes, though, by refusing to forget "the constructedness of the subject" (p. 87). The teachers' 'called' inner selves come into being through discourse, are historically and socially situated (Schick, 2000a). The notion of the preexisting core of authentic teacher-ness can only seem natural if we consider "the class, ethnic origins, race, gender, sexuality, [and] education levels" of the participants who positioned themselves as "middle-class, objective, non-political, educated, individualistic" and self-determining (Schick, 2000a, p. 91). Schick interprets these self-identifications as claims to whiteness and while I understand that objectivity and neutrality are tied up with white masculinities, I am interested in thinking about the self-identifications she delineates as claims to white femininity. I say this because white women make up the vast majority of public school teachers, so much so that some school boards have begun to seek out male minority teachers to better reflect student body demographics in their districts (Hammer & Alphonso, Feb. 28, 2013). There is relevant historical continuity here, too. Settler teacher subjects in colonial contexts were often women. Though they were not generally called upon to take on authoritative roles within schools, women's labour was heavily relied upon in the operation and staffing of Indian residential schools and in other settings where young Indigenous children were being educated in Catholic and Protestant traditions (*Honouring the Truth*, 2015, p. 125). The Viewbook, then, might indeed call out to an inner self and evoke a visceral reaction that appears natural but I contend that despite the fact that the booklet was designed for an FNMI readership, it speaks to and makes white feminine reader subjects

44

through its talk of dreams. This is amplified by the Viewbook's manifestation of the University's motto, *Fiat Lux* or let there be light.

The U of L motto coheres with the colonial imperative to bring light to dark places where light is a distinctly European, Western, and white version of knowledge and civilization and dark alludes so frequently to non-European, savage, Others. Setting this light/dark binary up next to Schick's (2000a) analysis becomes especially poignant when we consider that education for Indigenous peoples has historically been carried out in residential schools toward assimilative ends. Myra Rutherdale (2002) explains that settler missionary portrayals of Aboriginal cultures and peoples relied upon "metaphors of simplistic dualism" like dark and light to make sense of "complex colonial relationships" (p. 37). Aboriginals were associated with a darkness that could be lightened by accepting Christian doctrine and abandoning Aboriginal cultural practices like the potlatch (Rutherdale, 2002, p. 35). Missionary women were well-intentioned and convinced that "Christianity and the empire were inextricably linked and that 'heathenism' had to be eradicated" (Rutherdale, 2002, p. 156). Christine Carleton, an Anglican missionary and teacher at Gwayasdums in the late 1890s wrote to the Church Missionary Society that while she was very contented in her work, she questioned her efficacy, lamenting that not many people had "'come out of darkness' to see God's 'marvellous light'" under her tutelage (as cited in Rutherdale, 2002, p. 37-8). The residential school system has, of course, come to be recognized as deeply violent despite some survivor accounts that suggest otherwise. Paulette Reagan's (2010) engagements with IRS survivors have convinced her that "the road to hell is indeed paved with good intentions" (p. 3). Surely Carleton felt called (by God), similar to the teachers interviewed by Manuel and Hughes and Carol

Schick. But when white femininity continues to be secured as good through acts of 'help-ing' racialized Others in professional contexts like teaching and social work, then perhaps the Viewbook's ability to speak to future teachers' called inner selves should not be cele-brated (Badwall, 2014). The selves just detailed depend, after all, on Indigenous students who are always already in need of the help of enthusiastic settler teachers (for an example of how this occurs in the classroom, see Hyland, 2005). Schick (2000a), citing Robertson, describes the dreams of helping that Manuel and Hughes laud as admirable, as dreams of love which support "subjects' desire for legitimacy, authority and power 'that they might properly embody the desire to dominate'" (p. 91). Indeed, this colonial IRS history con-tinues to hold on in multiple ways in the Viewbook which promises that the NEp will equip preservice teachers with the gifts of inspiration, talent-discovery, and dream-reach-ing. The Viewbook draws on a hinterland in which a violent whiteness is thought superior and made innocent. So despite that the Viewbook is positively dreamy, I contend that the ghosts of residential schooling haunt the text.

What's more is that a substantial body of literature suggests that one of the effects of student participation in courses designed to provide preservice teachers with some multi/cross-cultural or anti-racist competencies is that while some sympathy toward those racialized as Other emerges, students continue to employ discourses that reproduce white-ness as a position of power, hence securing the dominance of their own identities (see, for example, Marx 2004; Picower, 2009; Schick, 2000b; Solomona, Portelli, Daniels, & Campbell, 2005). That is, privileged learners often come to understand themselves as good whites who arrive at places of innocence through education (Jeffrey, 2007; Schick & St. Denis, 2005) and as long as the definition of a suitable teacher is bound up with

pledging allegiance to white values, "public education is in no danger of disrupting its long-term effects of social reproduction" (Schick, 2000a, p. 91). If one of the effects of cross or multicultural education is that students learn how to better perform whiteness and make (fictional) light where there is (fictional) darkness, then what are the limits and dangers of the Native Education program at the U of L — a program designed to equip students to teach in majority FNMI classrooms?

Despite that I have argued that the Viewbook speaks to and makes white feminine and settler subject readers, I also read the promotional materials as speaking to and making deficient or in-need Indigenous not-subjects (Schick, 2000a, p. 87). There is no explicit talk of FNMI students as lacking but there is a long list of FNMI-specific "avenues of support" offered by the U of L (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 5). And though they are not mentioned in the Viewbook, the Native Education program has admissions procedures designed specifically for Aboriginal students (*Undergraduate Calendar*, 2016, p. 159-60). While Ken Montgomery (2013) suggests that racialized Others are often represented as "deficient in some ways, or merely too different to be reasonably accommodated," accommodations and student supports are plentiful at the U of L (p. 9). The U of L promises its future students "community, support, and success" (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 1). This promise is seemingly fulfilled by an FNMI recruitment officer whose job is to "encourage and support" students as they "investigate [their] post-secondary options" (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 3), "Tutoring, mentor programs, financial assistance options, daycare" (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 5), the Niitsitapi Gathering Place "where Elders share stories, teach and provide wisdom" (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 5), and Student Supports for Aboriginal Students in Health Sciences which "works to improve cultural sensitivity and

cross-cultural education on campus and in the community" (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 18). The list is longer than suggested here and there is an additional two page spread detailing a "Circle of Support" that includes an Elders Program, an FNMI Librarian and several other services (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 32-3).

In the U of L archives pertaining to the development of the NEp, materials from the early 1970s frequently refer to the question of admissions procedures and student services. Mostly, the question is 'what should procedures and services be?' rather than 'why is it important to have special procedures and services?' And in some instances, flexible admissions procedures are made to fall under the task of developing a "Support System" (Beckel, Dec. 23, 1971; Lane, May 17, 1993). It is, therefore, a bit tricky to discern whether the U of L thought it important to accommodate for perceived deficits, cultural differences, general incompatibilities with the usual way of things, or none of the above. I do get the sense, though, that making up for a perceived lack in Native students' abilities was at least one of the reasons for developing a range of services. In a 1993 memo, two members of the Native American Teacher Education Committee noted the importance of interviewing "all prospective Native Education majors" for the purpose of sharing information "concerning services offered" and discussing "teaching experiences and opportunities" (Lane & Hesch, March 25, 1993, p. 2). In a follow-up email, the interview continued to be suggested as something "all Native Education majors" should go through but was simultaneously listed as a means of "increasing program support for First Nation's Students" and reframed as a means of informing students about the "dimensions and expectations" of the major (Lane, May 17, 1993). Moreover, at least two members of the committee thought it necessary to inform "all prospective teachers at our university" of

the "limitations and possibilities for aboriginal children" (Lane & Hesch, March 25, 1993, p. 2). Almost 2 decades earlier, "tutoring, guidance, and counselling services" for "Native American students" were named as important to "assur[ing] success in Education" (Dupree, Dec. 16, 1975, p. 2).

So it seems that services were developed at least in part to keep students in the program and that the admissions interview was introduced to get students in to the program in the first place. "Normal requirements" were thought to be too high for Native students who might be discouraged from participating if the minimum GPA was not lowered (Mokosch, Aug. 18, 1972). Little Bear and Boldt (1972) agreed that admissions should be made more flexible but that such alterations would not "necessarily mean the lowering of standards" (p. 12). I suspect that this qualifier may have been made in response to earlier concerns voiced about the "realities of staffing such a [Native American Studies] department" (*A Chronological Account*, June 28, 1973, p. 11). Those realities included a need to interpret Faculty legislation and policy more flexibly. This was agreed to but again with the qualifier that "academic standards and excellence shall not be diminished" (*A Chronological Account*, June 28, 1973, p. 11). On Dec. 18, 1995, a member of the Faculty of Education at the U of L, wrote to the Dean of Education in a report on Aboriginal Teacher Education in Canada that affirmative action initiatives, like flexible admissions procedures, are often designed to "overcome limitations in a candidate's capacity to perform at a level normally required for university entrance" (Hesch, Dec. 18, 1995, p. 7). I am inclined to think that this is precisely the logic behind the U of L's work on support services for Aboriginal students. This inclination is not only informed by my reading of the U of L archives but by a haunting knowledge of the fact that similar logics informed a common

IRS practice of privileging vocational training over academics. Residential schools rarely offered high school courses, in part because of a "racist assumption that Native children were not capable of success at a relatively advanced academic level" (Miller, 1996, p. 390). Again, I argue that the hinterlands of the U of L's programming include IRS ghosts.

Another sign which I contend points to ghosts is that there seems to have been some resentment bubbling under the surface at the U of L with regard to the level of support offered to Native students. During a 1973 conference on Teacher Education for Native Students, one unnamed attendee scribbled a note next to the topic heading "Student Identity and Student Services," reading "To what extent if any should the University attempt to be all things to all people? Shouldn't the primary responsibility of the University deal with + emphasize the cognitive aspect?" (*Conference*, April 6, 1973). Years later, in a document lauding the successes of the teacher education program, the "advising and counselling of these [Native] students" is described as "a near overwhelming task" (*Native American Education*, Jan. 1977, p. 2). The immense work of supporting the students of the program, however, was framed as an important kind of help, ensuring that the "road to success" would not be "littered with fatalities because no one cared" (p. 2).

Through the Native Education program and the attendant supports, then, the University is positioned as caring toward Indigenous peoples and perhaps even unimplicated in ongoing colonial violences. I suggest, though that all of the help and all of the caring has the effect of reifying the fiction that FNMI students are lacking and that they require institutional support offered in 'circles.' Given that racism is consistently identified as a central factor in high attrition rates for Indigenous students in Canada and elsewhere, and that 3 decades of attention to building culturally-based education has not remedied the

problem of high attrition rates, it seems that student supports might more effectively come

in the form of anti-racism initiatives (Cote-Meek, 2014, p. 64; Purdie, Tripcony, Boulton-

Lewis, Fanshawe, & Gunstone, 2000; Cameron, B., 2009). None of this is to say that the

listed accommodations should be done away with or that they alone constitute a colonial

problem in the current context but I do wonder what kind of work needs to be done to re-

move the need for extensive supports in the first place. And how to offer supports that do

not essentialize a range of Indigeneities into easy shapes like circles which stand in per-

fect contradistinction to an equally homogenized and linear West?

A second reading

So far I've suggested that the Viewbook makes/requires two kinds of reader sub-

jects: white feminine settler teachers and culturally different/deficient Indigenous stu-

dents. But in the spirit of reading naively (Law, 2002) and avoiding comfortable stories

(Pillow, 2003), I am compelled to think some tension into my initial reading. As the

Viewbook (2015) comes to a close, the bright and fiery imagery settles into the rich cara-

mel oranges tones of a sunset. A sparkly sun flare passing over the Library and through

the needles of a coniferous tree places "the future" in the hands of the reader, extending

an invitation to meet the "uLethbridge family" (p. 39). The final enticement sits in the

hazy golden sky, calling upon future enrolees to "explore your options, expand your per-

spective, celebrate your heritage, and work toward an incredible future" (p. 39). I can im-

agine that the light in the Viewbook might be a sign of something other than ongoing co-

lonial violence through education. The images are warm and full of promise. I remember

that for myself and for many Indigenous students, too, the University is the first educa-

tional site at which colonial histories get confronted and counterstories are told (Cote-

Meek, 2014). I wonder whether the Viewbook might draw on multiple and contradictory hinterlands in its representations. Might the Viewbook speak to prospective preservice teachers who imagine working with young people toward Indigenous futurity and sovereignty? Perhaps some of the warmth and light that is so central to the appeal of the Viewbook comes from the excitement of the 1970s when the National Indian Brotherhood (NIB) called for Aboriginal cultural revitalization in response to the Indian Residential School system which has become infamous for its attempts at eradicating and assimilating Indigenous lifeways into a Eurocentric mainstream (Comeau, 2005, p. 22). The NIB's call for cultural renewal was coupled with another for Indian Control of Indian Education or education toward Indigenous self-determination and the amelioration of "systemic social inequality" (St. Denis, 2007, p. 1080; see also Cote-Meek, 2014, p. 55). And when Little Bear and Boldt wrote their proposal for the NAS and Native Education programs in 1972, it had only been a few years since a "combination of Native criticism, public revelations of inadequacies in the schools, and Aboriginal demands for greater control of Native schooling led . . . to a decision to close the residential schools entirely" (Miller, 1996, p. 396). This was a time charged with resistance against colonial education and I wonder if the programs have held on in some ways to those dreams of Indigenous futurity.

I wonder because some of the images break with colonial narratives about who Indigenous peoples are, what they know, and where they belong. On two pages detailing why students should choose the U of L, we see (racially marked) Aboriginal students leaning over rows of computers in a classroom that appears to boast expensive technologies (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 6-7). The projector screens are chalk full of line graphs and stats. I suggest that these students do not belong to that colonial narrative that says

that while Aboriginal peoples can be good craftsmen they cannot be scientists.[18] These

are students that belong at the U of L as becoming-researchers in a lab rather than as re-

search objects or cultural informants. Another example: Atop the vibrant coulees pictured

on the two page spread that offers a representation of the Native Education program,

stand five Blackfoot women, all with Master's degrees in Education (*Viewbook*, 2015, p.

16-17). These women are not portrayed as historical artifacts — those Indians of the colo-

nial imaginary, dressed only ever in braids and traditional regalia, 'authentic' and belong-

ing firmly in the past. They are simultaneously Blackfoot and University educated, a legal

impossibility under the 1876 Indian Act which made enfranchisement compulsory for

Status Indians who acquired higher education (Furi & Wherrett, 2003). This was reversed

in 1951 (Furi & Wherrett, 2003). In reading some of the Viewbook images, I am re-

minded that colonization is not, and cannot be, complete, that Blackfoot peoples are not

disappeared or singularly damaged, that efforts toward Indigenous sovereignty continue. I

want to suggest, then, that the Viewbook does not only draw on and reproduce discursive

constructions of deficient native subjects and white feminine helpers. I think it might also

speak more quietly to folks who are taking up anti-racist subjectivities and who are com-

mitted to the "repatriation of Indigenous land and life" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 1).

I want to note here that haunting does not always work in straightforward or deter-

minate ways. Haunting is not about a causal relationship between past and present. My

examples of haunting so far have been restricted to the ways in which there *is* historical

---

[18] The myth (potentially) being countered here is that "only Whites are 'objective'", a trait required for pro-
ducing apolitical, scientific knowledge (Larocque, 2010, p. 70, 30). Refer to Chapter 1, p. 23-25, for more
on this.

continuity between IRS practices and contemporary education programming at the U of L but this second reading which suggests a break from IRS histories does not necessarily suggest an escape from ghosts. The past is present here, just not in ways we might expect. I argue that the NEp at the U of L can only be read as a progressive and perhaps even anti-colonial program against a backdrop of colonial imaginaries and material violences. And the effects of these various kinds of haunting are not straightforward either. None of the discursively constituted subject positions articulated thus far is discrete or pure and none is occupied just one at a time. The readers of the Viewbook and of the other promotional and informational materials are necessarily made multiply and contradictorily and are also always in flux (Davies, 2000).

Contradictory universities of Lethbridge

If the promotional materials make various reading subjects then I suggest that they also make multiple Universities of Lethbridge. So what happens when an institution is read as multiple? What might the effects be of contradictory logics in tension? What happens when multiplicity cannot be assimilated into a singular story and the researcher's position as knower is thrown into question (Law, 2002)? I can only speculate about possibilities but I will begin here: The Viewbook (2015) illustrates that the U of L knows something about how to be/appear good in relation to Indigenous peoples and lands. It knows that if they include elements of the Blackfoot language, as in the case of page 4 of the Viewbook (2015) which greets prospective students with "*Oki* [hello], all nations," (p. 2) they will be doing something good because, historically and especially through the mechanism of residential schools, the Blackfoot language has been subject to attempted erasures. Similarly, Viewbook developers might have been familiar with scholarly critiques

54

of colonial representations of Indigenous folks which insist on the notion that true Indige-

neity can be measured only by its proximity to 'pre-contact' modes of being, dressing,

speaking, knowing (St. Denis, 2007). The Viewbook, importantly, does not include Ed-

ward Curtis-style portraits of Blackfoot students dressed in supposedly authentic regalia.

But as I have already argued, moves like these sit next to colonial ghosts. Because the

Viewbook enacts the U of L as a good institution and colonial discourse is difficult to

identify for readers that are not practiced at doing so, I suggest that the University's ap-

pearance of innocence might have the effect of precluding critique. I wonder whether the

fact that no ghosts immediately appear might mean that the task of enacting the U of L as

haunted by colonial histories of the present is set aside? Alternatively, could we think

about the idea that if U of L *staff* have important anti-colonial knowledge then the task of

thinking about the colonial *foundations* of the University seems to become unnecessary?

Can the U of L of the FNMI Viewbook become innocent in the ongoing theft of Indige-

nous land because it houses some anti-colonial knowledge?[19]

    A second possibility: The Viewbook (2015) promises FNMI students a "bright

and successful future" that is self-determined and marked by self-fulfillment (p. 7). This

is combined with an explicit promise of access to positions of power through the

knowledge gained via a U of L education (p. 7). Indigenous peoples in the Viewbook are

thriving with multiple degrees, career plans, and smiling faces. I want to think about these

---

[19] Of course I do not think that this is at all a possibility. In fact, the U of L is currently scraping off the top of a coulee to make space for a new science building, thus enacting the coulee as an object, in line with co-lonial understandings of the land. Maclean's magazine says the University is "always charting new terri-tory," something that makes sense given that University Hall is "surrounded by green hills that make it look like a ship amid an emerald ocean" (*University of Lethbridge*, n.d.). We're real pioneers!

enticing claims and images in relation to the fact that the promotional materials, across the board, promise to teach Indigenous and non-Indigenous students alike about Native peoples, cultures, and languages. The idea, I think, is that the U of L, as a Western institution for education can provide students of the NAS program with access to the good life by teaching them about Natives from a Native perspective. The narrative presented to FNMI students through the Viewbook reads like this: The U of L can meet your needs, present and future, by teaching you about yourselves from a Native perspective. Not only that but the University will gift you with instructors who can speak the Blackfoot language. It seems to me that because campus is located on Blackfoot land and the University allows Elders and their knowledge in through the doors, the Viewbook communicates to Indigenous students that the University is already a part of them, already fundamentally tied up with their collective and individual lives.[20] The Viewbook seems to ask Indigenous students to please forget that the U of L campus is located on stolen land and to

Buffalo disarrangement 2 — Education is the new buffalo/The buffalo is our education

---

[20] I have just suggested that the U of L makes allowances for or welcomes Elder participation in life at the University. I think that this is what is *advertised* but I wonder whether the word 'allow' captures adequately the ways in which the University requires and demands Elder knowledge (Mair, personal communication, Jan., 2017). In the Viewbook (2015), Elder presence at the U of L features as a selling point for recruitment. This is contiguous, I think, with the fact that during the development of the Native American Studies and Native Education programs in the 70s, it was very important to the University that developers make "use of 'resource people' including: a. Indian Natives" (*Preliminary Meeting,* Feb. 16, 1971, p. 1*)*. While it seems to me that utilizing Natives was supposed to be akin to what would be praised today as community engagement, participants might actually have been called upon to speak in a way that is similar to what Gayatri Spivak articulated when she said that she is allowed to "speak in certain circles" today only due to a sort of "benevolent imperialism . . . which simply says that because I happen to be Indian or whatever …" (Gunew & Spivak, 1986). She aims to speak for herself, yes, but she is suspicious of being called upon "as a Third World Woman", to speak *as a Third World Woman* (Gunew & Spivak, 1986). Spivak warns here against the essentializing and homogenizing effects of such a call to speak. I wonder whether the same critique might be made with regard to the U of L's welcome to Elders.

A quote and a claim: "In traditional times the Buffalo symbolized "all my relations". Today, the University of Lethbridge renews, strengthens and enlightens life-long relationships" [original emphasis] ((*FNMI) Alumni Chapter*, 2017).

A second quote and a second claim: "Elders Andy Blackwater and Bruce Wolf Child have explained . . . the Blackfoot teaching that education is the new buffalo, deeply valued and the way to the future" (Lapadat, April 24, 2015).[21]

Blackwater and Wolf Child echoed an idea common enough that Cree-Saulteaux scholar Blair Stonechild (2006) incorporated it into the title of his book, *The New Buffalo: The Struggle for Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education.* The book examines First Nations education policies and advocates for "unlimited access to any training for which they [First Nations individuals] qualify" and "the right [of Aboriginal people] to establish and control post-secondary institutions as a means of ensuring culturally appropriate and effective programs" (p. 137). Such moves would constitute the ability "to pursue this 'new buffalo'" and would have the effect of providing Aboriginal people with the ability "to acquire the tools that can one day enable them to contribute at the highest levels to the country they know as their homeland" (Stonechild, 2006, p. 138). Stonechild (2006) explains that "In the past, the buffalo met virtually every need of the North American Indian" but education is often considered to be the new means of survival (p. 2). It is the case that Indigenous peoples have "had little choice but to engage with Western institutions imposed on their lands" (Hill, 2012, n.p.). Hill's statement does not only refer to

---

[21] This quote comes from Lapadat's account of "The History and Role of the Aboriginal Education Committee" at the U of L.

mandatory attendance at residential schools, for example. In Dwayne Donald's 2003 the-

sis titled "Elder, Student, Teacher: A Kainai Curriculum Métissage", he explains that

prior to "the arrival of foreigners", the Blackfoot relied heavily on the buffalo and that it

was *only after the animals had been violently disappeared from the land that Blackfoot*

leaders agreed to negotiate Treaty 7 with the Canadian government (p. 32). The Treaty

made some provisions for education (though education is not a Treaty right according to

the Department of Indigenous and Northern Affairs) and thus seemed to offer "some hope

for the future" (p. 32). It is only in this context that education can be viewed as the key

"to future prosperity for the Blackfoot tribes" (Donald, 2003, p. 33). I thus offer the

words of Christi Belcourt (March 31, 2016) as a counterstory to the idea that Education is

the New Buffalo:

> Education is NOT the new buffalo. The buffalo will always be our educa-
> tion. The buffalo . . . sustained our ancestors for 20,000 or more years. They
> clothed us, fed us, housed us. We are alive because of them. I will never turn
> my back on the buffalo nation or disrespect them to say something as fleet-
> ing as western "education" in the long span of the history of the world could
> ever replace them in the high regard we continue to hold them in.
> Their genocide coincided with our own. Their lands were stolen at the same
> time ours were. They suffered because of us, because of the hatred the Brit-
> ish and Americans had for Indigenous Peoples and the desire to get us off
> the land. They the buffalo, took the brunt of that hatred for us. That is how
> deeply indebted we are to them for our lives.
> I dream of seeing 60 million buffalo roaming free again across Turtle Island.
> We are so deeply connected to this nation, we have stories and ceremonies
> with and about them. They taught us medicines. We dream of them still. We
> are still connected to this powerful nation. (n.p.)

End.

focus instead on the annual pow wow hosted by the University in the UHall atrium (*Na-*

tive American Studies, 2015). I am not at all suggesting that pow wow dances should be

excluded from the U of L or that the U of L's sharing of its Blackfoot title is inherently

'bad' but I do want to think about how the Viewbook's goods might also make room for colonial discourse to thrive by putting blatantly violent histories under erasure.

Making coherence and accomplishing singularity

Contradictory or ambivalent discursive moves are a common enough feature of writing on colonialism as an "established disorder" (Latour as cited in Law, 2002, p. 202). Latour, according to Law, "tells a story about colonialism" in which merchants, soldiers, bureaucrats, soldiers, cartographers, priests, hacienda owners and engineers were contemptuous of one another despite that they might all have categorically been called colonizers (p. 202). But none of the arguments, the fissures between various actors, "necessarily played [themselves] through to undermine colonialism 'as a whole'" (Latour as cited in Law, 2002, p. 202). We might also consider Homi Bhabha's work on ambivalence in colonial discourse where "relations between the colonizing state and the indigenous inhabitants are characterized by . . . intense desire at the same time as intense fear" (Mills, 2004, p. 110; see also Bhabha, 1994). Stuart Hall (1992) similarly explains that representations of the Other have been marked by both idealization and denigration, "as if everything which Europeans represented as attractive and enticing about the natives could also be used to represent the exact opposite: their barbarous and depraved character" (p. 213). But these contradictions, this multiplicity, did not necessarily make for weaker colonial endeavours. Multiplicities often hang together despite their non-coherence (Law, 2002; Mol, 2002). Law (2002) argues that there is a EuroAmerican cultural bias *away from multiplicity* and that, as such, there are a variety of strategies for fulfilling a bias *toward singularity.* In the case of the Viewbook, coherence is accomplished in several ways. For example, the booklet makes no reference to multiple Native Education programs or multiple

Universities of Lethbridge. Through standard grammatical practice, 'the' Native Education program and 'the' University of Lethbridge are made singular (Law, 2002, p. 18). The material structure of the Viewbook is also something to consider. The pages are bound together. The staples through the spine indicate that the various program descriptions and promotional statements belong together, perhaps naturally so (Law, 2002, p. 18). Further, the Viewbook content is ordered according to the ideal student's trajectory — making a decision to attend the U of L, selecting a program of study, applying, attending and building a community, and then graduating — which others many of the messy realities-in-practice of being a University student.[22] Law (2002) explains that a table of contents works in a similar fashion except that the table specifically organizes related content hierarchically with the most important topics coming first (p. 20). And in the table, each aspect of the Viewbook comes together to make a whole. Last, I propose that the fact that the Native Education program exists only on a two page spread in the booklet is also a means of creating a coherent NEp. The program does not feature in multiple places throughout the Viewbook so it seems reasonable that it would be taken up as singular. The Viewbook thus generates "a coordinated object" (Law, 2002, p. 21).[23]

---

[22] For many Aboriginal students, the 'messy realities' that might interrupt the attainment of a degree granted by a post-secondary institution include poverty, violence, the Eurocentricity of post-secondary education, and the added burden of commuting between reserve and University (Hardes, 2013).

[23] The Viewbook makes a coordinated reading subject, too. Law (2002) reminds us that, except as a "methodological fiction", there is no such thing as a naive reader (p. 32). The Viewbook's intelligibility depends on what we already know and the conditions for that knowing cannot be disclosed by the Viewbook. Prospective students come to the promotional texts with a historically and socially situated set of knowledge about the University as a modern, progressive institution, the goodness and innocence of the appreciation of difference and Canadian multiculturalism, and the importance of teaching in 'making a difference' in the world and in the lives of individual children through "inspir[ation]" and "a strong knowledge base" (*Native Education*, 2015; *FNMI Viewbook*, 2015). So, despite my naive reading of NAS, Native Education, and the University as multiple, it may be that for most readers, their prior knowledge, of the University, the nation, and of Self and Other stays in tact or is reinforced by reading the promotional materials.

Coordinated objects are also the result of being looked at from multiple perspectives. This sounds counterintuitive but Mol (2002) explains that objects under observation from various viewpoints are just that — looked at rather than touched, moved around, manipulated, changed. The result is that the object "becomes intangibly strong," solid or centred (p. 12). Despite *differences* in perspective, the truth of the object, the presumed really real essence of the object (which is only an effect of power struggles, anyway (Mills, 2004)), is untouched. I raise perspectivalism as a coherence making strategy because in each of the promotional sites referenced on the first page of this chapter, the University claims to offer courses taught from 'a Native perspective.' I wonder what constitutes 'a Native perspective' and whether any attempts to define it and then identify who might be qualified to teach from that perspective could avoid

relying on a scale of 'authenticity' or some assumptions about essential cultural or racial differences. Furthermore, I question whether a Native perspective can do the work of changing the objects of study embedded in those various disciplines offered under the NAS umbrella when EuroAmerican perspectives continue to be so highly valued in academia for their presumed closeness to objectivity and when the word 'perspective' references viewpoint but not the ontological (Law, 2002, p. 35). Taking Indigenous epistemological and ontological assumptions seriously is a vital component of anti-colonial practice but promoting the goodness of perspectivalism, a concept Law (2004) characterizes as corresponding with every central feature of EuroAmerican assumptions about reality,

is not constitutive of such a practice (p. 25; see also Sundberg, 2014, p. 38).[24] Indeed, the

NAS and NEd programs were "developed jointly by representatives of southern Alberta's

Native communities and the University", therefore presumably including a Native per-

spective (*Native Education Requirements*, 2017). But 44 years later one of the main re-

searchers and developers of the programs, Leroy Little Bear, continues to ask in his talks

at the U of L, what are the metaphysics of this place (*ulethbridge*, Feb. 8, 2016)? The fact

that Little Bear is still asking and that the Viewbook, developed just last year, seems not

to have (cannot have) escaped the stickiness of colonialism, suggests to me that including

a Native perspective hasn't meant an unsettling politics for the U of L.[25]

The proposal

My notes above were not about the failures of 'a Native perspective'. In fact, I

propose that the Indigenous peoples involved in the making of NAS and Native Ed. had

visions for the programs that were quite radically anti-colonial. In December of 1971, Lit-

---

[24] Differences in perspective on a particular object or experience are often read as the manifestation of cultural difference (Mann et al., 2011). Mario Blaser (2013) explains that tolerating cultural differences or "cultural perspectives" circumscribes the consideration of multiple reals and the possibility of ontological difference or conflict (p. 547). Law (2015) agrees. "If we're liberal," he says, "then we will respect the differences . . . But even so . . . we haven't abandoned our basic commitment to the idea of a single all-encompassing reality. Neither have we really stopped assuming that Aboriginal people have got it wrong" (p. 2).

For a list of Indigenous scholars who make clear that stories do not refer to "something 'out there'" (are not perspectival) but "partake in the variably successful performance of that which they narrate" (make realities/are a matter of ontology), see Blaser (2014, p. 54, 57).

[25] I am not in any way arguing that the NAS and Native ed. programs should have been developed in isolation from surrounding Indigenous communities. I am simply trying to distinguish between considering or including a perspective and negotiating about what is or ought to be real. I think here of Barthes' (1977) conception of true interdisciplinary critique wherein there is none of the "easy security" of keeping old objects in tact (n.p.). Instead, interdisciplinarity must be done in the interest of "a new object and a new language neither of which has a place" in the fields that were "to be brought peacefully together" (Barthes, 1977, n.p.).

tle Bear, now U of L professor emeritus and Special Assistant to the President was appointed by the University to "look into ways and means of creating conditions on campus that are congenial to Native Students" (Beckel, Dec. 23, 1971). After extensive research efforts and much collaboration with Indigenous leaders and youth in the areas surrounding Lethbridge, Little Bear and his colleague Menno Boldt (1972) had completed a proposal titled "A Program of Studies Primarily for Native Americans" (p. 1). My reading of the proposal suggests that Little Bear and Boldt's hopes were toward enacting a decolonized world through the realization of Indigenous sovereignty and dismantling Eurocentricity in post-secondary institutions. *The proposal suggested that the Native American Studies program would be developed with "the Indian community", a theme that coursed throughout the entire document (p. 1). This program would not be about assimilation, would not have Natives peoples as it's object of study, and would not require that Indigenous students be alienated from their communities to participate. The proposal also addressed what was named the European bias that persisted in post-secondary institutions despite "initial smiles of welcome" (p. 3). The program would counter the exclusion of Indigenous philosophies, viewpoints, and peoples from curricula, hiring procedures, and admissions requirements.*[26] *It would be toward equality in education, accomplished via supports and programs for Indigenous students and by working with non-Indigenous stu-*

---

[26] Given the important difference between talking about an Indigenous philosophy/viewpoint/people as singular and pluralizing those things, I will note that Little Bear and Boldt (1972) do fluctuate on this matter. Sometimes the authors refer to "the Indian Viewpoint" (p. 3) or "the Indian student" (p. 3). At other moments, the authors pluralize, as in, "the cultures and life-styles of the Indian communities," (p. 5) and "Indian . . . philosophies, aspirations, traditions" and "distinctive cultures" (p. 6). While I understand the importance of the distinction here, I contend that the spirit (or, more academically, the anti-colonial tone) of the document is in line with my articulation above.

dents to counter the "devastating prejudice and discrimination currently directed at Indi-ans in the Canadian society" (p. 6). In a smaller section specifically pertaining to the Faculty of Education, the authors of the proposal contended that schools serving First Nations areas need First Nations teachers familiar with specific educational techniques necessary for instructing Indian children, committed to teaching an alternative-to-Euro-pean version of history and culture, and competent in whichever language was spoken by the community served by the school. This was to be the case even when well-meaning non-Indigenous folks were available (p. 15).

Promotional departures from the proposal[27]

The proposal thus contains several demands that are central to some anti-racist and anti-colonial pedagogies much more recently developed (see for example den Hayer & Abbott, 2011; Simpson, 2014; St. Denis, 2007). The Viewbook (2015), though, pre-sents a very different (and domesticated) version of the 'same' programs. In this section, I will examine a final strategy for crafting singularity, namely the practice of making defer-rals.[28] That is, I will engage in the Foucauldian practice of reading what is not there using the content of Little Bear and Boldt's (1972) proposal as a text wherein the silences of the promotional materials speak.

First: The promotional and informational webpages cited at the start of this chap-ter boast the offer of an education *about* the Other, an approach defined by Kumashiro as a means of correcting stereotypes and filling in the blanks in partial and biased historical

---

[27] Until now I have been relying on the content in the Viewbook to make my arguments and shape my ideas. In this section, I will expand my writing to include the other promotional materials named at the start of this chapter.

[28] By deferrals I refer both to what is not said and to what was said, instead.

information. We see this in the articulation of NAS found in the "Native Education Requirements" (2017) page which states that the program will allow enrolees to "study the Native peoples of North America". On the "Native American Studies" (2015) page, the word 'study' is swapped out for 'investigation,' synonyms for which include appraisal, scrutiny, and probe. This is an obvious departure from Little Bear and Boldt's (1972) contention that "the thrust of the Native American Program is not primarily to study the Indian community" (p. 10). For privileged learners who might assume that stereotypical images of the Indian constitute appropriate and accurate representations of historical Indigenous populations, education about the other might go some way toward unlinking the associations between Indigeneity and savagery or laziness, for example. But the drawbacks of this approach include the modernist assumption that a perfect and complete picture of the Other is both possible and a good (Kumashiro, 2000). Little Bear and Boldt wanted to see work done with non-Native students toward correcting stereotypes and combating discrimination against Indigenous peoples, yes. But I wonder if, in their statement that Native peoples should not be the program's object of study, the authors understood that the anthropological gaze can have essentializing effects, placing Indigenous students in the position of cultural expert and representative Native (Cote Meek, 2014; Kumashiro, 2000). Andrea Smith (2014), drawing on Rey Chow suggests that when Native peoples are assumed to be ethnographic objects, they are placed in a position that requires them to prove their worthiness as human subjects. Chow refers to folks positioned in this way as protesting ethnics, attempting to complain eloquently enough that 'the system' will be compelled to give them something (as cited in Smith, 2014, p. 215). This sort of recognition/humanity-granting/inclusion allows the system to appear good without changes to the

landscape of power (Smith, 2014).[29] These critically important critiques of education about the Other have been deferred in the U of L's promotional materials which suggest that learning about the Other will provide answers to the "contemporary issues that face FNMI communities" (*Native American Studies*, 2015).

This brings me to my second point: Only Little Bear and Boldt (1972) provide a sense of what might be referenced by the phrase 'contemporary issues.' For example, the authors raise concerns about prejudice against Indian peoples, they argue that Eurocentric education might be detrimental to Indian students, and they explain that when students consider attending a post-secondary institution, they see a system that will "alienate them from the reservation lifestyle" thereby becoming "lost to the community where he is needed most" (p. 5). The 'issues' identified in the proposal then are problems of racism, Eurocentricity, assimilation and alienation. In contrast, the promotional materials make reference to the "current issues facing FNMI communities" (*FNMI Viewbook*, 2015, p. 12) and suggest career paths to students that include problem-centred jobs like "Native issues lobbying" and "Native outreach work" (*Native American Studies*, 2015) without giving a sense of what those issues requiring outreach might be. I contend that this leaves readers, settler subjects and otherwise, to fill in the blanks with what they already know to be true, including a host of racist tropes about Native peoples and the myth that the processes of building the Canadian nation were mostly innocent. When 'issues' are made to

---

[29] At the U of L, the Indigenous peoples that were welcomed to contribute to the making of the FNMI-focused programming were indeed 'given something' but as we will see in the coming section beginning on page 68 (A Scrambled Trail to Red Crow Community College), colonial power dynamics likely remained quite firmly in place.

be problems from nowhere, or at least not from any obvious external forces, they might

seem to emerge from Nativeness itself.[30]

Third and last: All of the promotional materials deferred Little Bear and Boldt's

recommendations that NAS be a tool for dismantling the Eurocentric foundations of insti-

tutions for post-secondary education and for fostering Indigenous futurity. The Viewbook

(2015) replaces these goals with talk of managing and/or appreciating Indigenous differ-

ence. Where the proposal recommends that teachers take an approach to history that is not

'whitewashed' or otherwise Eurocentric, the promotional materials promise to impart pre-

service teachers with an ability to engage FNMI students in the classroom, suggesting that

it is not course content that requires an overhaul but that some Indigenous difference/defi-

ciency should be attended to instead. Where the proposal advocates for programming that

will confront discrimination against native peoples, the promotional materials suggest that

learning native culture and history will be sufficient for addressing 'the issues.' The short-

comings of cultural and multicultural education rooted in the assumption of difference

have been well documented (Cote-meek, 2014; Razack, 1998; St. Denis, 2007). Cote-

Meek (2014) describes post-secondary classrooms as spaces marked by racism and vio-

lence for Indigenous students (p. 64). Such characterizations get lost in what Razack

(1998) describes as the "multicultural spiral" where power relations are not exposed and

where Indigenous students are accused of being inauthentic if they aren't knowledgeable

---

[30] The idea that the problems facing FNMI communities come from Nativeness itself is a common idea in
small Canadian prairie cities. Kingfisher (2007) reports that popular discourse in Woodbridge, one such
city, often blames an Aboriginal culture that produces laziness for the overrepresentation of First Nations
peoples in the city's homeless population (p. 95).

about their own cultures and where white students learn that they can become innocent "with a little practice and the right information" (p. 9-10).

It is not my goal to determine whether most of the students of NAS/the Nep get lost in Razack's spiral but I do contend that the depoliticized language of the promotional materials has the effect of situating the NEp, and the collaboration integral to its development, as existing outside of the complexities and violences of historical colonial endeavours. The promotional materials defer those complexities and violences as meaningful to FNMI-focused programming and so are not enacted as manifest absence but as Otherness (Law, 2004). Historical colonialisms are hidden from sight in the promotion of the NEp. My own attempt at enacting the proposal and it's important anti-colonial critiques as an important part of the NEp's hinterlands is informed by a desire to see Little Bear and Boldt's document and ideas taken up as material that might participate in making new realities at the University of Lethbridge.

A scrambled trail to Red Crow Community College

Because the promotional materials defer the content of the proposal that addresses questions of power, I wonder whether this might be symbolic of the U of L's approach to their relationships with FNMI peoples in practice. I would not be so bold as to claim that this is always the case, but it seems to have been so in 1995, twenty years after Little Bear and Boldt's proposal, when Red Crow Community College (RCCC), located on the Blood Reserve of the Kainai First Nation, reached out to the U of L's Education Faculty looking to partner with them for the purpose of designing an accredited Niitsitapi (Blackfoot) teacher education program in addition to the already-existing Native Education program (*Native Teacher Educ. Committee*, Jan. 8, 1996; Walker, Oct. 16, 1995). I

68

explore this relationship in brief in the spirit of Walter Benjamin's notion of blasting as a method, which requires "following the scrambled trail the ghost leaves, picking up its pieces, setting them down elsewhere" (as cited in Gordon, 2008, p. 66). I propose that while the institution's archives are silent on the question of what kind of dreams the University dreamed when it asked Little Bear to conceive of some means through which the U of L would become a better place for Native students, the institution's stated motivations for entering into a relationship with Red Crow might 'shed some light' on that matter.

Before I delve into this short story, which may appear to be a story about a small group of individual actors, I want to introduce Law and Callon's (1988) work on the "obligatory point of passage" (p. 290). The authors use this phrase to refer to a management style wherein one individual or organization is positioned as the person through which all decisions on a project should be passed (p. 209). More specifically, that person should gather and deploy what would be necessary for the project to happen while simultaneously *blocking off all outside interference* (p. 291). Law and Callon (1988) illustrate that, in the case of their example, having an obligatory point of passage was considered an ideal means of managing an important project, but it was not attainable in practice (p. 291). No single person or organization had the authority to impose itself as the point of passage, and none could put the project in motion in isolation from what the authors refer to as the "global network" or 'the outside' (Law & Callon, 1988, p. 291). In what follows, I will use the notion of outside interference to refer to the ways in which individuals like one university Dean who was positioned as a point of passage in the negotiations between Red Crow and the U of L could not and did not operate outside of the hinterlands of those

negotiations. I do not assume, therefore, that the Dean's words were fully his own but emerged out of and participated in making up a hinterland or network of institutional goals and their epistemological and ontological commitments, colonial histories and discourse, relations of power, committees of variously positioned others, funding applications and the commitments of funding bodies, and so on. Now, on to the story.

The leadership at Red Crow wanted a program, developed in partnership with representatives from both institutions and communities and offered at least in part on the Red Crow campus, that would specifically to respond to RCCC's concern that "In the last two centuries, the Blackfoot Nations nearly lost their traditional culture, language and ways of living" (*Kiipaitapisinnooni*, n.d., p. 1). Residential schools, integrated schooling, and federally-run on-reserve schools were all named by Red Crow as tools for colonization and a causal link was crafted between them and a long list of "resulting social problems" (*Kiipaitapisinnooni*, n.d., p. 1). Red Crow's proposed program would constitute a continuation of a recent "re-emergence of Blackfoot culture, language, identity and pride" and would respond to the limitations of the Native Education program already in place (*Kiipaitapisinnooni*, n.d., p. 1). The limitations were articulated as follows:

> Native teacher education programs have "added" Native American Studies classes, and/or cohorts of aboriginal students, and/or an aboriginal language component . . . TO a traditional teacher preparation program. To date, that is exactly what The University of Lethbridge has done . . . In order to make a program truly meaningful and relevant, there is a need to *question the premises the program is built on.*" [emphasis mine] (*Kiipaitapisinnooni*, n.d., p. 1)

The U of L agreed to partner with Red Crow and at the beginning of their new institutional relationship, the U of L Dean of Education presented to the Kainai Board of Education and explained the U of L's motivations for entering the partnership (Walker,

May 27, 1996). The University, the Dean explained, was an altruistic institution, aiming to make a "social contribution" to Alberta society through the Blackfoot teacher education program (p. 2). But he also made it clear that there was a sufficient level of "self-interest" operating so that even if it's altruism faded, the University would not withdraw its support for the program (p. 2). By the 90s Aboriginal teacher education programs had become a major trend in post-secondary institutions across Canada and the U of L hoped to capitalize on the moment and the "market" represented by a growing Aboriginal population (Hesch, Dec. 18, 1995, p. 6-7; Walker, Sept. 11, 1996, p.1). So the University articulated by the Dean was both self-interested and good but I read no archival evidence that either version of the institution was explicitly committed to re-working landscapes of power. In fact, I read quite a lot of evidence to the contrary.

In a 1997 letter authored by the Dean of Education, the program was articulated in terms of the following components: Overall Goal, Achievement of Quality, Intellectual Property, and Financial Considerations. The Goal was to create a program that would prepare both Blackfoot and other people who know "the Blackfoot culture well to be competent and effective teachers of both Blackfoot and non-Blackfoot children" (Walker, Feb. 13, 1997, p. 1). Quality would be achieved through expert instructors who should have or be working toward a PhD in a relevant field. Instructors should also be knowledgeable about Blackfoot culture. But because "there are too few people who possess this knowledge as well as expertise in teacher education," there should be an assistant Blackfoot instructor in each classroom with at least an M.A. in Education (Walker, Feb. 13,

1977, p. 1).[31] Because the Faculty of Education had been developing a curriculum for 30 years that would only need to be adapted "to the needs of the Blackfoot people", any intellectual property should be shared jointly (Walker, Feb. 13, 1997, p. 2). Red Crow, however, should be the only party responsible for raising necessary funds for the program. Red Crow's then president responded with several alterations to this version of the Niitsitapi program. Revisions consisted of the following: Red Crow was envisioning that at the end of the initiative (4 years), RCCC would "retain the Niitsitapi Teacher Education program to offer in its own right" and that the U of L would have "a legitimate Aboriginal Teacher Education Program for its First Nations students" (Smallface-Marule, Feb. 26, 1997, p. 1). Further, the U of L's existing program did not need minor curricular adaptations but a complete overhaul. With regard to quality, Red Crow's president explained to the Dean the she had previously provided him with the names of two Blackfoot speaking people with PhDs in Education from the treaty 7 area along with a list of Blackfoot speakers who had their Master's, some of whom were in the process of obtaining their PhDs. Furthermore, for any courses requiring two instructors, the Blackfoot instructor must not be conceptualized as an assistant and should be granted equal status and remuneration. And the process of adapting the pre-existing curriculum was done via a dynamic team approach, "augmented by Blackfoot elders" (Smallface-Marule, Feb. 26,

---

[31] Even this was a stretch for the U of L which obtained "Advice on the RCCC Proposal" from Orest Murawski (Feb. 12, 1997) who is currently the director of the University of Saskatchewan's Indian Teacher Education Program and had been involved in similar projects at the U of S at the time the document I refer to was produced. Murawski (Feb. 12, 1997) suggested that tutors be hired instead of assistant instructors. Even those tutors should have "a clearly defined role; otherwise activists get in" (Murawski, Feb. 12, 1997, n.p.). Further, Murawski (1997) informed the U of L that funds under band control should be used as seed money for the program. He called RCCC's proposed program "a big opportunity for the U of L" because "other . . . universities have no reputation with native people" (Murawski, Feb. 12, 1997, n.p.).

1997, p. 4). This process and the notion of individual property rights did not lend themselves easily to the "recognition of Blackfoot collective intellectual property rights" (Smallface-Marule, Feb. 26, 1997, p. 4). Aspects of Blackfoot language and culture brought to the table to develop the program were "difficult to render to the English language and European theoretical paradigms" and should thus belong wholly to the Blackfoot (Smallface-Marule, Feb. 26, 1997, p. 4). But because both institutions would gain new programming, and would thus benefit equally from the initiative, the U of L and Red Crow should be equally responsible for raising funds.

The discrepancies between these two versions of the Niitsitapi program appear to have been too great to work through and the project, which had already been in development for approximately 2 years, was put on hold. Things did pick back up, though, and by December 30th of 1998 the Dean of Education's name was on a funding proposal for the Niitsitapi program. Funding, though, proved to be difficult to secure and this problem continued to set the start date for the program back (Walker, April 26, 1999). Finally, in 1999, Red Crow secured funds from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and a contract was drafted between RCCC and the U of L (Smallface-Marule, Dec. 10, 1999). Ultimately, though, nothing was signed. On March 14th of 2000, the U of L Dean of Education e-mailed the president of Red Crow with the news that "the Faculty of Education will not, at this time, be proceeding further with the plan to offer the Niitsitapi Teacher Education Program" (Walker, March 14, 2000). He did so on grounds of insecure funding, an expected change in University leadership, including a new Dean, and divergent visions for the program, including and especially on the question of whose responsibility the quality of the program would be (Walker, March 14, 2000). And though Red Crow's

president was able to respond to, and in my read, resolve each of the issues presented by the Dean, 7 months went by with no further action. In October of 2000, though, the U of L hired a new Dean of Education and talk of reopening negotiations began (O'Dea, Oct. 3, 2000). Shortly after, the Niitsitapi program accepted its first cohort of students. The program boasted great successes but was ultimately terminated after a single intake seemingly due to an inability to secure a permanent source of funds (Campbell, Weasel Fat, & Magnusson, 2006). The U of L archives, though, are quiet on this matter.

Red Crow and the U of L began on unequal footing. The very possibility of Red Crow developing and offering an accredited teacher education program relied precariously on the U of L's altruism or self-interest, depending. In the 1990s, this was the norm for Tribal Colleges which were positioned as institutions required to negotiate "arrangements with external post-secondary institutions to gain access to the resources, expertise, and credibility needed to achieve their goals" (Barnhardt as cited in Hesch, Dec. 18, 1995, p. 18).[32] In the case of Red Crow and the U of L, that imbalance of power was never addressed, an act necessary for breaking with the successes of colonialism. This was not, it seems, what the partnership was about.

In analyzing the Dean of Education's assertions regarding altruism and self-interest as motivators for partnering with Red Crow, one might be inclined to suggest that the altruistic reasons were the 'good' ones while those rooted in institutional interest were

---

[32] In the early 1970s, "the post-secondary attrition rates for American Indian students reached 75 percent" in the U.S.. Tribal leaders there responded to the failures of public education with the "tribal college movement" (Wheeler, 2004, p. 3). In 1968, the Navajo Nation was the first to successfully lobby "Congressional members to sponsor federal legislation funding Navajo Community College" (Wheeler, 2004, p. 4). These colleges are "established to provide a nurturing atmosphere on the reservation that Indian students were not receiving when they left to go to state and private schools" and are funded by federal bodies as well as private organizations (Bearden as cited in Wheeler, 2004, p. 2).

'bad.' I am reminded here of Avery Gordon's (2008) refusal to distinguish between slave owners and abolitionists and her insistence on the difference between emancipation and abolition. Emancipation, she says, is not the same as abolition because abolition depends on white saviours who can change their minds (p. 163). For Gordon, the difference between kind men, abolitionists, and bad men, slave owners, is just a ruse and if a person is haunted, they might be keenly aware of this fictional separation. The U of L's relationship with RCCC might be interpreted as illustrative of this. If you crave more empirical evidence on this matter, or an example beyond my own work, you might turn to de Leeuw, Greenwood, and Lindsay (2013) who contend that when universities back their good intentions with diversity policies aimed at hiring more aboriginal scholars, the effects often include colonial dynamics that are more deeply entrenched than before, especially through the disproportionate exploitation of Indigenous professors' labor or what some folks have coined "death by a thousand committees" (p. 388). So neither the altruistic University nor the self-interested University can be relied upon in efforts toward Indigenous sovereignty in education or otherwise.

Notes on embodied and emplaced colonialisms + good intentions

It should be clear enough now that good intentions, even coupled with 'a Native perspective' do not necessarily make for unsettling politics. I have been compelled to ask how my own good intentions are not sufficient for doing anti-colonial work, even when paired with scholarship crafted by Indigenous scholars. Worded differently, I ask: how and where am I to position myself as a settler academic subject attempting to do anti-colonial work from within an institution that is multiple but never pure of colonialism, altruism or none. Given that "we are at least partially connected with our objects of study," I

ask how am I the University (Law, 2002, p. 7)? How do I "share in what [I] do not like with those whom [I] do not like" (Law, 2002, p. 7)? And how does the University share and shape my "most valued ways of being" (Law, 2002, p. 7). I ask this series of interrelated questions in light of Gordon's plea that abolitionists ask how they are the same as the slave owner. To disavow the slave owner, to say "I am not [him]/He is not me," is not sufficient, altruism or none (Gordon, 2008, p. 190). So how do I answer these questions? Do I list the ways my project might contribute to decolonization while confessing all of the ways in which I am racist?

'I am' revelations are interesting as identity claims, confessions, and what Sarah Ahmed (2004) calls declarations of whiteness. Ahmed writes on a number of such declarations, including the 'I am racist,' admittance. I am racist, like the University. I confess. Wanda Pillow (2003) would call statements like these practices of reflexivity for the sake of transcendence (p. 186). This sort of reflexivity performs a "modernist seduction - promising release from your . . . ethnocentrism" (p. 187). Once I have articulated my fully knowable self and asked for forgiveness of my sins, I can be free of my discursive positioning, my work free of history, or so the logic goes. Indeed, Ahmed (2004) contends that when folks admit to their racism in academic settings, they are actually saying that they are not racist "in the same way" that uneducated people are racist because those people have not yet learned to see their racism (n.p.). The declaration thus becomes a declaration of goodness and of learnedness (Ahmed, 2004; Jeffrey, 2007, p. 128). The fantasy is not only that we can confess our way out but that we can learn our way out - that we can still become good through knowledge when good intentions aren't enough. Ahmed (2004) contends that citing one's education in declarations about having become not-racist is

Buffalo disarrangement 3 — Buffalo memorializations

Margot Francis (2011) introduces her readers to George Catlin, American painter of Native peoples' portraits, and first promoter of the establishment of National Parks in the U.S. in the mid 1800s (p. 97). The state, thought Catlin, might create Parks for preservation purposes "where the world could see for ages to come, the native Indian in his classic attire, galloping his wild horse . . . amid the fleeting herds of elk and buffaloes" (Catlin as cited in Francis, 2011, p. 97). According to Francis, Catlin was working "under the assumption that both Indigenous peoples and the buffalo were 'under an equal doom'" (p. 97). Part of the hinterland of national parks, then, is the myth of the disappearing Indian, the exotic Other-as-spectacle, and the memorialization of a way of life rendered extinct.

Indigenous peoples have, of course, not disappeared and Waterton Lakes National Park does not preserve 'the native Indian is his classic attire.' Near to the park's entrance however, is a buffalo paddock where visitors and tourists can drive past and "view these huge, magnificent animals in natural habitat" (Barry, Sept. 16, 2011). In 1952, Reverend Father M. Lafrance, principal at St. Mary's Indian Residential School on the Blood reserve, knew of the buffalo paddock and upon their graduation, he took 16 students on a trip to Waterton Park "in all his fatherly kindness" (*The Voice*, 1952, p. 16). At the park, the students ate a picnic lunch and were taken to see the buffalo. I suspect there is more to the story than the Reverend Father's kindness. See, Lafrance, made a statement in 1956 that "Some fifty years ago the Western Indians were a dying race" because all of their energies were devoted to sheer survival. None of them had time for "fine arts" and school? Well! That was "a useless loss of time" (n.p.). But, with great thanks to the Department of

77

Indian Affairs, the "material lot of the Indian" had been improving (Lafrance, 1956, n.p.).

What was wild prairie began to bear "fruitful crops of grain" and most important to my

analysis, "herds of grazing cattle replace[d]the roaming buffaloes" (Lafrance, 1956, n.p.).

The result according to Lafrance (1956)? Indians developed a desire for education so that

they might "take their rightful place in society" (n.p.)![33] The buffalo were largely disap-

peared from the plains and, finally, progress might be made through education.

So why might Lafrance take his students to see the buffalo with whom the Black-

foot had lived in such intimate relation with? I borrow from de Leeuw (2007) in suggest-

ing that the school trip was a way of "gaz[ing] back upon" that which had been left be-

hind, "what they [the students] had surmounted" in the process of becoming civilized and

Christianized (p. 188). The example de Leeuw (2007) provides is not of a school field trip

but of the materiality of a B.C. residential school which landscaped a sort of Garden of

Eden where students could gather "figs and nuts" but would remain "enveloped within an

educational space," looking out over a vista of wilds that civilization had conquered (p.

188).

Fascinatingly, and like St. Mary's, the U of L has some connection to the buffalo

as "something that was once there [on the land], but is now gone" (Spencer as cited in

Perry, 2005, p. 8). In 1982 Reed Spencer was a student in an art class instructed by Carl

Granzow. Granzow assigned a project which was to create something "related to the his-

tory of the area and that would stand up to the environment" (Perry, 2005, p. 8). As

---

[33] These ideas certainly did not originate or end with Lafrance. Broader historical associations between dis-
appeared buffalo and attempted assimilation-though-education are made elsewhere in this thesis. See pages
56-58.

homework, Spencer constructed a larger-than-life contour of a buffalo and erected it in

the night, on top of the coulee south of University Hall. By putting The Buffalo up in se-

cret and specifically without the permission of the University, I suggest that Spencer prac-

ticed his art as a counter-monument or a monument not sanctioned by the University and

not designed to evoke pride of nation or institution (see Young, 1992). I suggest that it

points instead to the making of buffalo ghosts through unregulated hunting in colonial

Canada. The statue is only a shell of a life.[34]

   The U of L opted not to pay for the statue but some staff and faculty banded to-

gether to make it happen out-of-pocket (Perry, 2005). The Buffalo is now used in Univer-

sity promotional materials. The U of L FNMI Alumni web page explains, for example,

that "the Buffalo was the staff of life" in "traditional times" but today, "a University edu-

cation is the staff of life" ((*FNMI)Alumni Chapter,* 2017). In this way, The Buffalo is

practiced by the U of L as a monument, memorializing a time seemingly located firmly in

the past, and thereby assuming and celebrating the successes of settler colonialism. The

Buffalo might also serve as a sign of the University's contemporary embrace of Blackfoot

culture.

---

[34] Writing the buffalo as a shell is not the same as rendering it dead or inactive.

Vanessa Watts 2013 explains that in Indigenous cosmologies, "the land is alive and thinking" and decides "how living beings will organize upon her" (p. 21). In Blackfoot cosmology, specifically, stones and rocks have personhood (Onciul, 2015, p. 47; see also Garneau, n.d.), as do the metals found in them (Heavy Head, personal communication, Feb., 2017). The metal buffalo contour, even if lingering somewhere between life and death, is thus animate and an actor (Heavy Head, personal communication, Feb., 2017). It has been made so through language and it can be strengthened as such through communication or interaction (Heavy Head, personal communication, Feb., 2017). Little Bear explains that it is through ceremony, song, and story that Blackfoot people communicate with the animate world and thus *remake themselves as Blackfoot peoples* (as cited in Grier, 2014, p. 97). The Buffalo on the hill might thus be doing work that I cannot see but I contend that how the Buffalo is practiced in relation to the institution also imparts upon it a kind of ghostly existence (Heavy Head, personal communication, Feb., 2017).

I wonder, like Jeff Thomas (2017) has wondered of the Indian figure at the Samuel de Champlain monument in Ottawa: Where would The Buffalo go if it were "liberated from this spot" (n.p)? I cannot know this but I do know where The Buffalo has been moved, potentially without its consent. On June 11, 2014, the University of Lethbridge entered into a Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with Red Crow Community College. The MOU was in "recognition of [the] longstanding relationship" between the two institutions and toward further relations in the future (*U of L & RCCC*, 2014, p. 1). No specific agreements were laid out in the MOU but the document states the desire of both signing parties to "seek and promote academic programming, research and innovation, and community service opportunities . . . , having regard for the mandate, policies, and resources of each party" (*U of L & RCCC*, 2014, p. 1). Some initiatives were hinted at, like those to build "articulation across academic programs" and to develop and deliver "Joint program[s]" (*U of L & RCCC*, 2014, p. 1). The U of L has had opportunities to do those things in the past and has not attended to the problem of differential resources, for example. At the signing, though, the U of L did give to Red Crow what might have appeared to be a gift. The Buffalo to the South of University Hall had been replicated, its copy presented to the College and staged for photos. I am not entirely sure of how to read this but I feel compelled to say that I think there is something eerily similar to this gesture and the field trip to Waterton organized by Father Lafrance as a reward for his 16 graduates. Perhaps this feeling is informed by Paulette Regan's (2010) advice to "beware of settlers bearing gifts" (p. 16). I think that given 1) the use of The Buffalo in the University's promotional materials, 2) the fact that the removal of buffalo from the land was directly related to the colonial logics underpinning the residential schooling system, and 3) that

Red Crow was St. Mary's not so long ago, both the University's replicated buffalo and Lafrance's Waterton trip might constitute a violent sort of invitation to look back upon something lost or even conquered. I wonder: Why gift a ghost when there are possibilities to contribute to the repatriation of buffalo to the plains? Why gift a monument when *the buffalo are not dead*?

End.

actually a method of laying claim to an advantaged white identity. This becomes all the more important when we recognize the University as a place that privileges, reproduces, and is shaped by whiteness (Schick, 2002). Day in and day out, I do not only travel through the University's hallways but I am made by the University, shaped by its contours, shaped by racism in such a way that I am rewarded when I take up whiteness as a subject position, consciously or not. And Bronwyn Davies (2000) tells us that counter discursive resistance is never "freedom from discursive constitution of self," anyway (p. 67). So while it is deeply important to resist settler colonial logics and how they make us and the institutions we share boundaries with, the very act of doing so requires that we give up the quest for transcendence through knowing better or knowing more.

In light of this, Pillow (2003) would ask that I practice a reflexivity of discomfort. This kind of reflexivity does not lend itself to that familiar narrative that Andrea Smith (2014) outlines wherein settler researchers explain that while the Indigenous communities they entered in to were hesitant at first, everything got easier after the community realized the researcher's good intentions. Uncomfortable reflexivity demands much more complicated story lines and does not allow for the making of innocent authors (Pillow, 2003, p. 190). Researchers ought to interrogate all of the narratives produced by their work,

providing multiple interpretations, and working toward uncomfortable tellings (Pillow, 2003, p. 192). I wonder if part of this discomfort includes refusing to settle on a final, complete, or solid articulation of who I am in relation to the slave owner and to the University. Performing whiteness, being recognized and positioned as white is not a guarantee that I will feel a sense of belonging at the U of L at all moments. I am not plagued by *persistent* non-belonging but I (will) experience moments of non-belonging as a woman and as someone attempting to do research outside of positivist, masculinist, and Eurocentric traditions. I want to think about this complexity in relation to Eve Tuck's (2009) "desire-based framework" wherein the things that subjects do, say, write are not reducible to either the reproduction of, or resistance to, dominant discourse and social norms (p. 416). Perhaps what I write cannot be purely colonial or anti-colonial. Perhaps Gordon's (2008) slave owner is not a perfect embodiment of all that is racist, Eurocentric, oppressive. Recall the profound ambivalence in colonial discourse. Recall my argument that the Viewbook (2015) contradictorily contained both the colonial logic of wagon trains and pioneers and a recognition of Indigenous relations to the land. In no way do I want to celebrate those who thought/think black folk to be property or who believe(d) in the benefits of killing the Indian in the child. I do, however, want to think about what it might mean for me to ask how I am slave owner if slave owner and his ideas, his words, his feelings about the Other in relation to himself, were marked by contradiction, desire, fantasy. How are slave owner and I the same if we are both multiple and contradictory subjects?

Wrapping up, loosely

I have argued that, like me, the University of Lethbridge and its FNMI-focused programs are multiple and contradictory, despite being enacted as singular through their

promotion. I have also illustrated there has been considerable work done toward accomplishing singularity. Part of this work included the practice of departing in several ways from the content of Little Bear and Boldt's proposal. In this case, accomplishing singularity had the effect of depoliticizing the language of the Viewbook and the other promotional materials. It seems to me that in being presented with the proposal and hearing that its foundations were Eurocolonial, the University responded by taking the kind of action that would distance itself from those bad colonial Universities out there and simultaneously guarantee that the foundations identified would not be radically remapped. I recognize that regardless of intent and regardless of whether the foundations of the University remain Eurocentric, the University works in various ways. That is, being implicated in colonial histories does not guarantee that everything that happens here reproduces colonialisms of every kind. I can anecdotally attest that the U of L is simultaneously a kind of haven for many Indigenous students and a site at which many Indigenous students face alienation or are allowed to slip through the cracks. However, if the University truly intends to "contribute to and participate in reconciliation" as is its public position, the U of L has some work to do in unsettling its foundations and its programs (*Truth and Reconciliation*, 2017).[35] I cannot offer a formula for what constitutes good work in this arena and I acknowledge that any attempts at doing so would have a plethora of unintended consequences and would be circumscribed by limits of language and resonating hinterlands of education for/by Indigenous peoples (Law, 2004). However, I want to propose that it might include taking Little Bear's question seriously. What are the metaphysics of this

---

[35] My view, shared with Ryan McMahon and Christi Belcourt (March 1, 2016), is that reconciliation requires decolonization as defined by Tuck and Yang (2012).

place? According to whose ontological and epistemological assumptions do we operate? Law (2004) contends that if a group (or an institution) is serious about its ontological politics, it will negotiate with other groups about what is real. Such negotiations would lead to "Big and painful changes" and "a world of less certainty," (p. 139) something that Eva Mackey (2014) suggests is necessary for practicing relationships and power in new and specifically anti-colonial ways. I do not suggest that University leadership ought to work toward becoming unimplicated but that it might invest in becoming *differently* implicated. Such ongoingness, such uncertainty, for Mackey (2014), would exist in direct contrast to "settled expectations" or those certain settler feelings of entitlement in relation to land ownership, the "control of Indigenous peoples," and bright settler futures (p. 249). Little Bear and Boldt (1972) knew this, too, I think. They advocated a framework that would remain flexible, attuned to the changing needs of the Native community.

I wonder if the U of L has been operating on the assumption that the rosy account the Viewbook offers of the FNMI-focused programs and student services is *the* truth of the matter. I do not contend that it is merely untrue but rather one account of what goes on at the U of L. My concern is not that the promotional materials are deceptive or cover up the truth about the U of L's dark underbelly. I simply suggest that there are other versions of the institution that are invested in colonial and assimilatory projects and that promotional enactments of the U of L and its FNMI-focused programming as singularly good preclude consideration of those investments. I seek to admit this recognition of multiplicity into the discussions around this TRC moment where everyone wants to answer the question: What is the University's role in decolonization? Theorizing multiple Universities of Lethbridge is a strong means, I think, of fostering uncertainty and working

against the hope of transcending the stickiness of colonialism through knowledge or good

intentions.

Conclusion — Openings

> Keep in mind always the present you are constructing. It should be the future
> you want.
>
> - Alice Walker (2010, p. 236), *The Temple of My Familiar*

To whom and for whom is this work written? Might it matter to the future or has it merely

been an exercise in creativity and playing postmodern games (Law, 2002, p. 36)? My

methods were admittedly unruly. There was no coding, no grouping in to themes, the

Buffalo Disarrangements are inconvenient and not even highly referenced! I did not con-

sult on my interpretations with any experts, and I did not tell any complete stories. But

my methods were not unruly for the sake of unruliness (Pillow, 2003, p. 292). I did not

take a systematic approach because "life is complicated" (Gordon, 2008, p. 5) and "much

of the world is enacted" as non-coherent, vague, or indefinite (Law, 2004, p. 14). This

knottiness and haziness certainly stood out to me as I imagined how I might knit texts to-

gether or hold them apart. I wanted my methods to meaningfully attend to worlds that

have been and are being made in complex and ongoing ways. And, indeed, many things

were opened up, exceeding the singularities that characterize Euroamerican metaphysics,

including and especially the notion that researchers' objects can and should be known in

their entirety. In this work, the realities of the University of Lethbridge and its Native Ed-

ucation programming have been performed as multiple, both in terms of how the they

make social subjects and with regard to the University's relations with other institutions

for education, 'past' and present.

Messy method assemblages make for messy worlds and messy texts, too. The

Buffalo Disarrangements, scattered throughout the previous chapters, were designed as

ghost stories, put in place to circumscribe that satisfying sense of 'getting it,' a common side effect of being presented with a linear unfolding of information (Lather, 2000, p. 287). I did not set out to reinforce the notion that knowledge of a problem "necessarily unsettle[s] its operation" (Heron as cited in Jeffrey, 2007, p. 134) and I did not want to produce a text that would make the problems with Native Education at the U of L seem simple enough to conquer by following steps a) through k). The Disarrangements are useful, I think, for providing a sense of the sheer immensity of the hinterlands of education-and-Indigenous-people-in-Canada. When I tell folks on the fly that I am writing on the Native Education program, I know that writing on the program means that I am also writing about 1) residential schools, 2) walking trails, 3) national parks, 4) intertribal treaties, 5) treaties between Aboriginal Nations and the Crown, 6) Buffalo stories, 7) George Catlin's portraits and visions for Canada, 8) genocidal practices including land theft, 9) dreams, and so many other places, objects, and times. There is little that is straightforward here and the Disarrangements could have proliferated into perpetuity. The task of articulating associations between seemingly disparate matters is the kind of work that does not rest and I suggest that this is an important feature of writing/thinking that aims to respond to a haunting that does not "hope for reconciliation . . . [but] lies precisely in its refusal to stop" (Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 642). It is important for the recognition that there will be no heroic resolution (Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 649). That is, if haunting is ongoing, if it is about the *constant pursuit* of revenge, a point I will elaborate on shortly, then ghost stories cannot conclude. They must remain open-ended, perhaps even anticipating new associations and the next act of retribution, asking how the haunting might be deferred or disseminated (Tuck & Ree, 2013).

I want to return here to Tuck and Ree's (2013) story about aluminum-grid-and-tile ceilings that always betray the leaky pipes hovering above them. In the Chapter titled *Beginnings*, I proposed that efforts at replacing 'old tiles for new in the Canadian education system' would be for naught in the face of seething ghosts which orchestrate persistent dripping. It might seem a logical next step to suggest that instead of swapping tiles, we ought to focus on the *root of the issue*: poorly constructed pipes. Perhaps more highly qualified pipe fitters are needed or maybe pipes should be made of polyvinyl chloride rather than copper. But these are proposals that aim to beat the ghosts at their game and hope for a "future cleansed" of their spirits (Gordon, 2008, p. 63). Tuck and Ree (2013) explain that this kind of outcome is restricted to American horror films in which whomever is haunted is innocent and undeserving and becomes the hero by destroying the monster and restoring the world to order (p. 641). The assumption that ghosts wreak havoc on the blameless is countered by Gordon (2008) when she explains that we are only haunted by things "we have been involved in" (p. 51) and in light of this implicatedness, *nothing, not even decolonization, will be sufficient as reparations for the violences of colonialism* (Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 648). I have made the argument that the hinterlands of the NEp: a) include a history of residential schooling and b) matter to the present-day operations and effects of the program. I have also argued that new worlds, new NEp realities, can and should be made. But if this is to be done, then "practices that can cope with a hinterland of pre-existing social and materials realities also have to be built up and sustained" (Law, 2004, p. 13). Our inability to work outside of the limits of resonating hinterlands means that the ghosts of the IRS system cannot be made to go away. What happens, in this case,

88

to the question of the responsibilities of settler scholars and institutions in relation to Indigenous peoples? Tuck and Ree (2013) do not offer up an answer, perhaps mostly because they are more concerned with explaining to their readers that, in the face of colonization which is a "wrong that is too wrong to right", the ghosts' task is to seek "revenge as a strategy of justice" (p. 654). What I think the authors do make clear with regard to settler responsibilities, though, is that haunting is frightening and has consequences. Ceilings collapse when they become waterlogged and so some kind of something must be done in relation to ghosts. Second, whatever that something is, it will be limited and provisional, yes, but it must also be ongoing. Ghosts rear their heads whenever an injustice is nearly forgotten (Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 649).

In light of the ongoingness of haunting, I wonder how an institution might learn to live in meaningful ways with ghosts? I want to suggest here, that in instances where Indigenous peoples seek to make the U of L "responsive to their needs and goals", as was the case with Red Crow Community College, the University might productively engage in ontological negotiations as a way of being differently implicated (Hill, 2012, n.p.). My advocation for this sort of negotiation is not about mediation between worldviews toward harmonizing differences (Corntassel, Jan. 12, 2011). As has been made clear through my own attempts at exploring just a few of the possible reals of the University and its programming, making new objects is a task marked by uncertainty rather than security. It is not a task for reconciliation but should be part of making alternative-to-settler-colonial worlds, and it should always be done with attention to the problem of differential access

to power and resources (Corntassel, Jan. 12, 2011). I do not contend that ontological negotiations can be constitutive of a decolonized University, but that the conflicts they conjure up might make for productive openings.

Buffalo disarrangement 4 — Buffalo proddings

Andrew McKean (Sept. 16, 2013), "equal parts conservation-minded hunter and taxpaying rancher" (n.p.), on the "question of whether or how to return free-ranging buffalo to public grasslands in eastern Montana": The land is mostly wild. But there are fences which impose a sense of order over chaos and there are wheat fields which do the same. Things have changed a lot since "Lewis and Clark paddled through here and marveled *[sic]* over endless herds of buffalo." Buffalo, then cattle. Grassland, then grain field. Buffalo ghosts remain, though. Traces of their life can be found "in the eroded banks of prairie streams" and in "granite boulders". Ranchers and other opponents of buffalo reintroduction know that the time of the buffalo has passed except as mantle decorations and license plate logos. Their return could mean careful fencing bulldozed by the "wooly tanks." It could mean cattle becoming victims of disease, depleted resources, and displacement by incoming buffalo herds. It could mean the "systematic dismantling of the ranching culture". Ranchers, though, do not constitute the only voices in the debate. Indigenous proponents see buffalo restoration as "their gift to a species that for centuries gave prairie tribes food, shelter, and a world view that revolved around the hides and horns and meat of buffalo."

Why does McKean's story matter here? I propose that it matters in relation to the University's responsibilities in relation to Blackfoot peoples and lands. See, in 1971, the University asked Leroy Little Bear to figure out what would make campus a congenial

90

space for Native students. But if the U of L was serious about "revitalizing it [Indigenous intelligence] on Indigenous terms as a form of restitution for its historic and contemporary role as a colonizing force" it might instead begin to actively participate in "protecting the source of our knowledge - Indigenous *land*." (Simpson, 2014, p. 22). Indeed, the University might throw its financial support behind Little Bear's efforts toward buffalo repatriation as a kind of land protection in light of the buffalo's unique and potentially important role in prairie ecosystems. This is not trivial. It is tantamount to "dismantling settler colonialism" and requires getting in the face of what Mackey (2014) calls settler structures of feeling or those deeply felt but not individual beliefs in settler entitlement to Indigenous land and *a priori* Crown ownership of that land (p. 240). Indeed, it would require standing in opposition to those ranchers in McKean's (16 Sept., 2013) story who drive around in pickup trucks with bumper stickers reading "No Federal Land Grab" in protest of the buffalo.

My argument here is not that Indigenous students should entirely reject Western education (Simpson, 2014, p. 22; Smith, 2014, p. 214). I am also not arguing that Little Bear's two projects are mutually exclusive because as Andrea Smith (2014) suggests, Native Studies *in the University* can be strategically engaged with and appropriated toward a Native Studies *outside of the University* (p. 214). I aim instead to highlight Simpson's (2014) contention that the appropriate context for the resurgence of Indigenous intelligences is not in a University, as they exist today, but out on the land.

End.

I hesitate to push for negotiations of any kind because, as we have seen, the U of L might end up looking really good, largely through the efforts of Indigenous peoples

who have worked to make Indigenous thought intelligible to the academy, spending valuable time away from their communities and forcing important concepts "into the lingua franca of the University" (Hill, 2012, n.p.). Audra Lorde (1979) knows that this kind of work can also mean being subjected to the "tragic repetition of racist patriarchal thought" (n.p.). Communication between worlds is not always a good (Law, 2004) and there may be other means through which the U of L could mobilize its resources toward funding the regeneration of Indigenous thinkers outside of the academy. For example, the U of L might commit to partially funding the construction of a new site for Red Crow College, without strings attached. Since an August 2015 fire which brought the College to the ground, Red Crow has been badly in need of a new building. Over the course of 18 months, they have received only 5,000 dollars of a 50,000 dollar goal and to my knowledge, the U of L has not made any donations (Provost, Aug. 16, 2015). One other example (Granzow, personal communication, Feb., 2017): For many FNMI students who commute from the surrounding reserves to attend their classes at the U of L, doing homework in the evening can be difficult due to a lack of internet access. Keeping in mind that socioeconomic and geographic gaps/spaces between reserve communities and the City of Lethbridge are not natural but have everything to do with land theft and colonial efforts at containment, the University might invest in providing on-reserve internet services as a decolonial move that would help ensure the success of Indigenous students attending the U of L. Moreover, internet services might also mean improved access to and heightened participation in online activisms and local activisms, notices for which often circulate online. Again, money cannot cajole ghosts into granting the U of L asylum but it might be an important opening.

I very nearly ended this thesis here — on a note that emphasizes (laments?) that the University will never receive permanent mercy from ghosts (Tuck & Ree, 2013). Let me try something else: I have been writing on hinterlands, their immense complexity and the ways they circumscribe anti-colonial efforts. I have written less, perhaps because they are more quiet, on the hinterlands upon which anti-colonial efforts, including this thesis, can and have drawn. This work was designed, in part, to pay tribute to the important efforts of Leroy Little Bear who has held out hope and laboured long toward decolonial futures with U of L. Red Crow's long-time president, Marie Smallface-Marule, should also be mentioned here. Her engagements with the University were both patient, persistent, and informed by a desire to see her community remake themselves as Blackfoot peoples (on remaking, see Little Bear as cited in Grier, 2014, p. 97). I think here, too, of Tanya Harnett of the Carry-the-Kettle Nakoda First Nation whose insights have been more important to this work than she knows and whose tenure at the U of L was marked by unsettling and vital art activism and an open office door. To be clear, these are the names of individuals rather than the characteristics of hinterlands but it seems to me that much of the work of Harnett, Smallface-Marule, Little Bear, and so many others, draws on and makes worlds in which white people are rendered ghostly or are not entirely visible (Verran as cited in Law, 2004, p. 136), and where the question of settler futures is not being asked or answered (Tuck & Yang, 2012). I suspect that these are worlds that are informed by hinterlands that include strong connections to family and community (broadly conceived), Indigenous relations with land, ceremony, the flexibility of Native paradigms, and a formidable and effective legacy of resistance to colonial education launched since before

93

confederation. These hinterlands interfere with and interrupt those that inform the founda-

tions of the U of L and I contend that they pose a significant challenge to the University's

colonial capacities.

References

Archival Sources

Beckel, W. E. (Dec. 23, 1971). —. (Record Group 14 - Subject A - Z 1970 -1980, Box BBF, File 22). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

A Chronological Account of the Process Leading up to the Proposal. (June 28, 1973). —. (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 12). Report. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Conference on Teacher Education for Native Students. (April 6, 1973). —. (Record Group 14 - Associate Dean Admin., Box BBG, File 16). Conference Proceedings. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Dupree, C. (Dec. 16, 1975). —. (Record Group 14 - Subject A - Z 1970 - 1980, Box BBF, File 22). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Francis, M. (2011). *Creative subversions: Whiteness, indigeneity, and the national imaginary.* UBC Press.

Grier, A. (2003). *Aistimatoom: The embodiment of Blackfoot prayer as wellness.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Retrieved from https://www.uleth.ca/dspace/bitstream/handle/10133/3463/GRIER_ANGELA_MED_2014.pdf?sequence=1

Hesch, R. (Dec. 18, 1995). *Report to Dean Laurie Walker, the Native Teacher Education Committee, and the Faculty of Education: Aboriginal teacher education in Canada.* (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 4). Report. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Indian education convention. (Jan. 1, 1965). *Sundance Echo.* (Sundance Echo 1964-1966). Newspaper clipping. Southern Alberta Newspaper Collection, University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB. Retrieved from http://digitallibrary.uleth.ca/cdm/ref/collection/sanews/id/31523

Indian school teachers meet in convention. (1957). *Lethbridge Herald.* (File - Indians - Education - 1950s + years previous). Newspaper clipping. Glenbow Museum Library and Archives, Calgary, AB.

Kiipaitapisinnooni, Blackfoot culture as a living experience: Implications for education and teacher preparation (n.d.). —. (Record Group 14 - Misc., Box BEC, File 32). Report. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Lafrance, M. (1956). *The Voice of St. Mary's.* (Grey Nuns of Montreal Collection, Shelf 2012 - 021 - 002, Container 002). Yearbook. Shingwauk Residential Schools Centre, Sault Ste. Marie, ON.

Lane, P. (May 17, 1993). —. (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 14). Memorandum. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Lane, P., & Hesch, R. (March 25, 1993). —. (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 14). Memorandum. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Mokosch, E. (Aug. 18, 1972). —. (Record Group 14 - Associate Dean Admin., Box BBG, File 16). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Murawski, O. (Feb. 12, 1997). *Advice on the RCCC proposal.* (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 10). Phone Discussion Notes. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Native American Education. (1977). —. (Record Group 14 - Subject A - Z 1970 - 1980, Box BBF, File 22). Report. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Native Teacher Education Committee Meeting. (Jan. 8, 1996). —. (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 14). Minutes. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

O'Dea, J. (Oct. 3, 2000). —. (Record Group 14 - Misc., Box BEC, File 32). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

O'Reilly, J. (March-April, 1970). Catholic education for British Columbia Indians. *Indian Record, 33*(3-4). (Grey Nuns of Montreal Collection, Shelf 2012 - 033 - 001, Container 001). Newspaper Article. Singwauk Residential Schools Centre, Sault Ste. Marie, ON.

Preliminary Meeting on the Proposed Inter-disciplinary Orientation Program for Teachers of Indian Children. (Feb. 16, 1971). —. (Record Group 14 - Subject A - Z 1970 - 1980, Box BBF, File 22). Meeting Minutes. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

R.C. Indian Residential School, Stand Off. (Nov. 17, 1924). —. (RG 10, Vol. 6342, File 750-1, part 1). Correspondence Letter. Indian Affairs School Files Series 1879-1953. Microform c-8699. Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, ON.

Smallface-Marule, M. (Feb. 26, 1997). —. Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 10). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Smallface-Marule, M. (Dec. 10, 1999). —. (Record Group 14 - Misc., Box BEC, File 32). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Walker, L. (Oct. 16, 1995). —. (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 14). Memorandum. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

The Voice of St. Mary's. (1952). —. (Grey Nuns of Montreal Collection, Shelf 2012 - 021 - 002, Container 002). Yearbook. Shingwauk Residential Schools Centre, Sault Ste. Marie, ON.

Walker, L. (May 27, 1996). *Address to the Kainai Board of Education.* (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 5). Address. University of Lethbridge Archives, AB.

Walker, L. (Sept. 11, 1996). *Aboriginal Teacher Education at the UL: Presentation to Dean's Council.* (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 5). Presentation Notes. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Walker, L. (Feb. 13, 1997). —. (Record Group 14 - Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 10). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Walker, L. (April 26, 1999). —. (Record Group 14 - Misc., Box BEC, File 32). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB

Walker, L. (March 14, 2000). —. (Record Group 14 - Misc., Box BEC, File 32). Correspondence Letter. University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Non-Archival Sources

Ahmed, S. (2004). Declaration of whiteness: The non-performativity of anti-racism. *Borderlands e-Journal, 3*(2), n.p.

Alfred, T. (2004). Warrior scholarship: Seeing the university as a ground of contention. In D. Mihesuah & A. Wilson (Eds.), *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities* (88-99). Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

Badwall, H. (2014). Colonial encounters: Racialized social workers negotiating professional scripts of whiteness. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Policy, and Practice, 3,* 1-23.

Barry. (Sept. 16, 2011). Buffalo paddock -- Waterton -- Hiking Alberta. *Hiking with Barry -- Wilderness Adventure.* Retrieved from http://hikingwith-barry.com/2011/09/16/buffalo-paddock-waterton-hiking-alberta

Barthes, R. (1977). *From work to text*. (S. Heath Trans.). Retrieved from http://faculty.georgetown.edu/irvinem/theory/Barthes-FromWorktoText.html (Original work published 1971).

Belcourt, C. (July 1, 2013). Reclaiming ourselves by name: Contesting Canada's colonial names by language and map. *Briarpatch Magazine.* Retrieved from https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/reclaiming-ourselves-by-name

Belcourt, C. (March 31, 2016). [Facebook post]. Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/ christibelcourt/posts/10153917287180272

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.

Blaser, M. (2013). Ontological conflict and the stories of peoples in spite of Europe: Toward a conversation on political ontology. *Current Anthropology, 54*(5), 547-568.

Blaser, M. (2014). Ontology and indigeneity: On the political ontology of heterogeneous assembalges. *Cultural Geographies, 21*(1), 49-58.

Calendar 1978-1979. (1978). *The University of Lethbridge*. Retrieved from University of Lethbridge 1978_1979.pdf

Cameron, B. (2009). Retention of Aboriginal students in post-secondary institutions in Atlantic Canada: An analysis of the supports available to Aboriginal students. *Canadian Council on Learning*. Retrieved from http://en.copian.ca/library/research/ccl/retention/retention.pdf

Cameron, E. (2008). Indigenous spectrality and the politics of postcolonial ghost stories. *Cultural Geographies, 15*, 383-393.

Campbell, C., Weasel Fat, R. & Magnusson, K. (2006). Niitsitapi teacher education program: A collaborative project between the University of Lethbridge and Red Crow Community College. *Summary Report.* Retrieved from https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/index/cms-filesystem-action?file=pdfs/conferences/2007/university-of-lethbridge-niitsitapi1.pdf

Combined Degrees. (2017). *Faculty of Education.* Retrieved from http://www.uleth.ca/education/ programs/undergraduate-studies/combined-degrees

Comeau, L. (2005). Contemporary productions of colonial identities through liberal discourses of educational reform. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 3*(2), 9-25.

Corntassel, J. (Jan. 12, 2011). Indigenizing the academy: Insurgent education and the roles of Indigenous intellectuals [Blog post]. *Equity Matters.* Retrieved from

http://www.ideas-idees.ca/blog/indigenizing-academy-insurgent-education-and-roles-indigenous-intellectuals

Cote-Meek, S. (2010). *Exploring the impact of ongoing colonial violence on Aboriginal students in the postsecondary classroom.* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Retrieved from https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/24729/2/Cote-Meek_Sheila_L_201006_PhD_thesis.pdf

Cote-Meek, S. (2014). *Colonized classrooms: Racism, trauma and resistance in post-secondary education.* Fernwood Publishing.

Davies, B. (2000). *A body of writing: 1990-1999.* AltaMira Press.

DeLucia, C. M. (2012). Border crossings: Telling Indian histories at the frontière. *Rethinking History*, *16*(1), 134-139.

Derworiz, C. (Sept. 23, 2014). Historic buffalo treaty signed by First Nations to bring back bison. *Calgary Herald.* Retrieved from http://www.calgaryherald.com/news/Historic+Buffalo+Treaty+signed+First+Nations+bring+back+bison/10229219/story.html

Dion, S. (2007). Disrupting molded images: Identities, responsibilities and relationships — teachers and Indigenous subject material." *Teaching Education, 18*(4), 329-342.

Donald, D. (2003). *Elder, student, teacher: A Kainai curriculum métissage.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Retrieved from https://www.uleth.ca/dspace/bitstream/handle/10133/147/MQ83749.pdf?sequence=3

Field Experiences - Extensive Practica. (2017). *Faculty of Education.* Retrieved from http://www.uleth.ca/education/ undergrad/fe

FNMI Viewbook 2015-2016. (2015, February 22). *ISSU*. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/ ulethbridge/docs/fnmi-viewbook-finaldraft-singles

(FNMI) Alumni Chapter. (2017). *Alumni*. Retrieved from
https://www.uleth.ca/alumni/first- nations-metis-inuit-fnmi-alumni-chapter

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters*. University of Minnesota Press.

Freud, S. (1955). The 'uncanny'. In (J. Strachey, Trans), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, volume XVII (1917-1919): An infantile neurosis and other works* (217-256). London: The Hogarth Press. (Original work published in 1919).

Furi, M. & Wherrett, J. (2003). Indian status and band membership issues. *Parliament of Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.lop.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/bp410-e.htm

Gable, B. (2015). *Brian Gable's top twenty: The year in editorial cartoons*. [Globe ebooks]. Retrieved from http://beta.images.theglobeandmail.com/static/ebooks/Gable_eBook_1.pdf

Garneau, D. (n.d.). *Rocks, stones, and grandfathers*. Retrieved from
http://rocksstonesdust.com/essays/garneau.html

Goodstriker, W. (1996). Introduction: Otsistsi pakssaisstoyiih pi (the year when the winter was open and cold). In W. Hildebrandt, S. Carter, D. First Rider (Eds.), *The true spirit and original intent of Treaty 7* (3-27). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Gordon, A. F. (2008). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. University of Minnesota Press.

Granzow, K. (2016). *In the absence of indifference: Practices of life and death in a contemporary colonial city*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Granzow, K., & Dean, A. (2016). Ghosts and their analysts: Writing and reading toward something like justice for murdered or missing Indigenous women. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, *16*(1), 83-94.

Gunew, S. & Spivak, G. (1986). Questions of Multi-Culturalism: Sneja Gunew and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Hecate, 12*(1/2), 136.

Hall, S. (1992). The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall & Gieben, B. (Eds.), *Formations of Modernity* (184-227). Polity Press.

Hammer, K. & Alphonso, C. (Feb. 28, 2013). Hiring should favor male minority teachers: Toronto school board. *The Globe & Mail.* Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/hiring-should-favour-male-minority-teachers-toronto-school-board/article8797933/

Hardes, J. (2013). Retention of Aboriginal students in post-secondary education. In F. Widdowson & A. Howard (Eds.), *Approaches to Aboriginal education in Canada: Searching for solutions* (247- 255). Brush Education.

Hill, E. (2012). A critique of the call to "always Indigenize!" *Peninsula: A Journal of Relational Politics, 2*(1), n.p.

Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. Retrieved from http:// www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/ Honouring_the_Truth_Reconciling_for_the_Future_July_23_2015.pdf

Hyland, N. (2005). Being a good teacher of black students? White teachers and unintentional racism. *Curriculum Inquiry 35*(4), 429-459.

Jeffrey, D. (2007). Radical problems and liberal selves: Professional subjectivity in the anti-oppressive social work classroom. *Canadian Social Work Review/Revue canadienne de service social, 24*(2), 125-139.

Kindergarten to Grade 12 Education. (2016). Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. Retrieved from https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100033676/1100100033677

Kingfisher, C. (2007). Discursive constructions of homelessness in a small city in the Canadian prairies: Notes of destructuration, individualization, and the production of (raced and gendered) unmarked categories. *American Ethnologist, 34*(1), 91-107.

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational research*, *70*(1), 25-53.

Lapadat, J. (April 24, 2015). The history and role of the Aboriginal education committee. *Teaching Centre.* Retrieved from http://blogs.ulethbridge.ca/teachingcentre/2015/04/24/the-history-and-role- of-the-aboriginal-education-committee/

LaRocque, E. (2010). *When the Other Is Me: Native Resistance Discourse, 1850-1990.* University of Manitoba Press.

Lather, P. (2000). Drawing the line at angels: Working the ruins of feminist ethnography. In E. St. Pierre & W. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (284-311). Routledge.

Law, J. (2002). *Aircraft stories: Decentering the object in technoscience*. Duke University Press.

Law, J. (2004). After method: Mess in social science research. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge.

Law, J., & Callon, M. (1988). Engineering and sociology in a military aircraft project: A network analysis of technological change. *Social Problems*, *35*(3), 284-297.

de Leeuw, S. (2007). *Artful places: Creativity and colonialism in British Columbia's Indian residential schools*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Retrieved from http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/jspui/bitstream/handle/1974/870/de%20Leeuw_%20Sarah_Naomi_200709_GPHY_PHD.pdf;jsessionid=5D23BABA673D35C6BDA5A1A7E7393612?sequence=1

de Leeuw, S. (2009). 'If anything is to be done with the Indian, we must catch him very young': Colonial constructions of Aboriginal children and the geographies of Indian

residential schooling in British Columbia, Canada. *Children's Geographies*, *7*(2), 123-140.

de Leeuw, S., Greenwood, M., & Lindsay, N. (2013). Troubling good intentions. Settler Colonial Studies, 3(3-4), 381-394.

Little Bear, L. & Boldt, M. (1972). *Proposal for a Program of Studies Primarily for Native Americans* (Record Group 14 – Faculty of Educ., Box AMG, File 11). Proposal for Programs. The University of Lethbridge Archives, Lethbridge, AB.

Lorde, A. (1979). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. *History is a Weapon.* Retrieved from http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/lordedismantle.html

Mackey, E. (2013). The apologizers' apology. In J. Henderson & P. Wakeham (Eds.), *Reconciling Canada: Critical perspectives on the culture of redress* (47-62). University of Toronto Press.

Mackey, E. (2014). Unsettling expectations: (Un)certainty, settler states of feeling, law, and decolonization. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society/Revue Canadienne Droit et Société*, *29*(2), 235-252.

MacLure, M. (2011). Qualitative inquiry: Where are the ruins? *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(10), 997-1005.

Mann, A., Mol, A., Satalkar, P., Savirani, A., Selim, N., Sur, M., & Yates-Doerr, E. (2011). Mixing methods, tasting fingers: Notes on an ethnographic experiment. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, *1*(1), 221-243.

Manuel, J. & Hughes, J. (2006). 'It has always been my dream': Exploring pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing to teach. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development, 10*(1), 5-24.

Marx, S. (2004). Regarding whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of white racism in teacher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 37, 31-43.

McKean, A. (Sept. 16, 2003). New bison war: Should buffalo be reintroduced to the west? *Outdoor Life.* Retrieved from http://www.outdoorlife.com/blogs/open-country/2013/09/new-bison-war

McMahon, R. & Belcourt, C. (March 1, 2016). Reflections on reconciliation: Christi Belcourt. *Red Man Laughing Podcast.* Retrieved from https://www.redmanlaughing.com/listen/2016/3/red-man-laughing-reflections-on-reconciliation-christi-belcourt

Miller, J. R. (1996). Shingwauk's vision: A history of Native residential schools. University of Toronto Press.

Million, D. (2014). There is a river in me: Theory from life. In A. Simpson & A. Smith (Eds.). *Theorizing native studies,* (31-42). Duke University Press.

Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse: The new critical idiom* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Mitrou, F., Cooke, M., Lawrence, D., Povah, D., Mobilia, E., Guimond, E., & Zubrick, S. (2014). Gaps in Indigenous disadvantage not closing: A census cohort study of social determinants of health in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand from 1981–2006. *BMC Public Health*, *14*(1), n.p..

Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Duke University Press. Native American Studies. (2015). *Faculty of Arts & Science.* Retrieved from https://www.uleth.ca/future-student/program/native-american-studies

Montgomery, K. (2013). Pedagogy and privilege: The challenges and possibilities of teaching critically about racism. *Critical Education, 4*(1), 1-21.

Morrison, T. (2004). *Beloved.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1987).

Munslow, A. (2006). *Deconstructing history*. Taylor & Francis.

Narine, S. (July 29, 2016). Red Crow College struggles for funding to rebuild. *Alberta Sweetgrass, 34*(9). Retrieved from http://www.ammsa.com/publications/alberta-sweetgrass/red-crow-college-struggles-funding-rebuild

Native American Studies. (2015). *Faculty of Arts & Science.* Retrieved from https://www.uleth.ca/future-student/program/native-american-studies

Native Education. (2015). *Faculty of Education.* Retrieved from https://www.uleth.ca/future- student/program/native-education

Native Education Requirements. (2017). *Faculty of Education.* Retrieved from http://www.uleth.ca/education/programs/undergraduate-studies/after-degree/requirements/native- ed

Onciul, B. (2015). *Museums, heritage and Indigenous voice: Decolonizing engagement.* Routledge.

Perry, M. (April, 2005). From the archives. *The University of Lethbridge Ledgend, 4*(8). Retrieved from http://www.uleth.ca/legend/pdfs/Apr05_Legend.pdf

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined whiteness of teaching: How white teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies." *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2), 197-215.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(2), 175-196.

Provost, R. (Aug. 16, 2015). Red Crow Community College Fire. *Go Fund Me.* Retrieved from https://www.gofundme.com/redcrow

Purdie, N., Tripcony, P., Boulton-Lewis, G., Fanshawe, J., & Gunstone, A. (2000). Positive self-identity for Indigenous students and its relationship to school outcomes. *Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.*

Radway, J. (2008). Introduction. In A. Gordon, *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination* (p. vii-xiii). University of Minnesota Press.

Raffles, H. (2010). *Insectopedia*. Vintage.

Ramp, W. (Feb. 27, 2015). Dreams in a sliver of time: Plains songs (Chapter 1: The plains series). *The Weekly Hubris.* Retrieved from http://weeklyhubris.com/dreams-in-a-sliver-of-time-plains-songs-chapter-1-the-plains-series/

Razack, S. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race, and culture in courtrooms and classrooms*. University of Toronto Press.

Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian residential schools, truth telling, and reconciliation in Canada.* UBC Press.

Rutherdale, M. (2002). *Women and the white man's God: Gender and race in the Canadian mission field*. UBC Press.

Schick, C. (2000a). 'By virtue of being white': Resistance in anti-racist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education 3*(1), 83-101.

Schick, C. (2000b). Keeping the ivory tower white: Discourses of racial domination. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, *15*(2), 70-90.

Schick, C. (2002). Keeping the ivory tower white. In S. H. Razack (Ed.), *Race, space, and the law: Unmapping a white settler society,* (99-119). Between the Lines.

Schick, C., & St. Denis, V. (2005). Troubling national discourses in anti-racist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation, 28*(3), 295-317.

Schweber, N. (Sept. 26, 2014). 'His life is our life': Tribal Elders want buffalo back in the ecosystem. *Aljazeera America.* Retrieved from http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/9/26/save-buffalo-montana.html

Sestigiani, S. (2014). *Writing colonisation: Violence, landscape, and the act of naming in modern Italian and Australian literature*. Peter Lang Publishing Incorporated.

Simpson, L. B. (2014). Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *3*(3), 1-25.

Smedley, A. & Smedley, B. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist, 60*(1), 16-26.

Smith, A. (2014). Native studies at the horizon of death: Theorizing ethnographic entrapment and settler self-reflexivity. In A. Simpson & A. Smith (Eds.). *Theorizing native studies,* (207-234). Duke University Press.

Solomona, R., Portelli, J., Daniel, B., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How white teacher candidates construct race, racism and 'white privilege'. *Race ethnicity and education*, *8*(2), 147-169.

St. Denis, V. (2007). Aboriginal education and anti-racist education: Building alliances across cultural and racial identity. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, *30*(4), 1068-1092.

Stonechild, B. (2006). *The new buffalo: The struggle for Aboriginal post-secondary education in Canada*. University of Manitoba Press.

Sundberg, J. (2014). Decolonizing posthumanist geographies. *Cultural Geographies, 21*(1), 33-47.

Truth and Reconciliation. (2017). *U of L*. Retrieved from http://www.uleth.ca/truth-and-reconciliation

Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*(3), 409-428.

Tuck, E., & Ree, C. (2013). A Glossary of haunting. In H. Jones, T.E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (639-658). Routledge.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1-40.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.

Turnbull, D. (2007). Maps narratives and trails: Performativity, hodology and distributed knowledges in complex adaptive systems–an approach to emergent mapping. *Geographical Research*, *45*(2), 140-149.

ulethbridge. (Feb. 8, 2016). *Reconciliation: Discussion #1 with Dr. Leroy Little Bear*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3GdcrYOxW98

Undergraduate Calendar and Course Catalogue 2016/2017. (2016). *The University of Lethbridge*. Retrieved from https://www.uleth.ca/ross/sites/ross/files/imported/academic-calendar/2016-17/cal_doc.pdf

University of Lethbridge. (n.d.). *Maclean's*. Retrieved from http://www.macleans.ca/schools/university-of-lethbridge/

Walker, A. (2010). *The temple of my familiar*. Mariner Books.

Watts, V. (2013). Indigenous place-thought and agency amongst humans and non humans (First Woman and Sky Woman go on a European world tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *2*(1), 20-34.

Wheeler, G. (2004). Emergence, alliances, and vision: The Tribal College and beyond. Retrieved from https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/5805/ins.v05.n1.1-14.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Young, J. E. (1992). The counter-monument: Memory against itself in Germany today. *Critical Inquiry*, *18*(2), 267-296.