Whiteness and Land in Indigenous Education in Canadian Teacher Education

Alexa Scully

Faculty of Education

Lakehead University

Thunder Bay, ON

Traditional Territory of the Fort William First Nation

Robinson Superior Treaty

October 2018

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Studies

© Alexa Jane Scully, 2018

Abstract

After decades of advocacy by Indigenous scholars and communities, Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education is gaining support and status. Throughout Canadian teacher education, the 'common knowledge' of pre-service teachers does not include complex understandings of Indigenous peoples, Lands, or history in what is currently known as Canada. Using multiple qualitative research methods in the methodology of the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP), I investigate how I and eight teacher educators enact critical Place-based education (cPBE) in our Indigenous education in teacher education practice in Canada to trouble whiteness, centre Land, and disrupt settler colonialism. The decolonization of teacher education practices, and of the administrative structures and practices of faculties of education, is necessary to support learning with, from and for Indigenous peoples in support of Indigenous futurities.

As I struggled to teach with Land at the centre and in *right relation* to Anishinaabe Lands and communities, I examined and transformed my own practice-in-relation alongside my students and colleagues. As the Indigenization of universities proliferates, more questions are emerging about how to do this work well.

This research deeply confirms the dual oppression of Land and of Indigenous peoples that is at the heart of the Canadian identity, but it also offers some answers. Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education must include anti-racist education that contends with white privilege, Land-based learning both in and beyond the classroom, and centring local Indigenous communities by prioritizing relationships and learning contexts with them. These elements, which represent the ethical relationality and *right relation* necessary to cPBE in Canada, are not supported, rewarded, or remunerated in current university structures. This demands change in how universities hire, how they support critical, Land- and community-based pedagogies, and in how they conduct themselves in relation to the Lands and communities they stand on and serve.

Keywords: Indigenous education, teacher education, S-STEP, qualitative, decolonization

Acknowledgements

This research and writing has taken place in many territories in what is currently known as Canada, but primarily in the lands of the Anishinaabe, in Dish with One Spoon Anishinaabe, Mississauga and Haudenosaunee territory, unceded Alqonquin territory, and the Inuit Nunangat.

This work has been made possible by the financial support of Lakehead University's Faculty of Education & Faculty of Graduate Studies and the enormous personal support of Dr. Paul Berger, Dr. Connie Russell, Dr. David Greenwood, Dr. Ruth Beatty, Dr. Michael Hoechsmann, and Dr. Frances Helyar, who opened their homes and hearts to me, and spent countless hours supporting and encouraging me.

Thank you to my excellent committee, to my patient, positive and thorough supervisor Dr. Paul Berger, to committee members Dr. David Greenwood and Dr. Julian Kitchen, my internal examiner Dr. Joan Chambers, and my external examiner Dr. Dwayne Donald. Your thoughtfulness and encouragement has meant the world to me.

Miigwetch and Nakurmiik to Anishinaabe Elders Mark Douglas and Gerry Martin, to Bruce Beardy, Diane Maybee, Nancy Stevens, Brian Charles & to my dear Inuit colleagues Jobie Epoo, Jobie Kutchaka, Charlie Nowkawalk and Sala Padlayat.

Thank you to my family: to my parents for your support and encouragement, to Brian, Collette, Douglas, Katie and Michelle for opening your home to me and feeding me, and for so much more. Thank you to my sisters and your families for being loving cheerleaders.

Profound thanks to my peers and colleagues, my friends, and my students for accompanying me on this learning journey. Kathy, Erin, Laura, Nora, Julia, Mike, Ramsay, Marc, Brooke, Blair, Bob, Megan, Jeannie, Josh, Michael, Jan, Gerald, thank you all so much for your friendship, your time and your scholarship. Jordan, Nikki, Brendan, Jackson, Patrick, Andrew and Andrew, thank you for decades of love, laughter and music. Special thanks to Joe, Debby, Lara, Leo and

the girls for your love and encouragement all of these years. Thank you, also, to the ravens that are everywhere I go, for reminding me not to take myself too seriously, with love.

This work is dedicated, whole-heartedly, to my beloved grandmother Elizabeth Joyce Edwards Scully, and to Cathy Craig. In a life full of smart, loving, kind and generous women, you were extraordinary in every way.

All my relations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract……………………………………………………………………………………………i

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Foreground……………………………………….……..…………….……………….......…......1

Personal Ground………………………………………………………….……………...…..…..5

Complicated Locations………..…………………….………………….………….......……….16

What does whiteness mean for me as a teacher educator?..16

On Residential Schools……………………………………………………..………28

What does whiteness mean for pre-service teachers?..32

Essentialism and authenticity……………………….………………………….…...35

Relating to the *Perfect Stranger*…………………...…………………………...…..…36

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Place and Land……………………………………………………………………………...…43

Theories of Place……………………..……………………………………………………..…43

Landscape, wilderness, frontier, the commons, and *terra nullius*...................................45

Authenticity in Land and identity……………………...……………………….....…....56

Design and philosophy……………………………………………………………...…....60

Indigenous feminisms and borders………………………………………….............…67

Gatherings, assemblages and hybridity…………………...……………………....…..70

Place, Land and Indigeneity…………………………………………………………...79

Critical Pedagogy+Place-based Education = A Critical Pedagogy of Place..……………………...83

Critical Place-based Education, Meet Land Education……………..……........................…88

Education for *Right Relation*: Starting with Land……………………………….………..…92

Decolonization? ………………………………………………………..............105

Indigenous Education in Teacher Education in Canada……………………………………..111

Resistance: Uncommon Canadian knowledge……………………..........................…114

More on decolonization……………………...…………………………………....119

What Has Gone Before………………………………………………………………..…130

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Requirements and Elements…………………………………..................................…135

S-STEP in Relation to Indigenous Methodologies………………..…………………..…….136

Methods ……………………………………………………………………………..…138

Personal history self-study: Personal location & relationality ………………...………138

Journals…………………………………………………………….……………..…142

Critical friends and dialogue………………………………………………...…….143

Syllabi…………………………………………………………….…………….……146

Conference presentations and journal articles………………………………..……..147

Administrative advocacy…………………………………………………..…..…149

Conversations…………………………………………………………………….…..150

Participants…………………………………………………………...…155

Conversations in Place…………………………………………………….156

Ethical Considerations…………………………………………………………………157

Instructor evaluations…………………………………………………...159

Trustworthiness……………………………………………………..………….160

Data analysis……………………………………………………………...…….161

Limitations……………………………………………………….………..……162

CHAPTER 4. TEACHING THE CLASS

EDUC 4416 Aboriginal Education……………………………………………..........165

Context and preparation………………………………..……………………..…165

For the record: What the journals hold…………………………………………………168

Critical friends to the rescue……………………………………………………171

From experience, reflection and dialogue come change: The syllabi……..…………....172

Living Contradictions and Vulnerability………………………………………………..…175

Humour……………………………...……………………………………………………177

Communities of Practice…………………..…………………………………………...179

Contracts………………………………………………………………………..180

Land-based Learning………………………..……………………………………………181

On the Land……………………………………………………………………..182

Land as First Teacher……………….……………………………….…………185

The Mnjikaning Fish Weirs………………………………………………………186

Mnjikaning Kendaaswin Elementary School…………………………………..….190

Elder Gerry Martin's medicines………………………………………………...195

Suzanne Morrissette and the Thunder Bay Art Gallery………………………...……197

Nancy Stevens………………………………………………………………...…198

Bruce Beardy………………………………………………………...……....199

Bringing the Land into the Classroom……………………………………………………….200

Treaty Education……………………………………………………………………..203

Ceremony…………………………………………………………………...…..205

Language……………………………………………………………………..207

Relationships…………………………………………………………...…….209

Indigenization: Obstacles and Resistance……………………………………………………210

Structural obstacles and advocacy…………………………………………...…...212

CHAPTER 5. THE CONVERSATIONS

The Participants…………………………………………………………………….…..215

Personal Histories and Ethical Relationality….……………………………………..…….217

Coming to Know, Resistance, and Anger……………………………………………………224

Dysconsciousness……………………………………………………………...…….232

Compulsory vs. Elective Courses……………………………………………………………240

Learning from the Land……………………………………………………………………...245

Instructors Becoming Connected to Place…………………………………………………...253

Positionality and Anti-Racist Education………………….…………………………………256

Land and Place: Explicit, Implicit, and Null appearances……………………………………...259

Treaty Education as Land Education…………………………………………………...…267

Discussion……………………………………………………………………………………270

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION……………………………………………………...……273

Institutional support………………………………………………………………….276

The trouble with place and Land……………………………………………………….280

REFERENCES……………………………………………………………………………..287

Appendix A Consent Form…………………………………………………….…………..311

Appendix B Semi-Structured Conversation Guide……………………………………….313

Appendix C Conference Presentations……………………………………………..…...314

Chapter 1: Introduction

Foreground

Recently, public awareness has increased greatly regarding the need to change what all Canadians learn in school about, with and from Indigenous peoples (Kerr & Andreotti, 2017). This message was highlighted in the June 2015 release of the report on the findings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). Like the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) report, released in November of 1996, the TRC report, entitled *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Canada: Calls to Action*, emphasizes the need for education to play a key role in service of justice and resurgence for Indigenous peoples. This call echoes the messages of such reports as People for Education's 2016 *Moving Towards Reconciliation in Ontario's Publicly Funded Schools* and 2013 *First Nation, Métis and Inuit Education: Overcoming the Gaps in Provincially Funded Schools*, the Association of Canadian Deans of Education's 2010 *Accord on Indigenous Education*, and the Ontario Ministry of Education's 2007 *Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework: Delivering Quality Education to Aboriginal Students in Ontario*. This emphasis on education is also a key element of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN, 2007). While the struggle for Indigenous control of Indigenous education is as old as colonization in this land, for at least 20 years, scholars in Education such as Mi'kmaq[1] scholar Marie Battiste (1998, 2000), and Lenape-Potawatomi scholar Susan Dion (2007, 2009), have been teaching, advocating for, and writing about, the need for the educational changes outlined in these policy papers and documents.

[1] In this paper, the nation-affiliation of each Indigenous scholar, Elder and mentor will be identified the first time they are cited. This break from APA 6 has created some awkwardness in citing. I apologize in advance for any mistakes or omissions – this is a practice-in-process.

In 2009-2010, I entered the field of Indigenous education by teaching eight sections of *EDUC 4416 Aboriginal Education*, a required course for Bachelor of Education students at the Orillia campus of Lakehead University, in the territory of the Chippewa Tri-Council (Chippewas of Rama First Nation, Chimnissing, and Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation) and the Williams Treaty. After this first (incredibly challenging and inspiring) year of teaching, I committed to researching this practice. My research question is: *How is critical Place-based education in Canadian teacher education supporting Indigenous futurities*[2] *in Canada by interrupting settler colonialism*[3]?

Now, having taught 17 of these courses over six years, a nuance to the research question that has emerged is: What role do white, settler Canadians have in this education shift? As Dion points out in her important work, *Braiding Histories: Learning from Aboriginal Peoples' Experiences and Perspectives* (2009), this work must be about teaching educators to better reach/serve Indigenous learners, but it must also be about shifting the perspectives of non-Indigenous learners. Another important theme that emerged out of the research question is: In what ways can Land-based learning[4] (Tewa scholar Gregory Cajete, 1994; Haig-Brown & Anishinaabe knowledge keeper Kaaren Daanneman, 2002; Anishinaabe scholar Leanne Simpson, 2014; Mohawk, English and French scholar Sandra Styres, 2011; Styres, Haig Brown, & Algonquin scholar Melissa Blimkie, 2013) be an intervention against settler colonialism

---

[2] Indigenous futurities: A conceptual framework where the practices work towards Indigenous sovereignty & self-determination, which include the thriving of Indigenous bodies, languages, cultures, economies and the repatriation of Indigenous territories. (Unangax scholar Eve Tuck, & Gaztambide-Fernández,, 2013; Snelgrove, Dhamoon, & Tsalagi scholar Jeff Corntassel, 2014).

[3] Settler colonialism is the specific formation of colonialism in which the colonizer comes to stay, making himself the sovereign, and the arbiter of citizenship, civility, and knowing (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013, p.1).

[4] Throughout this thesis, I will alternate between capitalizing Land and not doing so: The capitalization is meant to gesture toward the understanding of Land in many Indigenous epistemologies as having a power and agency of its own.

(Nehiyaw-Métis scholar Tracy Friedel, 2016)? These two questions have emerged from the research findings as important ways of framing the inquiry.

At this time, with large population increases in Indigenous communities, and with institutions like the TRC (2015), People for Education (2013, 2016) and the Ontario Ministry of Education (OME) (2007) calling for change in the schooling that would help address the social and economic inequities that persist for Indigenous peoples, there is a window for all to act. This is the responsibility of all Canadians. Over the course of this introduction and the following literature review, I will show how I am committed to *spending my privilege* (MacIntosh, 2009) to try to contribute to the work of shifting Canadian *common knowledge* about Indigenous peoples and histories in Canada through initial teacher education. I have chosen the methodology of the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) in a large part because “equity and social justice are core values for self-study researchers” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 819).

As I have come to learn over the last seven years, there are teacher educators all over Canada who are similarly committed. There is diversity in the programs they teach in, in geographical location, in whether their course is an elective or is mandatory, in length/frequency of the classes, in intention of the classes, in resources available, and in duration of the program.

For example, there is Michelle Tanaka (2009) and Kickapoo-Choctaw scholar Carmen Rodriguez de France (in press) at the University of Victoria (cultural and land-based education), Carol Schick and Cree and Métis scholar Verna St. Denis (2003, 2005) at the University of Regina (anti-racist education); Papaschase Cree scholar Dwayne Donald (2009) at the University of Alberta (Indigenous education); UBC’s required course in Aboriginal education under the leadership of Q’um Q’um Xiiem, Sto:lo Nation scholar Joanne Archibald and Anishinaabe scholar Jan Hare (2011); Jennifer Tupper and Michael Capello (2008) at the University of

Regina (treaty education) (Dr. Tupper is now affiliated with the University of Alberta); Nicholas Ng-a-Fook at the University of Ottawa; Lisa Korteweg at Lakehead University (Indigenizing pedagogies and practices in education); Celia Haig-Brown and Susan Dion (Urban Aboriginal Education Project) at York University; Joanne Tompkins (2002) at St. Francis Xavier (Inuit and Mi'kmaq education); Julian Kitchen (2005) and the faculty at the Tecumseh Centre at Brock University (Indigenous education); Métis scholar Greg Lowan/Lowan-Trudeau (2010, 2011, 2012) at the Werklund School at the University of Calgary (Indigenizing Environmental and Outdoor education), Mohawk scholar Frank Deer at the University of Manitoba, and many more. For some, the emphasis is on how to reach and support Indigenous learners through culturally appropriate or culturally responsive pedagogies, iconography, and practices. For others, emphasizing the treaty relationships is key.

Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education is about serving Indigenous futurities in Canada through conscientization (Freire, 1990) and shifting Canadian common knowledge and accountability as these relate to Indigenous Lands, communities and histories in Canada. From the writings and presentations that I have consumed, it seems that many of us who are engaged in this work are encountering similar obstacles, including the profound ignorance of many of the non-Indigenous participants related to Indigenous peoples, communities and histories, the frustration of Indigenous students regarding these ignorances, the disavowal of privilege and cultural location of Whiteness and of settler[5], and an unwillingness to contend with the personal implications of changing these understandings. It is also my perception that what is working, in my own practice and coast-to-coast-to-coast, is Land-based engagement with local

[5] Settler: the term refers specifically to people who are occupying and benefiting from Indigenous territories and erasures at the expense of Indigenous peoples (Anishinaabe scholar Damien Lee [n. d.] and Lawrence & Enakshi Dua [2005])

Indigenous peoples and communities. This is part of the central argument of my research findings, and shall be demonstrated in the analysis. My perception has been shaped and supported through the multiple forms of qualitative data collection methods supporting this self-study including personal history, journaling, dialogue with critical friends, course design changes, public presentations, administrative advocacy, and conversations (Kitchen, 2005 Kitchen & Russell, 2012; LaBoskey, 2004; Loughran, 2004; Samaras & Freese, 2006).

One of the forms of self-study is *personal history*: "this is used to know and better understand one's professional identity; model and test forms of reflection; and, finally, push the boundaries of what we know by creating alternative interpretations of reality (Samaras, Hicks & Berger, 2004, p. 905). This element of self-study, with its rigorous attention to *ethical relationality*, or self-in-relation, will be explained in more detail in Chapter Three. Situating myself in this teaching, and in this research, is a necessary beginning to this dissertation. This introductory chapter begins with some background on my own personal connection to this work from social, cultural, political and territory-based perspectives, then moves to the topic of whiteness as it relates to me as teacher-researcher and to the pre-service teachers.

Personal Ground

I am a white Canadian of Celtic heritage, a cis-gendered, heterosexual, able-bodied woman, and a settler. I am a PhD student and a teacher educator; I taught from 2009 to 2016 in the Lakehead Faculty of Education. As an educator of teachers, I have a responsibility and an opportunity to change the way that First Nations, Inuit and Métis people are learned from and about in the Ontario education system. I am often asked (tested) about how I came to do this

work. The answer is both simple (Land & people) and complicated (whiteness & privilege), and is best told as a story.

I have spent almost every summer of my life on the land in the northern part of Southern Ontario, and in Northern Ontario. My family heritage is predominantly Welsh, Scottish and Irish, all communities that have been described as fiercely land-connected people. All, also, partly displaced by colonialism. The most recent people to arrive in North America in my ancestry are six generations back; we have long benefitted from the colonialism enacted upon Indigenous peoples and Lands in North America. The Scullys, my paternal lineage, purchased a foreclosed-upon piece of land on the northeast end of Lake Joseph in 1870, and we sold what remained of the property in 2007 due to the pressures of taxes and increasingly complicated family dynamics. I grew up there, and love it fiercely. This Anishinaabe land is granite and white pine, juniper and blueberry, and Lake Joseph is deep and clear. The populations of crayfish and frogs on the shoreline show that this is a healthy lake; both of these are indicator species—the proverbial 'canaries in the coal mine' for the pH levels and temperature changes that indicate pollution or ecosystemic disruption.

I spent a great deal of time at this cottage in the summer months in the care of my grandparents, and of my extended family, as my immediate family all worked full-time. When I was not at the cottage, I attended and then worked at a summer camp in Algonquin Park from 1984 until 2009, and again in 2017, participating in and then leading canoe trips, and being an outdoor educator, in Algonquin, Temagami, and Quetico parks. I also love these places fiercely. In my work, and in decolonizing my own perspective, I now name these places as the territories of the First Nations of the Algonquin of Pikwàkanagàn, of Wolf River, of Timiskaming and of Eagle Village (the Ottawa Valley – Algonquin and Samuel de Champlain Park), the Anishinaabe

of Zhingwaako Zaaga'igan (Quetico Park and the Boundary Waters), Temagami First Nation (Temagami region), the Chippewa Tri-Council, that is, Chippewas of Rama, Chimnissing, and Georgina Island (Western Algonquin, Muskoka and Georgian Bay), and the Mohawk of Wahta (Muskoka).

From a very young age, I read voraciously, and was particularly engaged with fairy tales and 'legends' from all over the world. Once I discovered the stories of the Anishinaabe and realized that here were stories and happenings that occurred in the landscape that I inhabited, a whole new level of dialogue was possible for me in relation to the places that I loved the most. These were stories and teachings that were experience-able for me – relatable. The Anishinaabe creation story becomes familiar – repeatable – in the landscape that is at the very centre of how I see myself in the world. This story that teaches respect, humility and *right relation*[6] through the actual Land that I love only becomes more powerful as I get older. I grew up on this Anishinaabe Land; I have spent every summer of my life learning the rocks, plants, lakes and animals of this territory through my family's property on Lake Joseph and through my 33-year affiliation with the Taylor Statten Camps (TSC) in Algonquin Park, and then through my many years as an outdoor educator all over Anishinaabe territory. The camp, in particular, set me on my decolonizing journey.

TSC is comprised of Ahmek and Wapomeo, a pair of summer camps in Algonquin Park that were established in 1921 and 1926, respectively (Ahmek is Anishinaabemowin for beaver, but the translation of Wapomeo is less clear. At the camp, it is interpreted as 'blue birds of

---

[6] According to Anishinaabe-kwe Elder Edna Manitowabi, healthy self-concept in Anishinaabe epistemology is the fundamental understanding of *right relation* (personal communication, Trent University, October 17, 1996). In terms of wellbeing, from this perspective, a healthy person understands with respect and humility that they are implicated in their relationships with their family, clan, community and with the Land – that an understanding of self is only whole through an understanding of self-in-relation with all of these beings with the Land at the centre.

happiness', although I can find no relation between this word and this interpretation). The founder, Taylor Statten (the first) had branched off from the YMCA organization in part because of his staunch belief in and support of the writings and ideology of Ernest Thompson Seton, who he met through the Boy Scouts Organization. Seton's *League of Woodcraft Indians* was an outdoor youth movement that for a while was hugely popular; in fact, in 1910 it was the largest youth organization in North America (Francis, 1992). Seton's writings demonstrate a reverence for an Indigenous way of life that place him far outside of the Eurocentric norm of situating Indigenous peoples and cultures at the very primitive (read negative) end of the linear trajectory of "progress". Rather, as is explored later in this dissertation, Seton and Statten's reverence for their perception of the Indigenous way of life expresses the positive connection being made then between the antimodern 'primitive' and masculinity and nobility. While this interpretation of the primitive can be read as positive, it dehumanizes Indigenous peoples and knowledges through generalizations and stereotypical representations, and has little to do with the dynamic and complex Indigenous communities and peoples. Also, it is horrifying to know that this *playing Indian* was happening at the same time that terrible violence was being perpetrated upon Indigenous people, and children, all over Turtle Island. In fact, this trend depended heavily on the belief that Indigenous peoples were dying out and assimilating – on the trope of the Vanishing Indian (P. Deloria, 1998, 2004; Francis, 1992).

Statten started his own camp in part because of his discomfort with the deeply Christian practices and perspectives in the Y camps that he was involved with, and the falling out of favour/fashion of the appropriateness of the Red Man as a role model in outdoor and character education that he felt was more in line with the character education he wanted to model his camp

on (Francis, 1992). The practices and ideology of the *League of Woodcraft Indians* is still very much in evidence at both Wapomeo and Ahmek today.

As a camper, I remember Indian Council Ring as one of, if not *the* highlight of the summer. Upwards of 260 campers would line up double file in imperfect silence to cross over Wigwam Bay bridge at the Ahmek site, at the northeast end of Canoe Lake, to climb the hill behind one of the section groupings of cabins on the mainland to the Council Ring site, set right against a cliff in the woods, and surrounded by a palisade. Night would be falling, and we would wait quietly, anxiously, for the grand entrance of the Chief (the white camp director in full buckskin and head dress) so the Council could begin. There would be a “pipe ceremony”, signs in the cardinal directions written in Lakota, with the Chief and all the section directors wearing headdresses. Campers could apply face paint if we wished (war paint), and the girls would vie for roles as fire dancers to usher in the lighting of the Council fire. The girls practiced the song *Indian Wapomeo* for a full week before the event, to be sung as the sky darkens, to usher in the storytelling/serious part of the event, in contrast to the games and water-boiling contest.

Only in the last five years has the script changed: The Chief’s script barely changed from the 1920s to 2010s. This Council Ring is so integral, so sacred to the ideology of the camp, that efforts to change the practice by me and by many others over the last 20 years have been met with incredible levels of proprietary resistance and anger. To this day, I encounter alumnae who claim knowledge of authentic Indigeneity based solely on their experience of this event. The Indian Council Ring is the first ritual invocation of the sacred that I can remember participating in, and it connected me and the other members of the TSC to the site and the camp community.

Early in the history of the camp, this faux-Indian mythology was supplemented by a real-life relationship: In the 1920s, Taylor Statten cultivated a reciprocal and warm relationship with

the nearby community of Golden Lake First Nation – The Algonquins of Pikwåkanagån. Members of the community would come to the camp to teach birchbark canoe building, bushcraft, and canoe paddling. This relationship did not survive, unfortunately, and while there have been efforts over the last two decades to mend the relationship, the endemic culture at camp is such that this is a complicated task that would require serious multi-year commitment from the camp. In the summer of 2017, we began to take steps in this direction. In the meantime, in the last eight years, the camp has started to employ Indigenous knowledge holders to lead sessions in storytelling, plant knowledge, and Anishinaabe culture, and the Indian Council Ring no longer includes headdresses, the Medicine Man, or Indian Wapomeo. Council Ring now centres the history of the camp, and begins with a land acknowledgment and the importance of Indigenous land and people to the founding of the camp. Change is happening; I hope it continues to happen in a good way.

That sense of the sacred that is invoked in that circle in the woods was created by Seton at the turn of the last century, and the land connection and openness to spirit and relationality that it has engendered in generations of campers at the camps is very powerful. It was also a deeply culturally negligent practice, a mishmash and misrepresentation of plagiarized Indigenous language and ritual that perpetuates outright falsehoods about First Nations cultures and practices, performed by white people in a privileged environment. The TSC resistance and anger that has met attempts at changing this practice, or doing away with it altogether, suggests a troubling and remarkable willful separation and ignorance about the socio-political implications of the continuation of the practice. Another reaction to attempts to change the practice, and one that I continue to encounter, is a genuine surprise that it might be at all negative – the perception

being that if Council Ring is ‘portraying’ First Nations peoples in a positive and reverential light, then how could it be harmful or racist?

I encountered the same resistance in my classes in my first year of teaching in discussions around the problems of representation in the movie *Avatar* (2009), and encounter it perennially around a ‘Sports Mascots’ presentation. *Avatar* uses the same images and signifiers (in my class, I call it ‘feathers and leathers’) of what Francis (1992) calls the Imaginary Indian, as does the camp. This Imaginary Indian is the invention of the European (Francis, 1992, p. 4). Indian Council Ring at TSC demonstrates the potential of Indigenous pedagogy in connecting people to place and to Land. For 80 years, this practice has reified—indeed, made ‘traditional’ and sacred—a harmful misperception of Indigenous peoples that has been held as truth by generations of very privileged people, including leaders of state and industry. This practice, shown as powerful in this context, has erased the true ‘locations’ of the people and the practice, and has replaced knowledge of settler colonialism, Indigenous territories and communities, and the personal locations of the practitioners with myths that reinforce violent notions of Indigenous ‘authenticity’ while supporting settler feelings of ‘care’ for *Indians*. Again in the summer of 2017, I was asked ‘what harm’ was done. Plenty. And in going forward with my own work, I need to remain vigilant that I am not repeating these harms by affirming settler notions of the *Indian*. In my case, this practice was part of the path to pursuing my undergraduate degree at Trent University, in Indigenous Studies, and has been a huge impetus in my wish to contribute to changing what settlers ‘know’ about Indigenous peoples.

When it came time for me to choose an area of focus for my undergraduate studies, my decision to attend Trent University, also in the lands of the Anishinaabe and Algonquin peoples and adjacent to Haudenosaunee territory, arose out of my profound love of Land. I found, in the

epistemology and ontology of the Anishinaabe, a knowledge system that articulated the interrelationship and humility that could inform and express how I understand myself in relation to these Lands. The stories and teachings of the Anishinaabe take place in and are populated by the beings and locations that I am shaped by. “Indigenous people represent a culture emergent from a place, and they actively draw on the power of that place physically and spiritually” (Standing Rock Sioux scholar Vine Deloria Jr. & Yuchi Muskogee scholar Daniel R. Wildcat, 2001, p. 32). This is *not* a claim to Indigeneity, or to any authority with respect to traditional knowledge or cultural authority. It is, however, the story of how my own connection to the Lands of the Anishinaabe people was deepened through learning something about the epistemology and ontology of the Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples from some of the knowledge keepers and Elders of these communities.

This learning process taught me about my relationships and responsibilities to the Land and is how I came to understand my own implication in the oppressions of Indigenous peoples and Lands in Canada, both historical and contemporary. “The ongoing injustices of the world call educators-as-students-as-activists to work together—to be in solidarity as we work to change the history of empire and struggle in the common project of decolonization. To do so requires courage, humility, and love” (Grande, 2004, p. 175).

My undergraduate degree is in (what was then called) Native Studies, from Trent University. Many of my professors were Elders, namely Anishinaabe Elders Edna Manitowabi and Paul Bourgeois, and Cayuga Elder Chief Jake Thomas. Other notable teachers included Mohawk faithkeeper Dr. Dan Roronhiake:wen Longboat, and highly respected non-Indigenous advocates for/with Indigenous peoples Drs. John Milloy and Peter Kulchyski. This university experience was a very powerful one: I was learning from Elders and from powerful advocates

and activist professors while I was continuing to work as a canoe trip guide and live on the Land that formed these knowledges. This was my first immersion in Indigenous education. I was learning to see the oppressions that continued to be enacted upon Indigenous peoples while in community with Indigenous peoples from all over Turtle Island, learning from and with them, and learning about how I benefit from these oppressions and institutions as a treaty-partner, and as a Canadian citizen, and especially as a person with white privilege. For several years after the successful completion of the degree, I struggled to understand what I could do with this learning. After some years of guiding and teaching experiential education, some landscaping and waitressing, I eventually went back to school, pursuing my master's at York University.

At York, I did a master's degree in Environmental Studies. My major paper was an exploration of experiential environmental education in the Evergreen Brick Works (before it was built/repurposed), and the Toronto Botanical Gardens, in the Don River Valley. In keeping with my devotion to place-specific relationships, the case studies I did held extremely detailed site-specific information about the plants, river and earth features, and building schematics. I also investigated the educational and promotional materials and programs on each site through literature reviews and through interviews with designers and program deliverers. It was during this time that I first encountered theories of Place from a few different discourses, including philosophy, architecture, geography, landscape architecture and environmental thought (much more on this in the literature review). What I discovered was a total lack of acknowledgement of, or valuing of, Indigenous history, community or knowledge both in the discourses that I investigated and in these two major educational sites (Evergreen has since addressed this lack). My subsequent assertion on this topic in my major paper did not recommend me for employment

at the two organizations (to no one's surprise), and I spent a couple of years continuing to work in seasonal experiential education, landscaping, and in restaurant and retail work.

In the summer of 2008, I decided that I needed to take another leap into Land-based learning from Indigenous peoples: I signed up for Peter Kulchyski's *Pangnirtung Bush School* at the University of Manitoba. This program is a six-week program of intense study:

> The course includes in-class sessions in Winnipeg, and experiential, classroom and workshop learning over a five-week period in Pangnirtung, Nunavut, including a land immersion, living with elders and hunters in a summer camp where traditional foods are gathered and consumed. (University of Manitoba, n. d.)

We also had daily Inuktitut classes, though I am embarrassed to report that my Inuktitut is about as far from fluent as it is possible to be. This program, which has run since 1997, is described as placing students in "an ethical dilemma, situating them in an Inuit Arctic context where they will have to develop ways of making positive contributions to (and minimizing negative impacts on) the community" (University of Manitoba, n. d.).

The experience was intense and life-changing. From the realities of life in a small Arctic community, to the communal living (never easy for me), to the extraordinary beauty of the mountains and ocean, to the catastrophic and overwhelming evidence of climate change, but most importantly to the repeated exhortations of the Inuit community members who worked with us that we share what we saw and learned there with the people in the South – this was an incredibly significant experience for me, and one that contributed profoundly to my sense of being implicated in relation to Indigenous peoples in Canada. This galvanized my need to contribute in a positive way to changing what Canadians learn/know about, with and from Indigenous peoples from coast-to-coast-to-coast.

In the spring of 2009 I was notified by Dr. Connie Russell, a former instructor of mine from York University, now a deeply respected scholar and professor at Lakehead University (LU) in the Faculty of Education, that there was an opening at the Orillia campus for an instructor position, teaching a required course entitled *EDUC 4416 Aboriginal Education*. I had given a presentation in Dr. Russell's *Environmental Studies 101* course in 2001 on the topic of Indigenous education; I remember that Dr. Dan Longboat was in class that day, and I was nervous, but glad to show him that learning from him years before had stuck. I got the job at Lakehead Orillia. I taught eight sections of *EDUC 4416* in 2009-2010 as a contract lecturer, while working four days/week outside in a provincial park two-and-a-half hours away as an outdoor educator and labourer. I had 240 students in four-and-a-half months in eight demanding and interactive sections.

I loved this work, and was both devastated by the lack of knowledge of Indigenous peoples and history performed by the predominantly white teacher candidates, crushed by the sometimes scathing and personal resistance to the material, and propelled to apply for the PhD program to formalize my learning and intention to continue in this field of Indigenous education in teacher-education as a citizen and a treaty-partner. I had finally found a way to contribute – to spend my learning and privilege in this field, and to mind the words of the Inuit community members in Pangnirtung who had so forcefully directed me to make a difference in what "southern" Canadians know.

This research is my own coming to understand how to contribute to the resurgence and resilience of Indigenous peoples by exposing and interrupting settler futurity where it displaces Indigenous futurity, and by centering Land-based learning that is specific to territory and Nation in this work. As a researcher employing S-STEP methodology, I am committed to the

transformation of my own practice through reflection, public vulnerability and dialogue regarding my work and perceptions, and it is my hope that this work will contribute to the growing community of practice in Indigenous education in teacher education. Through this research, and the dissemination of this research, I seek to be a part of redressing the miseducation of non-Indigenous Canadians through Indigenous education in teacher education. One complicated part of this work is contending with whiteness – my own, that of the majority of my students, and the white privilege that underpins Canadian common knowledge.

Complicated Locations

What does whiteness mean for me as a teacher educator? Being a white settler working in this field is complex and contentious. It will be a lifelong process to integrate how to *be* in this field in a way that is respectful, that demonstrates genuine ongoing humility and ethical relationality, and that honours the work and learning that so many people have contributed to as I 'spend my privilege' (McIntosh, 2009). In this section, I address how Indigenous education must also be about shifting the way Indigenous people are learned from and about in the Canadian education system, and what my place and responsibility as a white settler committed to learning how to be in solidarity with Indigenous people might be in these aims.

When I began my schooling at Trent University, I began my own journey in contending with my own implication in settler colonialism, and in learning about whiteness. This was the early-mid 90s – whiteness was not a term or a critical concept that I remember being used in the way that it is now. I knew that my education had failed to teach me about Indigenous peoples and about the central role of Indigenous peoples in Canadian history, geography and economy. I knew that what I had encountered at my summer camp was at best ignorant. I did not yet know

how very little I really knew, although almost failing the Homelands Assignment in Native Studies 101 was the first of many lessons in humility. I try to remember these realizations when I see them mirrored in the experiences of the vast majority of my students in *EDUC 4416*.

I also remember an almost-impossibly powerful story contained within the novel *Ceremony* by Mexican, Kawaik, and European author Leslie Marmon Silko (1977). This story, but strangely not the context, stuck in my mind so clearly that I spent many years searching for its origin. The novel reappeared in my life over Christmas 2016 (I purchased it to re-read), and was I bemused but unsurprised to come across the powerful tale in the dead centre of this classic novel. The protagonist, Tayo, of Kawaik (Laguna Pueblo) heritage, is talking with an Elder, Betonie, as he tries to heal from post-traumatic stress disorder and intergenerational trauma. They discuss witchery as a disease, and white people as a tool of the witchery:

> 'I wonder what good Indian ceremonies can do against the sickness which comes from their wars, their bombs, their lies?'
>
> The old man shook his head. 'That is the trickery of the witchcraft,' he said. 'They want us to believe all evil resides with the white people. Then we will look no further to see what is really happening. They want us to separate ourselves from white people, to be ignorant and helpless as we watch our own destruction. But white people are only tools that the witchery manipulates; and I tell you, we can deal with white people, with their machines and their beliefs. We can because we invented white people; it was Indian witchery that invented white people in the first place.
>
> The witch stood in the shadows beyond the fire
> And no one ever knew where this witch came from
> Which tribe
> Or if it was a man or a woman…
> This one just told them to listen
> 'What I have is a story'
>
> *...caves across the ocean*
> *in caves of dark hills*
> *white skin people*
> *like the belly of a fish*

covered with hair.

Then they grow away from the earth
Then they grow away from the sun
Then they grow away from the plants and animals
They see no life
When they look
They see only objects
The world is a dead thing to them
The trees and rivers are not alive
The mountains and stones are not alive
The deer and bear are objects
They see no life.
//
the wind will blow them across the ocean
thousands of them in giant boats
swarming like larva
out of a crushed ant hill
//
they will kill the things they fear
all the animals
the people will starve

They will poison the water
They will spin the water away
And there will be droughts
The people will starve

They will fear what they find
They will fear the people
They kill what they fear
//
They will take this world from ocean to ocean
They will turn on each other
They will destroy each other
Up here
In these hills

Set in motion now
Set in motion
To destroy
To kill
//
Whirling
whirling
whirling

whirling
set into motion now
set into motion.

So the other witches said
'Okay you win; you take the prize,
but what you said just now—
it isn't so funny.
It doesn't sound so good.
We are doing okay without it
We can get along without that kind of thing.
Take it back.
Call that story back.'

But the witch just shook its head
At the others in their stinking animal skins, fur and feathers.
It's already turned loose.
It's already coming.
It can't be turned back.
(Silko, 1977, pp. 122-128)

As I progressed through the Native Studies program at Trent, I experienced some of what I would later hear repeated so often in the classes I would later teach at LU–the shame and consternation of how much I did not know about institutionalized oppression in Canada, and about how these oppressions are carried out in my name as a Canadian citizen. My [hairy, white as the belly-of-fish] forbears were colonized on and eventually out of their lands in Ireland, Wales and Scotland, and passed down the colonizing disease to Turtle Island through my more immediate ancestors, and to me. In my third year at Trent, I went to speak to Elder Edna Manitowabi about my place in those classes, on those Lands, and what we spoke about was my deep connection to Anishinaabe land; as a canoe trip guide, and as a human, I was connected to Land in a way that I found hard to explain. For me, learning the Land meant learning from the language, epistemology and ontology of the people of that land in order to be there with respect and understanding.

This does not – will never – erase my whiteness or my position as settler, as colonizer. As Tuck and Yang (2012) write, “Solidarity is an uneasy, reserved, and unsettled matter that neither reconciles present grievances nor forecloses future conflict” (p. 3); this is why I have personally rejected the term “ally”.Ally, to me, is a claim or a title that implies that my position is static. That is it! I get it! My harming/colonizing days are over and behind me! What I learn, over and over again, is that being a white settler in this field means enacting colonialism in ways I am not (yet) aware of, despite my intentions. This work is not about intentions, it is about impact. Learning this is never over. The teachings of the Anishinaabe and the Haudenosaunee and the understanding of my own implication in colonization have become more and more powerful each year. Now, as a teacher educator and as a scholar, I continue to learn the ways that I am accountable to my students, colleagues and to Indigenous peoples and Lands in doing this work in a good way.

I am committed to teaching and learning in this field within the principle of ‘relational accountability’ (Cree scholar Evelyn Steinhauer, 2002; Opaskwayak Cree scholar Shawn Wilson, 2001, 2008).

> It is imperative to relational accountability that as a researcher I form a respectful relationship with the ideas I am studying. In order for you to also be able to see this relationship and how it was formed, you need to form your own relationship with me as a researcher. You need to understand some of the factors that go into my side of things: how and why I decided to research this topic, where it fits into my life, and some of the factors that have influence my point of view. (Wilson, 2008, p. 22).

Relational accountability is a practice that figures prominently in this project; it is echoed in the S-STEP literature as *ethical relationality (*Kitchen, 2005a, 2005b; LaBoskey, 2004), and this term is also invoked by Donald (2009). It is articulated in some Indigenous worldviews that I have learned from, and for the purposes of this dissertation, in particular in the concepts of

gabeodesung, '360-degree vision', and 'All my Relations'. *Gabeodesung* and '360-degree vision' are principles that I was taught at Trent by Elder Edna Manitowabi and by SkyLynx, D'Arcy Rheault, her assistant (personal communication, 1996). It is not my place to teach them here, but the overview is simple – each describes a person as *everlasting walking upon the earth* (Anishinaabe Elder Jim Dumont).

Imagine that human beings are at the centre of a sphere of relations that is always connected; past, present, future and in every cardinal direction, and up, down, and within. Humans are perpetually accountable and connected in all directions (in time and place); each choice and action we make must be done with this in mind. As Donald (2009) tells us, "this requires that we see ourselves related to, and implicated in, the lives of those who have gone before us and those yet to come" (p. 6). Donald is a Papasechase Cree scholar and is referring to the

> ethical imperative to recognize the significance of the relationships we have with others, how our histories and experiences are layered and position us in relation to each other, and how our futures as people similarly are tied together. It is also an ethical imperative to see that, despite our varied place-based cultures and knowledge systems, we live in the world together with others and must constantly think and act with reference to these relationships. Any knowledge we gain about the world interweaves us more deeply with these relationships and gives us life. (Donald, 2009, p. 6)

Relational accountability is a process that I am committed to learning about, particularly as it relates to the fact of my whiteness, and the implications of my whiteness in my roles as learner, researcher, practitioner and teacher. I am committed to a lifelong process of learning to be in *right relation*. For me, this means slowing the 'whirling' described by Silko (1977), and being accountable on these Indigenous lands.

On the first day of my classes teaching *EDUC 4416* in the B.Ed. programs at Lakehead's campuses in Orillia and in Thunder Bay, I would walk into the classroom, smile, and say, "Ok! First things first. Why is the whitest woman on the planet teaching Aboriginal Education?"[7] There have been a variety of responses; for the most part, laughter on a scale from hearty to nervous to forced, some indignant glares, and then an expectant pause. I would tell them how I came to teach the course, and then would move on to two statements that I saw as crucial in terms of my being white and being in that role with any sense of integrity. These two statements are that: a) I have no traditional knowledge, and b) I have no cultural authority. I make it clear that I will not be giving any teachings or conducting any ceremonies, and that I will be speaking from the experiences and knowledge base that I have been given in my interactions with First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities.

The very first experience that these students have in my class is that they see I appear white when I walk in the door, and I announce/'expose' my Whiteness as a socio-political location in my first words. I am coming to understand just how important it is for me to do this in this role for several reasons. First and foremost, my unearned privilege as a white person is undeniable and ever-present, and implicates me in both historical and contemporary systemic oppressions: "Discourses, particularly within anti-racist projects, and given tangible realities, position the white body as always-already the oppressor" (McLaren, 1995, p. 63). Additionally, Greenhalgh-Spencer (2008) identifies the tension inherent in identifying as white in a textual context, and suggests that while some readers become resistant because of this tension, "on the one hand, we have a body which corporeally and discursively signifies inequality and racism. On

[7] I am an extremely pale-skinned, red-headed woman of Celtic descent. (I have actually been asked why I am wearing white 'nurse-stockings'). I have found that joking about how white I am can create an entry point to the conversation about whiteness.

the other hand, we have a body, posed by the white author, which signifies purity and expertise" (p. 10); my whiteness is also read by some as evidence of neutrality, particularly in anti-racist contexts, where people of colour are perceived as having bias (more on this later).

Ahmed (2004) points out that the confession of whiteness often gets viewed as a pronouncement of anti-racism, while not actually achieving any anti-racist effects. She further writes that the confession of whiteness can then be seen as an "exercise [of] rather than a challenge [to] white privilege" (p. 4). I am likely performing or persuading people that I am Probyn's (2004) 'good white': Probyn writes that the oppressor "is the very thing that the white critic of whiteness is but does not want to be" (p. 6). This 'confession' may be what Tuck and Yang (2012) have called a "settler move to innocence"; that is, a problematic attempt to assuage my own guilt and complicity in settler colonialism – as might be my declaration of settler status (Snelgrove, Dhamoon, & Corntassel, 2014, p. 16).

It is not my intention to erase my whiteness and settler status by confessing them, and I hope that I am not enlarging and reinforcing my privilege by naming them. Whiteness is part of the *situated context* (a central concern in S-STEP, see Brown, 2004; LaBoskey, 2004; Kitchen & Russell, 2012; Samaras & Freese, 2006) that I bring with me as a teacher and as a researcher. As I wrote earlier, though, this is not about intentions – it is about impacts. It is my intention to actively remain aware of the problems and conflicts that my whiteness and settler status pose as I work and learn in this field of Indigenous education. I strive to keep learning about the pernicious ways that these facts of my privilege and status are enacted by me, regardless of these intentions. There is much scholarship on the problem of multicultural education as being a practice that embodies the tokenistic visibilization of whiteness, or of the racism evidenced in education, in order to hide it deeper by seeming to expose it (e.g., den Heyer, 2009; DiAngelo &

Sensoy, 2009; Schick & St. Denis, 2005). Multicultural education is still using whiteness, or Eurocentrism, as the normative against which the 'other' cultures are explored. "As long as White people are not racially seen and named, they function as the human norm….The definition of Whites as non-raced is most evident in the absence of reference to Whiteness in the everyday language of White people" (Frideres, 2007, p. 44).

The history and current realities of settler colonialism in Canada with relation to the Indigenous people of this land necessarily means that my whiteness and settler status identify me as the oppressor. I want to be reflective about my privilege and the power relations that cause it. Ahmed (2004) points out that the ability to see race and racism often counts as evidence of a lack of racism, and writes that: "We [white authors] need to be uneasy about the ways that attempting to subvert the invisibility of whiteness can develop into the recuperation and affirmation of whiteness and white privilege" (p. 4).

I am perceived in many cases to be what Kincheloe (2008) refers to as a "detached practitioner" – I am unbiased by virtue of not being Indigenous. Schick (2004) writes about this paradox that she finds herself in as a cis-gendered female, heterosexual teacher:

> It is ironic that in areas of social justice—when talking about inequality, being seen as "objective" and believable can often coincide with being less informed. Among some audiences, even though my understanding of the effects of homophobia is second-hand, my speaking against homophobia will not be seen as "self-interested," but perhaps "unbiased." This is similar to the way that white people are sometimes called upon to verify a charge of racism made by a person of color, or the way a man will be able to decide whether or not a situation is sexist. (p. 246)

The energy and interaction in my classroom sometimes changes drastically upon my utterance of the word feminism, since I am a cis-gender woman: "Without this perceived detachment in relation to the object of study, [I] am positioned as a biased instructor with a personal agenda"

(DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2009, p. 447). My whiteness and settler identity, then, in the context of Indigenous education, both diminishes my authority as it fosters resistance from those learners for whom naming it signifies oppression, and potentially a re-centering of whiteness. For students for whom whiteness functions as an unproblematic norm, my whiteness lends me authority by rendering me unbiased, or without agenda.

I was the first white instructor who was hired at LU to teach this course, in the fourth year after it was added to the requirements of the degree (in 2007, it was separated from a course called *Multicultural and Aboriginal Education* to become *EDUC 4416 Aboriginal Education*). I described earlier how I came to apply for this work, and wrote a bit about the challenging context of my first year of teaching. At the time, the Orillia campus was new enough that there were few employees doing a great deal of teaching and administrative work. When I moved to Thunder Bay the next year, to the territory of the Fort William First Nation in the Robinson-Superior treaty area, I continued teaching the course.

In a faculty meeting of some instructors of *EDUC 4416*, a few Indigenous faculty who had been teaching the course made it very clear that they were no longer happy to do so, due to the profound and violent ignorances that they were exposed to both in class and in their evaluations. While these experiences are not ubiquitous, they are part of the reason that I was hired. Though I am non-Indigenous, my instructor evaluations have included some of the accusations of bias, or of 'creating an unsafe space for opposing opinions' that have been reported by other educators doing anti-racist work, or work that challenges dominant narratives (e.g., DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014b). Tompkins (2002) writes about doing anti-racist work as a white educator:

> Part of the challenge of doing anti-racist work with white educators is the task of leading people to see what they have, up to this point in their lives, been unable to see….My own

> journey in anti-racist education has been one of trying to move from an unconsciously arrogant position to what I hope is a consciously less arrogant one. The journey has not come easily and many of the lessons were painfully learned. It did not come in detached intellectual ways after reading a text. Most often it came from being in relationship with others—in a place where finally I could see and hear what I could not see and hear previously. I stress this point because it is the very messy side of what we do in anti-racist work with white educators. (pp. 410, 413)

As Tompkins indicates here, this learning-in-relation has been a difficult and uneven process of reflection, dialogue and transformation in this S-STEP research. Being white and doing this work means attending to and centering relationships with Indigenous peoples and Land. At the Canadian Society for Studies in Education (CSSE) conference in Calgary in 2016, Dr. Marie Battiste authored a hashtag: *#nothingaboutuswithoutus.* Dr. Battiste emphasizes the importance of learning *from* Indigenous peoples and places *about* Indigenous peoples and places (Battiste & Henderson; 2009). This assertion can be connected to the S-STEP literature in the emphasis on *situated context* (Samaras & Freese, 2006, p. 41), introduced on p.28.

I am committed to centering the local Land and community members in this work. Thanks to a wide web of relations from many years of generous teachers, mentors and community connections, and the privilege afforded by the academy, when I teach I have been able to engage and appropriately remunerate local Indigenous knowledge holders and Elders to teach culture and Indigenous epistemology, and to provide local first-person experiences and accounts. I also take the learners out onto the Land, and into community, to learn from Land and from local Indigenous peoples; these practices are well understood to be central to Indigenous education (Battiste, 2000; Cajete, 2009; Hare, 2011; Tanaka, 2009). The information, activities and structure that I provide are related to understanding the (continuing) colonization of

Indigenous peoples in Canada, and the intergenerational and continuing effects of these processes, institutions, and systems.

I am grateful to the many community members that have helped me to do this work. In Orillia, I am grateful for the work and mentorship of Elder Mark Douglas of Mnjikaning/Rama, Nancy Stevens (Haudenosaunee and Celtic) of Six Nations Reserve, Elder Neil Monague of Chimnissing, Brian Charles of Chippewas of Georgina Island, John and Dave Snake of Mnjikaning/Rama, Vicki Snache of Mnjikaning/Rama, Ben Cousineau of Mnjikaning/Rama, Anishinaabe artist Vicki Pavis, and to Nicholas Howard and the teachers at the Mnjikaning Kendaaswin Elementary School in Rama First Nation. In Thunder Bay, I am grateful for the work and mentorship of Elder Gerry Martin of Mattagami First Nation, Elder Sarah Sabourin of Pic Mobert First Nation, Bruce Beardy of Wajashk-onigaming First Nation, Diane Maybee of Moose Cree First Nation, Sandra Wolf of the Chippewas of Turtle Mountain, Elder Dolores Wawia of Gull Bay First Nation, Suzanne Morrissette (Cree-Métis), Lisa Korteweg, Tesa Fiddler of Onigaming First Nation, and Yolanda Wanakamik of Whitesand First Nation. It is their generosity and availability that supported my efforts to center Indigenous peoples, places, and Land in my practice of critical Place-based education in teacher education, as I strive for solidarity.

There are some rooms that I will not enter, and some gatherings that I will not be included in – that is as it should be. After centuries of violence and oppression by white people, it is of great importance to understand that there are circumstances where “safer space” excludes me. It will take me a lifetime to understand what my solidarity with Indigenous peoples might look like – how I might contribute without appropriating, speaking for, or taking up space that is not mine – and that this solidarity must be dynamic and responsive to places and relationships. In

2010, in the late fall, an insight came to me that helps me to work in this field: I will never profess to be an expert on Indigenous peoples, having never been one. I am becoming an expert on the *miseducation* of non-Indigenous peoples. There are some circumstances where modeling and communicating my position in solidarity can shift perspectives of non-Indigenous peoples, and can provide support for Indigenous community members. There are some circumstances where my role is to create a context to learn from Land and community, and then get out of the way as much as possible, although I acknowledge as the instructor and evaluator, I am never truly out of the way. I seek to create those circumstances in my teaching. As a white, settler, Canadian teacher educator, I endeavour to live "the double movement of awareness of race privilege and the forging of practices, methods, and relationships that shift identity formations forged in oppression" (Swiencicki, 2006, p. 354). One topic that must be a part of doing this work well, or at all, must be Residential Schools.

On Residential Schools. This is not a dissertation about Residential Schools. The fact of Residential Schools is embedded in the fabric of Canada as a nation, and in the identity of 'settler' in Canada, on these Indigenous territories. Doing a good job of teaching Indigenous education in teacher education means facing Residential Schools—their history and legacy—head on, and providing supports, resources and practices that will enable the pre-service teachers in the classes to also do so in their teaching.

For 21 years, I have been learning about Residential Schools from activist scholars such as Dr. John Milloy (who was my advisor at Trent and who is the author of *A National Crime* [1999], widely considered to be a crucial work in learning about the system), from survivors, from children of survivors, from the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996) and more

recently from the incredible work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC, 2015). I continue to learn from friends, colleagues and from scholars about this unimaginably violent, institutionalized tool of cultural genocide enacted by the Canadian government upon Indigenous peoples.

In the final stages of writing this dissertation, the office that I am writing in is in the former Residential School building in Inukjuak, Quebec. This school was attended by my friend and colleague in the next office, Jobie Kutchaka. Both his beautiful handwriting and his shyness around speaking English are vestiges of his years spent in these rooms (J. Kutchaka, personal communication, November 20, 2017). For another great resource to learn about the Residential School system, Regan (2010) is excellent. For tools on how to teach about this system with compassion and respect, *A Project of Heart* (projectofheart.ca) has resources, information, actions and lesson plans. All Canadians should read the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. It is available in print and online at www.trc.ca.

On June 2nd 2015, I was present in the Delta Hotel in Ottawa for the official release of the final report of the TRC. There were thousands of Indigenous people there. When the release was announced, there was cheering, there were smiles, and there were a great many tears. There were artifacts, and testimonials, *Project of Heart* blankets, and memorials to lost children and survivors. It was, and still is, incredibly emotional. Bearing witness to that moment was profoundly uncomfortable, but so important for me to do as a Canadian citizen. Regan (2010) writes about settler responsibility in the context of Residential Schools:

> For me, Canada's apology was a call for settlers to take seriously our collective moral responsibility for the systematic removal and institutionalization of Native children some of whom were abused and most of whom were deprived of their family life, languages, and cultures. Although the debilitating impacts of sexual, physical, and psychological

> abuse upon children are self-evident, and Canadians condemn such practices, the problematic assimilation policy that gave rise to such abuses is less understood by the Canadian public. To those who argue that they are not responsible, because they were not directly involved with the Residential Schools, I say that, as Canadian citizens, we are ultimately responsible for the past and present actions of our government. To those who say that we cannot change the past, I say that we can learn from it. We can better understand how a problematic mentality of benevolent paternalism became a rationale and justification for acquiring Indigenous lands and resources, and drove the creation of prescriptive education policies that ran counter to the treaty relationship. Equally importantly, we can explore how this mentality continues to influence Indigenous-settler relations today. Failing to do so will ensure that, despite our vow of never again, Canada will create equally destructive policies and practices into the future. To those who argue that former IRS students should just get over it and move on, I say that asking victims to bury a traumatic past for the "greater good" of achieving reconciliation does not address the root of the problem – colonialism. For all these reasons, I think of the apology not as the closing of what is commonly referred to as a dark, sad chapter in Canada's history but rather as an opening for all Canadians to fundamentally rethink our past and its implications for our present and future relations. (p. 4)

In the introduction to John Milloy's excellent and devastating book on the Residential School system in Canada, *A National Crime* (1999), he writes about being a non-Indigenous scholar in his subject area:

> This is a non-Aboriginal story too. In 1965, the Department of Indian Affairs asked a number of Residential School graduates to put in writing their memories of their school days. One, recalling his experiences at the Mohawk School, wrote: 'When I was asked to do this paper I had some misgivings, for if I were to be honest, I must tell of things as they were and really this is not my story but yours' [INAC file 1/25, Vol. 1, To Miss…, 16 February 1966, and attached correspondence.]….As such, it is critical that non-Aboriginal people study and write about the schools for not to do so on the premise that it is not our story, too, is to marginalize it as we did Aboriginal people themselves, to reserve it for them as sites of suffering, and grievance and to refuse to make it a site of

> introspection, discovery and extirpation – a site of self-knowledge from which we can understand not only who we have been as Canadians but who we must become if we are to deal justly with the Aboriginal people of this land. (pp. xvii-xviii)

To learn about Residential Schools, it is crucial that Canadians spend time learning from Indigenous accounts of experiences of the schools and of the intergenerational legacies from the schools. Here I have included two settler authors as examples of what this history means for white people in Canada. As Regan (2010) and Milloy's writing demonstrates, I am implicated by my complicated location, as a settler, as a treaty-partner, as a beneficiary of white privilege, as a Canadian.

As reported in the literature about Indigenous education in teacher education, and as reported by the participants in the conversations for my research, my own experience is that Residential Schools are not yet a part of Canadian common knowledge. The places that I teach in, and that the pre-service teachers in my classes will teach in, will have either a local former Residential School or day school, and/or community members or descendants of community members who were forced to attend these schools. There is no place in Canada that is not implicated in this system; critical Place-based education (cPBE) requires education that contends with this reality.

As a teacher educator, it is my hope that by modelling my own processes of decolonization, acknowledging privilege, and teaching in a way that opens classroom space for the taking up of power relations, that I can contribute meaningfully to shifting the gravely incomplete, incorrect and violent common knowledge that is evident in my classrooms regarding Indigenous peoples and histories in Canada. I endeavour to create a context where "teachers are challenged to recognize their responsibility to critique and transform those classroom relationships that perpetuate the economic and cultural marginalization of subordinate groups"

(Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009, p. 12), and to celebrate the “multiple and contradictory perspectives” (Nieto & Bode, 2008, p. 319) necessary to a critical classroom.

An 18-hour course is, of course, insufficient to achieve such a lofty goal (the course is now 36 hours in Lakehead’s new two-year program). However, I see it as hopeful that more faculties of education across Canada are taking up this challenge, are requiring, or at least offering, a course solely dedicated to Indigenous peoples, that more and more school boards are providing professional workshops, resources and training in this area, and that Indigenous education is rising in profile seemingly daily. There are many more resources both at the Ontario school board level and at the national level available to the students I teach now than there were in 2009, and, thanks to the TRC and the tireless work of many Indigenous advocates, there is a great deal more ‘common knowledge’ about Residential Schools and Indigenous peoples in general than there was in 2009. The question I grapple with consistently is: What role do white, settler Canadians have in this education shift?

What does whiteness mean for pre-service teachers? The vast majority of the teacher candidates I have taught have been white – in each class of 30-40 students, students who were not white were a tiny minority. An often-reported obstacle in anti-racist education in general that has also been my experience in teaching Aboriginal Education is widespread resistance to, and disavowal of, the cultural/racial location of white. Hill-Jackson (2007), Adair (2008), Santoro (2009), Schick (2000), St. Denis (2007) and Tompkins (2002), among many others, have documented the unsettling of white teacher candidates’ uninterrogated cultural locations through different programs in Australia, in the southern USA, and in Canada as a necessary precursor to their being engaged and effective educators in multi-cultural educational settings.

Madden's (2014) recent work calls for greater attention to the troubling of whiteness and racism in both pre-service teaching and in professional development for in-service teachers. I frequently encounter denial and even rage in classroom discussions around privilege and whiteness; it will come as no surprise to many others working in this realm that this recurs each semester around class discussions and presentations about stereotypes, and about sports mascots in particular. This denial of positionality (race, class or gender) "allows the dominant group to deny the results of dominance for itself: privilege, excessive power, and resources" (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2009, p. 451), and is rooted in the ideology of individualism which "positions us as unique…outside of culture and history" (p. 448).

This is a dangerous fallacy: We are always already in relation. Tupper & Capello (2008) assert how important it is to teach 'Native Studies' to non-Indigenous peoples in order to "challenge the tacit and overt reproduction of cultural norms through curriculum and teacher enactment of curriculum" (p. 567). To further complicate the implications of learning about cultural location in the classroom, there are also some learners in these classrooms who are not white, and who are non-Indigenous, and who might not be considered settlers by some, in Canada as a result of a myriad of factors including forced migration due to economic, political and cultural oppression and violence. Haig-Brown (2009) argues for the ineffectiveness of the binary of Indigenous/settler in this way:

> I began to see how offensive and really unfair they are to people who came to this continent in ways which, while not unrelated to colonization—we cannot escape the endless march of capital across the globe—did not implicate them in the same ways as those who came with the clear intention of exploitation for profit. Many people came for better lives, to escape war and famine, to seek freedom, to start anew in a country that was advertised as terra nullius, empty land, there for the asking. (p. 9)

Morgensen (2014) further challenges the insufficiency of the term settler as it relates to white solidarity with Indigenous peoples at the expense of accountability to racialized and intersectionally oppressed peoples. Other scholars, including Lee (n. d.) and Lawrence & Enakshi Dua (2005) argue that *settler* is not a race-based identity, and importantly includes people of colour, as the term refers specifically to people who are occupying and benefiting from Indigenous territories and erasures at the expense of Indigenous peoples and futurities. In this specific context of Indigenous education in Canada, the troubling of whiteness and taking up of race are important examinations of the symptoms of settler colonialism as a material and ongoing concern (Lee. n.d.). Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard (2014) puts it this way:

> A settler-colonial relationship is one that is characterized by a particular form of *domination*; that is, it is a relationship where power—in this case, discursive and nondiscursive facets of economic, gendered, racial and state power—has been structured into a relatively secure or sedimented set of hierarchical social relations that continue to facilitate the *dispossession* of Indigenous peoples of their lands and self-determining authority. (pp. 6-7)

This circumstance increases tension by "working towards decolonizing not just cultural location and relative privileges of student-teachers and their pedagogy, but also of engendering an acknowledgement of legislated implication in the Indigenous/non-Indigenous relationship in Canada as all Canadians are treaty partners" (Scully, 2012, p. 153); in areas where there are no Treaties, there are still nation-to-nation agreements inscribed in the Canadian constitution. Settler colonialism is at the root of the oppression of Indigenous peoples and Lands in Canada that must be uncovered and disrupted; settlers benefit from Canadian lands at the expense of Indigenous peoples, and settler colonialism is the tool that implicates all settlers in this inequity (Lee. n.d.). In Canada, "how does settler society come to terms with the reality that colonization and its

pattern of violence, slavery, genocide, and ecocide are the foundation of Western industrialized culture that is reproduced in part through schooling?" (Greenwood, 2009, p. 2).

Kahnawake Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred (1999) asserts: "Attempting to decolonize without addressing the structural imperatives of the colonial system is clearly futile" (p. 70). In the teacher education classroom, working towards the understanding that all Canadians are implicated in these developments, decisions and oppressions is incredibly difficult, owing in no small part to the dependence of the current economic and political system on dysconsciousness[8] (J. King, 1991) related to Indigenous peoples and Land. "Whatever settlers may say—and they generally have a lot to say—the primary motive [of settler colonialism] is not race (or religion, ethnicity, grade of civilization, etc.) but access to territory. Territoriality is settler colonialism's specific, irreducible element" (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). Land-based learning, then, including treaty education, is a crucial element of Indigenous education in teacher education. However, this learning must be critical, specific and complex.

Essentialism and authenticity. While some generalizations are powerful and important in this work, some are damaging. Essentialization of Indigenous peoples through stereotyping and through broad attempts at institutional control of Indigenous peoples has been lethally dehumanizing. While the education systems in Canada have oppressed and essentialized Indigenous peoples (e.g., Battiste, 1998; Arapaho scholar Michael Marker, 2000), it is of crucial importance that as work is done to redress these oppressions and their legacies, the cure is not further essentialization through assumptions about what Indigeneity is in a contemporary context (Marker, 2000). Friedel (2010a, 2011), too, has troubled the notion of an *authentic* identity for

[8] King's term dysconsciousness refers to purposeful ignorance – that is, where knowledge/truth is suppressed either personally or systemically to support a certain perspective or privilege.

Indigenous peoples, and youth in particular, that can be oppressive and archaic for learners. The damage of this call for authenticity has been enormous for Indigenous peoples since contact with Europeans, and is tied to Eurocentric notions about Land, wilderness and place (see Raibmon, 2005); this will be taken up later in this dissertation.

While Indigenous knowledge and identity are inherently Land-connected, it must be acknowledged that some urban and non-urban Indigenous people do not have access to or interest in their heritage epistemologies. While there is a common experience of being Indigenous in Canada, part of this work is to communicate that there are as many different versions of being an Indigenous person as there are Indigenous people; it is here that some Place discourse can contribute to constitutive and intersectional identities (hooks, 1990; Malpas, 2009; Massey, 1994). This adds yet another layer of complexity to the work of bringing Indigenous education respectfully into schools in Canada. However useful the contributions of Place discourse to understanding decolonization in Canada, all lines of inquiry lead back to the central importance of Land; of deeply understanding Land in the context of Indigenous peoples and knowledges in Canada. This need poses a second, deep problem in this context: Many people do not know Land, just as they do not know Indigenous histories, peoples and knowledges.

Relating to the *Perfect Stranger*. In all 17 of the *EDUC 4416* courses that I taught, there were many who were so astounded by how little they knew about Indigenous peoples in Canada that they had a difficult time taking in the 'new' information. They struggled with the cognitive dissonance necessary to support their *perfect stranger* (Dion, 2007, 2009) stance. Dion wrote

> When I asked Diane and Jenna about their relationship with Aboriginal people, both initially denied its existence. Like those of many teachers and teacher candidates with whom I work, their responses went something like 'Oh I know nothing, I have no friends

> who are Aboriginal, I didn't grow up near a reserve I didn't learn anything in school, I know very little, or I know nothing at all about Native people.' One way or another, teachers, like many Canadians, claim the position of 'perfect stranger' to Aboriginal people. There is an ease with which they claim this position. But, what does it offer them? Where does it come from? What is its appeal? In what ways is it problematic? And, perhaps most critical, how can it be disrupted? I argue that it is not an uncomplicated position. It is informed simultaneously by what teachers know, what they do not know, and what they refuse to know. (2009, p. 179)

Right up until spring of 2015, there were many people in each of the classes I taught who reported having never heard of Residential Schools, or of the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG).

In the first class assignment, the Local Assignment (a variation on the still-in-use Trent University Homelands Assignment), I ask the students to find out which treaty and specific or comprehensive land claim they live in, and to research what the closest Indigenous nation and/or community is to where they live (an example of a critical Place-based education assignment). Every time, I have had many students assert that there was no treaty/land claim, that there were no Indigenous peoples where they live, and very tellingly, some students would assert that there was no way to find out this information.

The 'discovery' that they were, indeed, on Indigenous lands, and neighbours to Indigenous communities, that there were Residential Schools in their hometowns or down the street from the school, is an important one. I found that time with community members, Elders Mark Douglas in Orillia and Gerry Martin and Sarah Sabourin in Thunder Bay, working at the Fall Harvest or going on Gerry Martin's plants walk (Thunder Bay), visiting the Mnjikaning Fish Fence (Orillia) with knowledge keeper Elder Mark Douglas, and the visit to the Rama school Mnjikaning Kendaaswin, facilitated by Principal Nick Howard and his excellent staff – these

experiences seemed to materially change the perceptions of the students regarding their own interrelationships with Indigenous peoples and Lands.

These were, without exception, with over 650 students, the classes that were singled out as the most powerful and enjoyable. These were the classes that supported the pre-service teachers' growing understanding that they were *already* implicated in relation to Indigenous peoples. Of even greater significance, these were the classes that seemed to inspire the pre-service teachers to incorporate Indigenous learning into their own practices; they reported wanting to forge their own relationships with communities and Elders, wanting to do Land-based teaching, and wanting to incorporate storytelling and Anishinaabemowin[9] into their own classrooms.

How can I make this assertion? These classes inspired excitement, wonder, some well-placed outrage, and warm-hearted inspiration from the people and places that hosted us. It is no exaggeration to say that in the closing circles of each class, these experiences were raved about nearly unanimously. In the early classes, there were consistent expressions of fear of appropriation, of hesitancy in case of offending or due to lack of knowledge, and of skepticism about the need for the class; Dion (2009) also reports these reactions:

> With the advent of multicultural and anti-racism education, teachers have been inundated with demands that they discuss 'difference' in their classrooms, yet many are unsure of how to proceed. They do know that ways of teaching that reproduce stereotypical representations are inadequate. Thus, there is a fear and a silence involved in addressing this context. The fear of offending, of introducing controversial topics, and of introducing content that challenges student understanding of the dominant version of Canadian history all support the claim for the position of perfect stranger. Dominant stories that position Aboriginal people as, for example, romanticized, mythical, victimized, or

---

9 [9] Anishinaabemowin is Anishinaabe language; Anishininimowin is sometimes called Oji-Cree.

> militant Others enable non-Aboriginal people to position themselves as respectful admirers, moral helpers, or protectors of law and order. In classrooms and elsewhere, there is a dialectical relationship between these discursive practices. While dominant discourses structure their engagement with post-contact history, teachers and students take them up as a form of protection against having to recognize their own attachment to and implication in the history of the relationship between Aboriginal people and Canadians. (p. 179)

The contrast between students' concerns at the beginning and the end of the courses was universal, and remarkable. It is not lost on me that the favourite classes were overwhelmingly those that I was not leading, and that this might be a factor! However, I (and my ego) can peaceably appreciate the importance and power of the local community members, Elders and Lands that were the true teachers in these classes.

It is also not lost on me that these were the classes where I was not actively challenging students to understand their implications in the historical and ongoing oppression and settler colonial structures that privilege non-Indigenous Canadians. However, I would argue that their excitement and interest in these classes, and the interest demonstrated by students in these experiences long after these courses were over, seems to demonstrate that these experiences with Land and with local Indigenous people open these students up to taking up the call to do education differently, in service of justice for Indigenous peoples. These practices are critical Place-based pedagogies, and are needed "so that the education of citizens might have some direct bearing on the wellbeing of the social and ecological places that people actually inhabit" (Gruenewald, 2003, p. 3). While I am hopeful about taking up these pedagogies as a central piece of Indigenous education in teacher education, there is a danger here, a tension, that is critical; as I indicated earlier in reference to the Indian Council Ring, it is crucial that I not reify stereotypical

notions of the *Indian* through these experiences, where perceptions of *authenticity* interrupt and preclude learning dynamic and complex realities of Indigenous peoples and knowledges. This will be taken up in the next chapter.

The abject failure of the Canadian education system to teach accurately and respectfully about Indigenous peoples, and about Indigenous/settler histories, perpetuates the oppression of Indigenous people, just as this system oppresses Indigenous learners. Milloy's (1999) description of the Residential School system also applies to the current education system:

> The Residential School system was conceived, designed, and managed by non-Aboriginal people. It represents in bricks and lumber, classroom and curriculum, the intolerances, presumption, and pride that lay at the heart of Victorian Christianity and democracy, that passed itself off as caring social policy. (p. xviii)

Omushkegowuk scholar Jacqueline Hookimaw-Witt (1998) argued similarly that the Canadian education system has not shifted appreciably since the Residential School era to create success by Indigenous learners – that it in fact continues to marginalize, oppress and assimilate.

This is a significant and well-understood danger in schooling and the 'common knowledge' that is disseminated through Education, as articulated by critical pedagogues for decades. Kincheloe (2008) writes:

> One of the central dimensions of Western colonial domination has involved its production of "universally valid knowledge" that worked to invalidate the ways of knowing that had been developed by all peoples around the world. In the name of modernization, salvation, civilization, development, and democracy, colonial powers have made and continue to make the argument that they know better than colonized peoples themselves what serves their best interests—and they have the knowledge to prove it. Universalism, the idea that all scientifically produced knowledge is true in all places and for all times, is a key concept in our discussion of knowledge and its relation to critical pedagogy and its concern with power and justice. (p. 5)

As Rasmussen (2011) writes:

> Alaskan Inuk Yupiktak Bista says it better than I do:
>
> 'Before the erection of school houses and the introduction of professional teachers to whom Western civilization entrusts the minds of their children. . .we did not worry about relating learning to life, because learning came naturally as a part of living. . .(from) the father, mother, grandmother, grandfather, brother, sister, uncles, aunts, cousins, and friends... (and from) the weather, the sea, the fish, the animals, and the land.... The coming of Western civilization broke this unity and living.... Today we have entrusted the minds of our young to professional teachers who seemingly know all there is to know. They are teaching a child how to read, write, repair a car, weld two pipes together. But they are not teaching the child the most important thing; who he is: an Inuk or Indian with a history full of folklore, music, great people, medicine, a philosophy, complete with poets.... Now our culture and subsistence way of life are being swept away by books, patents, money, and corporations.' (2011, p. 24)

Can this oppressive and universalized model of education be transformed through teacher education that attends to the social, political, ecological and economic relationships and dynamics of the particular places where this learning happens? To the personal locations of power and privilege that each student brings to the classes? This is the hope and the potential of this work. As Indigenous education in teacher education gains momentum, in Canada, I am both encouraged by the innovative and powerful strategies and frustrated by the challenges and ignorances being practiced and reported in my own classrooms and in classrooms across the country.

Since the publication of the TRC Report (2015), and in the most recent People for Education (2016) report, there have been more calls and support for mandatory Indigenous education. There have been editorials pushing back on these calls, asking the crucial questions: For who? By whom? To what end? One of my findings from this research is that compulsory

Indigenous education is very, very complicated, possibly counter-productive for some, and certainly insufficient. This work may contribute to understanding how to do this work better. What is clear to me is that it must start with the Land, and that critical Place-based education plays a huge role in the unsettling and relationship building that is at the heart of Indigenous education in teacher education.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Place and Land

In the course of my own learning about being a white settler on Indigenous land, about being an outdoor educator, and now in learning as a scholar and activist in community and post-secondary education, I have come to understand how complex the concept of Place is: How differently people see common ground. In this chapter, I investigate the conceptual frameworks of theories of Place, Place-based education, Indigenous scholarship, and Anishinaabe epistemology. I argue for the need to centre Land and territorially and culturally-specific Indigenous knowledges in critical Place-based education in initial teacher education to support Indigenous futurities and disrupt settler colonialism. Through the literature review I make the case that more knowledge about how cPBE is being enacted in Indigenous education in initial teacher education addresses a gap in the literature, and will be useful to teacher educators and policy makers. A critical Place-based education with Land at the centre requires learners to seek to understand themselves in relation to power and privilege; as will be seen in the conversations, this part of cPBE is considered by many to be foundational to Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education.

Theories of Place

For this literature review, I learned a great deal about the context and progression of Place theories from Cresswell (2015); he writes at length about how place is an important conceptual move toward understanding peoples' realities in a way that is rich and intersectional.

Cresswell uses Agnew's (1987) three fundamental aspects of place as a meaningful location like this:

> 1. Location: the simple notion of 'where'
> 2. Locale: the material setting of social relations
> 3. Sense of place: subjective and emotional attachment people have to 'place'.
>
> (Cresswell, 2015, pp. 12-14)

Here, Cresswell writes succinctly about the interplay between two important aspects of place – meaning and materiality. A very great deal has been written about these aspects and how they interrelate; I will address some scholarship in this section. Of particular interest to Indigenous scholars is the differentiation between the concepts of space and place (e.g., Cajete, 1994; Deloria Jr., 1994). Cresswell distinguishes between *space* and *place* in this way:

> Space, then, has been seen in distinction to place as a realm without meaning – as a 'fact of life' which, like time, produces the basic coordinates for human life. When humans invest meaning in a portion of space and then become attached to it in some way (naming is one such way) it becomes a place. (2015, p. 16)

Cresswell indicates that the development of *humanistic geography* was a conceptual push-back against the generalizing notions of space in contending with place as more than a descriptive term for the particular in geography.

Two theorists are critical here: place-philosopher Yi-Fu Tuan, who developed the term topophilia – "the affective bond between people and place" (1974, p. 4) – and Edward Relph, a phenomenologist:

> The basic meaning of place, its essence, does not therefore come from locations, nor from the trivial functions that places serve, nor from the community that occupies it, nor from superficial or mundane experiences….The essence of place lies in the largely unselfconscious intentionality that defines places as profound centers of human existence. (1976, p. 43)

What does it mean to be connected to a place? As someone who had worked in landscaping for a few years, and outdoor education for longer than that, and who was increasingly noticing how places can segregate and/or include, these ideas were, and continue to be, of great interest to me. In learning more about how place is thought about and written about, I repeatedly found my way back to Indigenous understandings of Land and place. On the way, and in revisiting some Place scholarship for this work, I am reminded of the breadth of scholarship on this subject. As my mentor David Greenwood suggested, I have revisited Place as an interdisciplinary area of scholarship.

***Landscape, wilderness, frontier, the commons*, and *terra nullius*.** As an educator who seeks to centre Land in my practices of outdoor, environmental and Indigenous education, I have found that I continually encounter Eurocentric conceptualizations of 'nature'. These approaches are an impediment to understanding human relationship to Land. To support my practice of cPBE, I turn to the discourse of Place and to environmental theorists to make sense of this conceptual clash.

My first conceptualizations of Place were connected to what I learned in Native Studies at Trent, and concerned, for example, the complex and damaging notions of *landscape, wilderness, the frontier*, *the commons,* and *terra nullius*. All of these concepts are examples of what Evernden (1985) calls resourcism.

> Resourcism is a kind of modern religion which casts all of creation into categories of utility. By treating everything as homogeneous matter in search of a use it devalues all. Yet its most dangerous aspect is its apparent good intention. By describing something as a resource we seem to have cause to protect it. But all we really have is a licence to exploit it. (p. 23).

These conceptualizations of 'nature' from a western standpoint also share some characteristics, including, for *landscape* and *wilderness*, a sense of the spiritual: Cronon (1996) describes some Western canonic writing about wilderness as a 'domesticated sublime':

> All three men are participating in the same cultural tradition and contributing to the same myth: The mountain as cathedral. The three may differ in the way they choose to express their piety—Wordsworth favouring an awe-filled bewilderment, Thoreau a stern loneliness, Muir a welcome ecstasy—but they agree completely about the church in which they prefer to worship. (p. 75)

These writers figure prominently in the outdoor and environmental education communities that I have been a part of, and have played a large role in shaping western concepts of *wilderness* and place.

For Evernden (1995), this ascribing of intrinsic and unmeasurable value to 'nature' is the project of both the Romantics and of environmentalists, and is fundamental to understanding 'ourselves' (humans) as interdependent with 'nature' in more than scientifically measurable, and objectively definable, ways (p. 33). The *commons* is a concept that is deeply entwined with western understandings of Land; that is, Land as a communal right as a source of both resource (means of production) and as a gathering place. In particular in America (and, one assumes, in Canada), many British settlers arrived as the *commons* at home in the British Isles, village communal spaces that were central to community life and livelihood, were being enclosed by wealthy landowners (Olwig, 1996). Apfell-Marglin (2011) describes the time of the enclosures during the 15th and 16th century—during the boom in the European cloth industry, landlords were converting land to pasturage. "Enclosure extinguished common rights to a particular piece of land" (p. 36). She goes on to assert that "the crucial act here is not the act of using, it is the act of *calculating the encloser's advantage"* (p. 43, emphasis in original). Imagining access to, and

benefit from, the land in the 'New World' as the replacement for these places contributed to the *terra nullius* myth.

At the same time, these enclosures and the violent removals that echoed the practices of the wealthy and colonial landowners in Scotland, Ireland, Wales and England were reenacted throughout America and Canada to create parks and wildlife preserves to be enjoyed, again, by the wealthy few (Cronon, 1996). Here, too, lies both resourcism and a more social understanding of place. In North America, the *commons* is linked to the concept of the *frontier*; the impossibly violent myth that free 'wild' land and the simpler, more primitive living available on it, was the promise of the beginnings of America (and Canada). These founding myths were also weaponized in the push to set aside national parks and wilderness areas, displacing and destroying Indigenous peoples and communities (Cronon, 1996, pp. 76-77).

The concept of the *frontier* is an extension of the concept of *terra nullius*: Coulthard (2014) describes this term as

> the racist legal fiction that declared Indigenous peoples too 'primitive' to bear rights to land and sovereignty when they first encountered European powers on the continent, thus rendering their territories legally 'empty' and therefore open for colonial settlement and development. (p. 175)

Western thought does not recognize the agency of Land or of Indigenous peoples; these colonizers saw/see emptiness to be overwritten and filled, used. This concept of *terra nullius*, while not named as such back then, was the foundation of the Doctrine of Discovery:

> The Doctrine of Discovery is rooted in two 15th century Papal Bulls called *the Dum Diversas* (1452) and the *Romanus pontifex (1455)….*The *Romanus pontifex* clearly explained that since there were a lot of people (heathens) around the world who weren't really using the land they were on, Europeans had every right to take that land and do something with it! (Vowel, 2016, pp. 235-236)

All of these terms set up, or rather illustrate, the deeply-held Western conceptualization of land in North America as absent of people, and as a material resource, whether aesthetic or physical, to contribute to the wellbeing of settlers in economic or in religious ways. And yet, the enclosures and separations enacted by European imaginings of 'progress' were also spiritual separations:

> Not only were individuals disentangled from specific ties to place and community, but the pursuit of their self-interest eliminated the spiritual link, resulting in a general disregard for the effects their practices might have on members of both the community and the spiritual realm. The community here is understood to include the place where the humans lived and from which they drew their sustenance. (Apfell-Marglin, 2011, p. 37)

This imagining subsequently required the erasure of Indigenous peoples, the connections and interrelationship that Indigenous peoples have to Land, and the eliding of any claim that Indigenous peoples might have to this wellbeing through thorough and violent dehumanization and displacement.

On a smaller scale, Cresswell (2015) invokes moving into a college dorm room as the transformation of *space* into *place*. We notice the stains and remnants of the last occupiers, and add our own ephemera in order to claim it; "these are hauntings of past inhabitants" (p. 7). To play this analogy out in the context of Land, we must account for that the space being inhabited; it is so thoroughly known to the Indigenous peoples that lived/live there that whole languages, economies, governance structures, epistemologies and ontologies have grown out of the molecules and spirit of the space. The trace that is there gestures towards the family rooms and lives of millennia of generations of families and communities. The term *space* in this context is analogous to the concept of *terra nullius* – the deeply racist and violent assumptions of the colonizers that Indigenous lands were *space* to be transformed into their *places*.

While seeming to value Land, a commonly-invoked Eurocentric term, and one that is frequently conflated with place, is *landscape*. Cresswell (2015) differentiates between landscape and place by arguing that the term *landscape* “combines a focus on the visual topography of a portion of land (that which can be seen) with the notion of vision (the way it is seen). “Landscape is an intensely visual idea. In most definitions of landscape the viewer is outside of it.…Places are very much things to be inside of” (p. 17). This reading of the word *landscape* figured prominently in my learning about cultural constructions of *nature* and of *environment* both in Environmental Studies and in Native Studies at Trent. Now, whenever people use the term *landscape* or the term *wilderness*, I hear them saying that Land and people are separate, and I infer a value judgment that is aesthetic about how Land is valued and by whom. The *whom* is typically settlers/colonizers/planners.

When I do a search in this dissertation of the term *landscape*, I see that I and the research participants use this term frequently, but not necessarily from the vantage point of the viewer. This brings to mind Anne Whiston Spirn’s *Language of Landscape* (1998):

> Landscape is loud with dialogues, with story lines that connect a place and its dwellers. The shape and structure of a tree record an evolutionary dialogue between species and environment…a coherence of human vernacular landscapes emerges from dialogues between builders and place, fine-tuned over time…the context of life is a woven fabric of dialogues, enduring and ephemeral. (p. 17)

Spirn later stated that “sacred landscapes are shaped by ritual” (1998, p. 56); in her writings, I find both a profound connection to place and an odd (to me) segregation between sacred and mundane landscapes; as if she is incorporating both the scientific and Romantic perspectives at once, but separately. Additionally, there is a convention of conceptualizing landscape/Land as

text; this too strikes me as an oddly static understanding of Land. For me, these understandings of land go hand-in-hand with the concept of *wilderness*.

Wilderness is a concept that is central to how Canada perceives itself; this idea is also at the heart of a great deal of outdoor and experiential education. Here is Romantic 'nature' that is pristine, that is pure, devoid of people or industrial processes—as with *terra nullius*.

> Wilderness is understood to be the place where plants and animals live without being "domesticated" by humans, and its definition has been extended for several centuries to "wild people" who were seen as living outside of civilization and its control. (Apffel-Marglin, 2011, p. 26)

As previously mentioned, linked to the idea of *wilderness* is that of the *frontier*, of land to be conquered and appreciated, coupled with the (white) masculinity required to 'commune' or survive in these contexts (White, 1996). Cronon (1996) observes that "frontier nostalgia became an important vehicle for expressing a particularly bourgeois form of antimodernism. The very men who benefitted most from urban-industrial capitalism were among those who believed that they must escape its debilitating effects," previously characterized as "the comforts and seductions of civilized life were especially insidious for men, who all too easily became emasculated by the feminizing tendencies of civilization" (p. 78).

This antimodern quest for gendered authenticity is certainly evident in the outdoor industry, in my experience as a cis-gendered female outdoor guide and educator; this was mentioned early on in this dissertation with relation to Seton and Statten and the basing of the Boy Scouts and of many Ontario summer camps on Seton's League of Woodcraft Indians (Francis, 1992). The 'imaginary Indian' and the appropriative practices that surround it have been well-explored by P. Deloria (1998, 2004). This is a strange contradistinction to the associations frequently invoked in writing about Eurocentrism and colonialism (see Shohat &

Stam, 1994) between the concepts of primitive, uncivilized, and women as more closely associated with Nature. The campaigns for the preservation of wilderness areas are fraught with (white) environmentalists who are privileging the static historical concept of the pristine nature/ecosystem over the concerns of local communities and particularly over local Indigenous Nations (Nadasdy, 2005). *Authentic* wilderness is an idea to be saved or rescued; Indigenous land is to be ceded, surrendered...for the interests of colonial capital or colonial appreciation.

Here is a terrible paradox: The perception that North American land had not been valued for its productive capabilities through agricultural and primary resource extraction was the rationale for *terra nullius* and colonization; this required the erasure of thousands of productive and sustainable Indigenous economies and communities (Coulthard, 2014; Manuel & Derrickson, 2017; Vowel, 2016). Land appreciation through Western eyes has meant the ongoing destruction of Land, Indigenous peoples, and the sustainable economies that may best support people and planet. Measures must be taken to stop the destruction and consumption of Land and water in the interests of justice for planet and for humans; doing so under the auspices of *wilderness* elides the human costs of environmental destruction *and* of conservation, including enclosure and displacement. I have experienced these destructive understandings in relation to outdoor and environmental education (EE) discourses and practice, and distinguish Land-based education from these fields.

Korteweg & Russell's (2012) special issue of the *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* was concerned in particular with the ways that EE must be Indigenized:

> Environmental educators…no longer have the time or privilege to ignore or avoid the devastating sociocultural and political costs of colonization on Indigenous peoples: the theft of their Lands, the reaping of unilateral profits from Land exploitation, and the

> ultimate injustice of stealing their children and attempting to destroy their language, culture, and future through the Residential School system. (p. 6)

Conversely, Land education:

> puts Indigenous epistemological and ontological accounts of land at the center, including Indigenous understandings of land, Indigenous language in relations to land, and Indigenous critiques of settler colonialism. It attends to constructions and storying of land and repatriation by Indigenous peoples, documenting and advancing Indigenous agency and land rights. (Tuck, McKenzie & McCoy, 2014, p. 13)

So what is wrong with the way that Western conceptions of place/Land venerate *wilderness*? When Deloria Jr. (1994) writes about Indigenous spirituality being located in place, instead of in time, as the Judao-Christian traditions are, it seems obvious that people look to their immediate surroundings for spiritual connection – for something responsive and tangible. Indeed, I believe that this craving is responsible for the entire genre of fantasy fiction, of which I am a devoted consumer. Additionally, the place and nature-theorist are attempting to account for and rectify the deep schisms between nature and culture that have grown so virulently into the earth-annihilating practices and policies of industrial capitalism. And so, the philosophers and poets reach back to call for a return to nature-centered lifeways.

> Where you find a people who believe that man [sic] and nature are indivisible, and that survival and health are contingent upon an understanding of nature and her processes, these societies will be very different from ours, as will be their towns, cities and landscapes. (McHarg, 1969 p. 27).

This understanding of the indivisibility of people and nature as being the premise for healthy and resilient communities and societies is the subject of Shepard's (1982) *Nature and Madness*; his passionate assertion is that industrial capitalism indicates a perhaps-fatal neoteny in humans, whereas the gatherer hunter socio-economic structure is evidence of a more mature and

independent human ontogeny. Here is a conceptualization of what are frequently characterized as 'primitive' socio-economic communities as, in practice, evidence of a more sophisticated, resilient and evolved understanding of the dependence of humans both upon each other (and the collective wellbeing of the community) and on 'nature'. In Sean Kane's amazing work *Wisdom of the Mythtellers* (1994), he relates some understanding of this, told to author Robert Lawlor by an Aborigine Elder from Nowra, New South Wales:

> I know where all the roots and berries and fruits are. Anyone who does not know how to find food and feed himself is always frightened inside like a little child who has lost his mother and with that fear, the spirit world departs. (p. 22)

Earlier in this section, the sacred with relation to 'nature', and *wilderness* in particular, as expressed by western writers and theorists was touched upon. Attending to the spirit, and invoking the sacred as part of connecting to nature continues to be a theme in environmental and place discourses (see Apfell-Marglin, 2011). Among many other EE scholars, Blekinsop (2005) has written extensively about place, and in particular about relationships with and in place. In writing about Martin Buber's 'autobiographical, theological and relational writings', Blekinsop advocates for an understanding of relationship between human and more than human beings as a process that calls for humility, grace and enormous personal commitment:

> Buber did not want us to objectify nature, to approach nature in the one-directional monological way of *I/it*, but to understand that any approach to a specific object holds with it the possibility of engaging with the *Eternal Thou* situated within, the *shikina*. This is because the self is discovered and nurtured by means of continually more reflective and conscious relationships, so that the individual becomes a person 'in between' others. (Blekinsop, 2005, p. 304)

Ingold (2000) calls these inter-relational networks "spheres of nurture"; they feed human beings with knowledge, spirit and with bodily sustenance (Chambers, 2008, p. 116).

In connection with the discussion of the fundamental indivisibility of the human from the more-than-human, the discourse of ecojustice (see Bowers, 1993, 2001; Martusewicz, Edmundson & Lupinacci, 2014) takes a related turn in linking the oppressions and violences done to people and to 'nature'; it shows that it is frequently people who have less privilege—are racialized, differently able, identified as female, and/or low on the socio-economic spectrum—who suffer more from environmental degradation enacted in the interests of economic gain. Ecojustice is

> the recognition and analysis of deeply entrenched patterns of domination that unjustly define people of color, women, the poor, and other groups of humans as well as the natural world as inferior and thus less worthy of life. (Martusewicz et al., 2014, p. 13)

These multiple oppressions can be tied back to the Western notion of the *commons*. While this concept is frequently invoked in discussions around the collective impact of environmental degradation (the air we breathe, the water we drink), it is also tied to concepts of collective land use and ownership. In Canada, this has deep implications: The commons here are Indigenous territories.

As Kulchyski (2005), Malpas (2009), Wenzel (1991) and many others have argued, the stewardship practiced by Indigenous communities shows a far more sophisticated understanding of inhabitance and dwelling than do the feudal or capitalist systems of resource 'management' practiced by settler nations. Learning about living well in place, then, is crucial learning for settlers implicated in the continuing colonization of the Lands in Canada. The Treaties from Guswenta (the Two-Row Wampum) (Parmenter, 2013) to the post-confederation Numbered Treaties, to the Nunavut Lands Claim Agreement and the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement, promised that Indigenous peoples, despite 'ceding, surrendering, giving up….' their lands, would continue to live their lives as they always had, with culture and economy intact.

They were not to be interfered with, and the proceeds of the ‘development’ of their lands were to be shared. They were to be meaningfully consulted about any projects on their lands (which would reasonably mean they could veto), and these projects and their effects were not to interfere with the wellbeing of the people and Lands that they depended on (Manuel & Derrickson, 2017). Of course, this did not happen.

Resourcism (Evernden, 1985) as a way of relating to ‘nature’ has had drastic implications in Canada: The national and provincial parks systems have criminalized, monetized and fragmented access to traditional territories; forestry and mining have done irreparable damage to ecosystems and waterways; to date there are still hundreds of boil-water advisories in Indigenous communities. According to the website watertoday.ca, as of April 13, 2017, there were 917 boil-water advisories across Canada. Most of these are due to agricultural or industrial impacts on local water tables. The commons have been enclosed and exploited, for the benefit of very few.

It seems incredible that these ideas about nature, Indigenous peoples and place, while seeming to be about love and appreciation, can have such spectacularly negative impacts on the very territories and bodies they are professing to adulate and wish to protect and preserve. But this is exactly what is happening. In continuing to conceptualize humans as outside of nature, and in continuing to imagine Indigenous peoples as Indians – as closer to a Western idea of primitive nature, these ideas, including wilderness, landscape, the frontier and *terra nullius* support the ongoing domination and exploitation of ecosystems and of Indigenous peoples.

Authenticity in Land and identity. Land and Indigenous peoples share an oppression rooted in a particular concept: That is, an idealized static historical version, frequently characterized as *authentic*, of a particular ecosystem and of Indigenous identity. In this section, I

will show how this version disempowers both by denying the dynamic, responsive and vernacular nature of both places and cultures.

As I read more about Place in philosophy, I was encouraged by some scholars' emphasis on relationship and reflexivity: David Strong's correlational co-existence is explained by Higgs (2003) as characterizing the "distinctive mutual relationships that emerge between people and things…a thing is enlarged by care, and a person is rewarded with a more profound understanding of existence and responsibility" (p. 311). Higgs' (2003) book *Nature by Design*, on ecological restoration, has continued to resonate and inform my perspective on that topic, but it has also deeply influenced my thinking about concepts in Indigenous education such as reconciliation and cultural authority and authenticity. Higgs writes:

> There is nothing quite so rewarding for local restorationists than learning that salmon have returned to spawn in a stream long dormant. There is more than technical proficiency in achieving these results. To restore a stream of salmon means changing the structure and ecological characteristics of a stream, but it also entails reconfiguring the economic conditions and land-use practices that determine the amount of silt ending up on the local spawning beds as well as the social relationships that make up the economy. To change one thing in a complex system, as all of us have learned, means changing the whole system. In some ways I find the cultural dimensions of restoration as exciting as the ecological ones. By restoring ecosystems we regenerate old ways or build new ones that bring us closer to natural processes as to one another. This is the power and promise of ecological restoration. (p. 2)

Higgs (2003) spends a great deal of time writing about the importance of cultural and social factors in regenerating ecosystemic health. I am, as is Higgs, uncomfortable with the notion of a static historical ideal of an ecosystem – this elides the agency of the ecosystem to evolve to suit the changing factors and actors that make it up.

The same is true of culture: Indeed, for many passages in Higgs' (2003) book, if you swap out the word 'culture' for 'ecosystem' or 'ecology', there are many parallels to be discovered. For Higgs, an instrumental or ahistorical approach to ecological restoration does not work – ecosystems are dynamic and vernacular, as are cultures. This is an ongoing and pressing concern in particular in relation to Indigenous cultures; often Indigenous cultures are presented as static historical ideals (a great example would be the faux tipi clusters that seem ubiquitous in Canada150 tableaux), while Indigenous cultures and peoples are denigrated or dismissed for incorporating 'modern' technologies or practices into daily life. This phenomenon has been widely observed, theorized and continues to be practiced. Raibmon (2005) explores this deeply in the text *Authentic Indians*:

> Whether they used definitions of Indianness in the context of policy, religion, amusement or science, colonizers shared an understanding of authenticity. They were collaborators in a binary framework that defined Indian authenticity in relation to its antithesis: inauthenticity. Parallel binaries followed. First among them was the distinction between Indian and White. Indians, by extension, were traditional, uncivilized, cultural, impoverished, feminine, static, part of nature, and of the past. Whites, on the other hand, were modern, civilized, political, prosperous, masculine, dynamic, part of society and of the future. Alignment between these oppositions was neither absolute nor without contradiction. Members of colonial society might value certain traits associated with Indians—like closeness to nature—positively or negatively. But non-Aboriginal people of all sorts set these traits in binary mortar, treating them as mutually exclusive and non-interchangeable. They agreed that real Indians could never be modern, and thus were (regrettably or thankfully, depending on the perspective) most certainly vanishing. (pp. 6-7).

As Raibmon states, these associations and binaries seem to shift to serve those who benefit from them.

The resilience and dynamism of ecosystems, and of cultures, are their very strength, held in the new patterns and languages that emerge to express them. The 'preservation' of wild spaces that led to the displacement of many Indigenous communities in the creation of parks in the US and in Canada (Cronon, 1996), and the efforts at restoration described by Higgs (2003) are linked to notions of an *authentic* nature; sacred and endemic characteristics of a place that are imposed by western values. This perception is also at the root of considering places as constituting particular identities, also expressed by western notions of the *frontier*, and of Heidegger's *dasein* (see p. 68). Conversely, while Indigenous epistemologies, languages and ontologies are created in place, they are deeply dynamic, and innovative in response to the changes in the ecosystems they are connected to. Herein lies a particular challenge to the resurgence of Indigenous peoples, languages and cultures as communities grapple with the tendency for Western/Eurocentric frameworks of religion and knowledge to be static and universal, situated in time instead of in place, as Deloria Jr. (1994) tells us.

L. Simpson (2011) stresses the importance of 'researching back' Indigenous intellectual traditions, calling for Indigenous peoples to "delve into their own culture's stories, philosophies, theories and concepts to align themselves with the processes and forces of regeneration, revitalization, remembering and visioning" (p. 148). Rather than a static historical ideal, what richer knowledge of heritage epistemologies can offer is a more resilient and dynamic approach to Indigenous futurities. While philosophy tends to generalize, critical approaches particularize and complexify.

One of the legacies and continuing practices of colonialism in Canada is the continuing perception that the Land is separate from people, instead of "emphasizing the relationality and connectivity that comes from living together in a place for a long time" (Donald, 2009, p. 6).

The privileging of a static historical ideal of ecosystems and of cultures has, at its heart, an agenda that is fundamentally out of touch, perhaps even dysconscious (J. King, 1991) of the dynamism and resilience of ecosystems and of people: This perception is necessary to the abrogation of personal responsibility to people or place. Evernden (1985) and Cronon (1996) write forcefully about the need to expand Romantic and narrowly imagined conceptions of environmentalism that include human processes, accountability and inequity.

The fields of eco-feminism (Di Chiro, 1987; Fawcett, 2000, 2013; Gough, 1999, 2013; Harvester & Blenkinsop, 2011; Maina-Okori, Koushik, & Wilson, 2017; Piersol & Timmerman, 2017; Plumwood, 2002; Russell & Bell, 1996) and ecojustice (Haluza-DeLay, 2013; Maina-Okori, et al., 2017; McKenzie, Koushik, Haluza-DeLay, Chin, & Corwin, 2017; Miller, 2017; Martusewicz et al., 2014) have further demanded these expansions and more. Indigenous scholars, activists, advocates, communities and peoples in Canada demand complexity and humanization for emancipation: "This reductive Canadian national narrative weighs heavily on the consciousness of Aboriginal peoples and Canadians, and continues to influence the ways in which we speak to each other about history, identity, citizenship and the future" (Donald, 2009, p. 3). As Canadians do not see themselves in relation to Land and to Indigenous peoples with respect, humility and a deep understanding that we are all fundamentally interwoven, the work of education, with EE and Indigenous education as parts of the whole, becomes to uncover and teach this ethical relationality (Donald, 2009, p. 6).

Many efforts in ecological restoration fail, too faithful to an idealized historical version of an ecosystem (Conniff, 2014; Palmer, Menninger, & Bernhardt, 2010). Environmental education must attend to the vernacular, the particular, and to complicated relationships and identities within Place to be powerful. The continued teaching and use of the dehumanizing and

historically inaccurate stereotypes of Indigenous peoples perpetuate profound and dangerous misunderstandings and social injustices towards Indigenous peoples. Institutional, communal, and personal demands for 'authenticity' are anathema to resurgence and relationship building, and to learning. Places are the literal common ground. The very best thing that a learner can say to me is: "I never saw it that way before". Communicating differing, and sometimes contested, perspectives on literal common ground means shared points of reference seen in a whole new way – a whole new set of relations to people and to place, built on foundations of shared experiences. Only through a complex understanding of both the historical and the contemporary contexts and factors in the environments of ecosystems and of Indigenous peoples can resurgent Indigenous futurities be worked towards. And, these conceptual frameworks are deeply intertwined. Where they intersect discursively is in Place and identity.

Design and philosophy. In this section, I investigate some of the concepts that undergird western Place theory, and situate these with relation to Indigenous articulations of Place. The concept of Place as an area of critical thought has emerged in several disciplines, including geography, architecture, art, sociology, philosophy and in landscape architecture and urban planning. It was in the context of these last two disciplines that I encountered some theories of Place in my master's degree at York; I was investigating the interactions between places and people—between the land, the design of the human additions to the place, and the use of the place. Through that investigation, I was trying to make sense of the incredibly strong connections I feel to places that I care about (and resistances to some I do not). As with wine, architecture, and design theory in general, I knew little about design except for what I liked, and this was one

of a few ideological wormholes that I almost disappeared into during my studies there. I had no training in design, and found the theory of design fascinating.

I continue to be fascinated by how the intentions of the designers are articulated through how places are constructed, and equally fascinated by how places are used/interacted with, sometimes in spite of design. What does design say about who the places are for? About the values of the designers? The social, political, economic and cultural contexts of the humans that are in the place? How does design respond to place – to the genius loci? I was particularly fascinated by this term; I encountered it in the writings of Marc Treib (2005), a landscape architect. Genius loci, in Ancient Rome, referred to the particular spirit that watched over their place. In architecture and landscape architecture, it has come to mean the sense of the place—phenomenologists would say essence—that already exists in the place and should be expressed and attended to in the design and production of a structure or garden. I later came to see how this was connected to the understanding that Land is agentic that I had learned from the Elders at Trent. This was one of the few times that I encountered an articulation of a 'spirit' that was specific to a particular place in the readings on place that I was consuming at York.

While these understandings are common in the stories of the Irish, of the Anishinaabe and of the Inuit, they have taken on a different tone through Western filters. These are stories that teach humility and care in relation to particular places, but they have been diminished, categorized as superstition or faery tales. (This is in keeping with the Eurocentric move to reduce non-Western thought through the binaries mentioned earlier; in this case, knowledge vs. wisdom, knowledge vs. story [Raibmon, 2005]). As Nadasdy (2005) explains, treating Indigenous practices in place as superstitions or worship misunderstands the Indigenous relationship with place. The reverence and rituals enacted in place are deeply pragmatic, and serve as an enacted

reminder that ‘nature’ is always more powerful than humans, and that we are dependent upon it. Putting down tobacco before crossing a big lake in Anishinaabe territory may be an ‘offering’ to Mishepezhiew, the giant water lynx; this is a gesture of humility, reminding and affirming that that this lake is to be respected and feared – it is more powerful than I am. This is not necessarily an act of worship – it is a careful acknowledging of the respect, and the knowledge, needed to live and travel well in this place.

Through the reading and learning I have done in graduate school, from Environmental Studies at York and in the required courses for the PhD in Educational Studies program at Lakehead, *place* is a leitmotif in the readings regarding Western thought. It is present in the work of Aristotle in his articulation of *chora,* a large region of country, and *topos,* a specific place within the region (Casey, 1996). The philosopher Albertus, heavily influenced by Aristotle and Plato, explained a conception of place is a unique combination of cosmological (philosophical) and environmental (natural scientific) influences; that the particularity of a place plays a role in the kind of human life that develops in a place (Cresswell, 2015, p. 26). Cresswell points to this argument of Albertus’ as being influential for environmental determinists; these views have emerged in some racist imaginings of inclusion and exclusion in particular places. Here, I am thinking about the Nazi’s campaign of *Blut und Boden*: This campaign was enacted to consolidate the ties between the pure-blood Germans and their land – their birthright.

> School gardens were places where children could be rooted to the soil, where race education and eugenics could be taught, and where the soldiers and mothers of the nation would be raised. While contemporary school gardening focuses largely on environmental education, nutrition, and sustainable food production, I feel that it is ethically imperative to respond to this difficult past and recognize where colonial, patriarchal, religious, and other oppressive ideologies may continue to play out in the material and discursive performances of school gardening. (Ostertag, 2015, p. 47)

I learned about this from Dr. Julia Ostertag's (2015) doctoral thesis entitled *School gardening, teaching, and a pedagogy of enclosures: Threads of an arts-based métissage*. Ostertag draws a parallel between this campaign and the focus of Residential Schools on agriculture and gardening as contributing to the civilization of Indigenous children; through agricultural instruction, they were to be taught what 'real' connection to the Land was. As their bodies were subjugated and violated, their Indigenous relationship to Land was being reordered under the oppressive ideologies that Ostertag (2015) refers to.

The writings of Heidegger, another very influential place-theorist, figured prominently in these campaigns in his calls for *authenticity* in experiences of place.

> A key term in Heidegger's lexicon is Dasein – a word that is broadly translated as 'being there' or 'being in'. Being (existence) is not simply being in place as a container (as in Aristotle) but is instead marked by a stronger connection between a thing and its place (a relationship that is hinted at in Albertus's insistence on the fit between 'place' and 'thing'. The relation between people and place is affirmed as a relationship of dwelling – of inhabitation – in which there is a continuity between person and place. (Cresswell, 2015, p. 27)

Heidegger's imprint on Place understanding in Western traditions is profound, especially in the field of phenomenology; Maurice Merleau Ponty's (1945) and Husserl's (1970) work also figured prominently in my learning about phenomenology, in particular as it relates to bodies-in-place.

Phenomenology, developed by Brentano and Husserl in the nineteenth century, is concerned with human consciousness as self-in-relation – that is, consciousness is consciousness *in place*. Here I turn to Ahmed (2006) for a succinct and simple explanation for a concept that is still being developed and contested: "Phenomenology…emphasizes the importance of a lived

experience, the intentionality of consciousness, the significance of nearness or what is ready-to-hand, and the role of repeated and habitual actions in shaping bodies and worlds" (p. 2).

At York, I was more interested, finally, in the writing of Gaston Bachelard; *The Poetics of Space* (1994) is, for me, a more satisfying exploration of the interaction between consciousness and place. Bachelard investigates topoanalysis, his term for "the systematic psychological study of the localities of our intimate lives" (1994, p. 8). Bachelard writes about memories, feelings, poetry; this expression of the significance of place has more kinship to a romantic notion of place. Still, I remember being troubled by the sense that the place functions as a blank canvas or an echo chamber to magnify or reify the self, or self-concept. For a mind-bending and poetic exploration of phenomenology and ecohermeneutics where he calls for resonant interrelationality, see Michael Derby (Sitka-Sage)'s 2015 book *Place, being, resonance: Towards a critical ecohermeneutic approach to education*. There is a sinister turn in these works where it can be understood how, conceptually, if places constitute identity and consciousness, then place can be weaponized as an exclusionary factor – an enclosure. Certainly, this was the interpretation of Heidegger in supporting the Nazi nationalist garden program (Ostertag, 2015). Additionally, these oppressive ideologies of place (Ostertag 2015) are being used to exclude Indigenous peoples all over North America from racialized identity categories for band membership, and federal Indian Status in Canada, and from being allowed to live on reserves and reservations, or qualifying for programs to pay for housing and education.

Particularly problematic for me in the philosophies of place that I have described are two things: First, in the search for essence and the 'thisness' of experience the phenomenologist seeks, there is a generalization about consciousness and experience that does not take into account such significant differences between humans' experiences as gender, race, ability,

culture, and epistemology. While I know that is partly the point, I think that part of the richness and potential of place is how learning to see places from other points of view materially changes the experience of the place. Phenomenology is a philosophy that was generated out of the Western canon, and the phenomenological canon seems to be populated by white male philosophers. I have come to understand that I share this discomfort with many place theorists.

Marxist and feminist geographers dismissed this essentialism by asserting that places are socially constructed; as capital becomes more mobile (workers, means of production and modes of production as geographical location markers) (Massey, 1994; Soja, 1989), 'places' as understood by the place philosophers above, remain fixed (Heidegger; Husserl, 1970). My grasp of Marxism is in its infancy; I appreciate what I understand of Marxist frameworks for the emphasis on the importance of capital; that is, the modes and means of production as central organizing structures in society. Marxism and Marxists have been criticized roundly in many disciplines for a perceived lack of accounting for the differences in social location based on race and gender and, in this context of place, accounting for the agency of Land and the more-than-human (although this is repudiated by Kahn [2010]); this same criticism is leveled at the discourse of critical pedagogy by Bowers (1993, 2001). However, there is a strong case to be made for the huge significance of the totalizing structure of capitalism and its effects on Land and on Indigenous peoples and economies. Kulchyski writes:

> The homogenization that comes with capitalism, and is increased exponentially in the latest phase of capitalist development, is an expression of the totalizing exigencies at the structural core of the dominant system. Totalization has been experienced by Aboriginal peoples in Canada as a State policy, characterized by many scholars as "assimilation," which has worked to absorb them into the established order….The concept of totalization is indispensable to an understanding of the political project of Aboriginal peoples in northern Canada, a project that can be seen as a form of resistance to the world-as-grid

> being constructed by the totalizing exigencies of commodity culture. (Kulchyski, 2005, pp. 24-25)

Harvey (1996), a Marxist place theorist, positions place as ambivalent; place can be a site of resistance to globalization, but also a nationalist tool of exclusion. Critical cultural geographers add contending with power in places: “Place was not simply an outcome of social processes though; it was, once established, a tool in the creation, maintenance, and transformation of relations of domination, oppression, and exploitation” (Cresswell, 2015, p. 46). Some very powerful critiques of place theory emerged in the 1980s and 1990s: Foremost among these theorists is Doreen Massey.

In the introduction to her powerful work entitled *Space, Place and Gender*, Massey (1994) writes that “The central thread linking the papers is the attempt to formulate concepts of space and place according to social relations”; she goes on to mention class, gender and culture as co-constructors of experience within geographical locations. She also writes of “the recrudescence of exclusivist claims to places—nationalist, regionalist and localist. All of them have been attempts to fix the meaning of particular spaces, to enclose them, endow them with fixed identities and claim them for one’s own” (1994, p. 4). Massey’s feminist critiques of place, which she calls a “battle over power in particular addressed the positioning of Place as ‘a place called home’ (identity formation?)” (p. 6). Massey and other feminists argued that this framing of place overlooked the oppression of women and the devaluing of women’s labour that accompany enclosure, exclusion, and domination. These are characterized as linked to the ahistorical, philosophical, modern, and masculine nature of space, vs. the temporal, local, socially situated and feminine, nature of place. These are clearly echoes of the scholarship around colonialist understandings of Land, Indigenous peoples and women, expressed earlier in

this dissertation. Massey herself is quick to point out that this essentialism, strategic[10] (Spivak, 1990) or not, is:

> not generalizable beyond certain cultures at certain times. Writings on the diaspora and on slavery, for instance, indicate the lack of its purchase on the lives of women in cultures other than the white/western ones of the last two centuries. Even in those cultures the actual relations between women and 'the local sphere' has by no means been absolute nor held good for many women who did not live in heterosexual couples, with children, in suburbs" (Massey, 1994, p. 10).

Massey goes on to encourage the reading of Toni Morrison (1987), bell hooks (1981), and Valentine (1993) to challenge the white heteronormative feminist conceptualization of 'place' and of 'home'. hooks in particular challenged white feminist notions of 'home' as a 'site of oppression', and instead wrote of her experience of home as a site of power and resistance (1990). Indigenous feminist relations to place might be seen as encompassing both/and; Western cultural values have significantly disempowered Indigenous women compared to the economic and social roles held by women in many Indigenous societies (Mi'kmaq scholar Bonita Lawrence, 2002, 2004; Mohawk author Patricia Monture-Angus, 1995). And yet, the power of Indigenous women is inherently and profoundly linked to Land. The oppression of Indigenous women and Land is linked, and the resurgence of Indigenous communities, cultures, languages and Lands is deeply centered on Indigenous women.

Indigenous feminisms and borders. Indigenous feminisms in Place is an important discourse in and of itself. Gendered knowledge and roles in Indigenous communities are often

---

[10] Spivak (1990) tells us that there can be circumstances where essentialism, which is sometimes dehumanizing, is useful as it may assemble a larger group. For example, generalizing about Aboriginal people dehumanizes, but acknowledging the common experience of Aboriginal people in Canada in contending with multiple structural oppressions is necessary and powerful.

differentiated and specialized. Kulchyski (2005) played an important role in my own coming to understand how these roles are different, but are not valued hierarchically: “While men and women occupy clearly defined and differentiated social spheres, there is a balanced reciprocity between the two, rather than an order of hierarchy and subordination, as prevails in other modes of production” (2005, p. 48). At Trent, Elder Edna Manitowabi made it very clear that the oppression of Indigenous women and the devaluing of women’s roles, skills, knowledge and labour in Indigenous communities occurred as a result of colonization (personal communication, 1996). Cayuga faithkeeper and Elder Jacob Thomas taught me about the Haudenosaunee Great Law of Peace; in Haudenosaunee governance, the clanmothers hold critical roles, and are responsible for the choosing of and removing of government representatives (Thomas, personal communication, 1996). Haudenosaunee nations are matrilineal; Anishinaabe nations value women enormously for social and economic reasons but also as ‘windows to creation’ (Manitowabi, personal communication, 1996). These profound cultural differences from Western misogynist traditions have presented grave, and indeed fatal, difficulties in terms of the deeply gendered Canadian laws regarding Indian Status, and the imposition of band council governance.

Indigenous women hold enormous social, political and economic power in Indigenous communities, and in the work for resurgence and restitution. This was true before contact with Europeans, and is true now. The impact that colonialism has had on the gender roles and dynamics in Indigenous communities figures prominently in a great deal of the scholarship and advocacy work by Indigenous scholars.

> The violence that Indigenous women face is both systemic and symbolic. It is systemic in the sense that it has been structured, indeed institutionalized, into a relatively secure and resistant set of oppressive material relations that render Indigenous women more likely than their non-Indigenous counterparts to suffer severe economic and social privation,

> including disproportionately high rates of poverty and unemployment, incarcerations, addictions, homelessness, chronic and/or life-threatening health problems, overcrowded and substandard housing, and lack of access to clean water, as well as face discrimination and sexual violence in their homes, communities and workplaces (Native Women's Association of Canada, 2012). Just as importantly, however, the violence that Indigenous women face is also 'symbolic' in the sense that Pierre Bourdieu used the term: 'gentle, invisible violence, unrecognized as such, chosen as much as undergone' (Bourdieu, 1990, 127). Symbolic violence, in other words, is the subjectifying form of violence that renders the crushing materiality of systemic violence invisible, appear natural, acceptable….the symbolic violence of settler-colonial misogyny, institutionalized through Residential Schools and successive Indian Acts, has become so diffuse that it now saturates all of our relationships. (Coulthard, 2014, p. 177)

There is a great wealth of important, painful and fascinating work on this crucial topic of the structural and ongoing oppression of Indigenous women as a result of colonization, including Monture-Angus (1996), Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson (2014), Lawrence (2002, 2004), Sherene Razack (2002), Andrea Smith (2005, 2015), and Métis scholar Janet Silman (1987). "Because relationships to land and identity have been mediated by colonial regulations and policies, Indigenous women's knowledge and experiences have been underpinned by a variety of personal and communal experiences and gender processes" (Breton scholar Nathalie Kermoal & Zapotec scholar Isabel Altamirano-Jiménez, 2016, p. 10). Attending well to place and Land through Indigenous lenses necessitates attending to both gendered knowledges of Land and to gendered oppressions introduced by colonialism, some of which link gender oppression to Land-based oppression. Another area of discourse where these intersections are attended to is in Borders discourse.

I first became aware of Borders discourse from Xicana Tejana scholar Marissa Munoz, who writes about the relationships between border communities and water, recognizing

traditional ecological knowledge as an intergenerational pedagogy along the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo border. Cashman (2016) describes this field in this way: "A *critical border dialogism* considers the interconnectness of place-based and border pedagogies as part of contemplating one's own positionality in the context of larger research, intellectual knowledge, appreciation, and learning" (p. 30). Later in the piece, he goes on to describe border pedagogy:

> Border pedagogy, like a critical pedagogy of place, includes a concern for illuminating the spaces we occupy. Border pedagogy builds upon critical understandings of place and attempts to connect those understandings with larger contexts. According to Giroux (2005), there are three components of border pedagogy that indicate a respect for differences: (a) a recognition of margins, (b) the need for border crossers, and (c) a recognition of the historically and socially-constructed strengths and limitations of places and borders. Borders are considered boundaries of entities, while the act of crossing borders involves going beyond existing boundaries and broadening one's perspectives of others in locales near or afar. (Cashman, 2016, p. 32).

Borders discourse asks for learners to engage in the stories and heritage of the people we are in community with, in order to respect the intersectional locations, socio-historical and material. Rather than seeing places as sites of enclosure, I see this discourse as recognizing our respective locations and asking for recognition and respect for relative locations. Another area of Place discourse where these complexities and relativities are invited is in the conceptualizing of this work as that of Assemblage (DeLanda, 2006), or Gathering (Casey, 1996), which references the older framework of Hybridity (Bhabha, 1994).

Gatherings, assemblages, and hybridity. It is clear that understandings of place have been contested and are complex – indeed, I believe they must be complex to be useful. The

phenomenological emphasis on places as sites of gathering – of material, of meaning, was articulated by Casey:

> Places gather: this I take to be the second essential trait (i.e. beyond the role of the lived body) revealed by phenomenological topo-analysis. Minimally, places gather things in their midst – where "things" connote various animate and inanimate entities. Places also gather experiences and histories even languages and thoughts. Think only of what it means to go back to a place you know, finding it full of memories and expectations, old things and new things, the familiar and the strange, and much more besides. What else is capable of this massively diversified holding action?...the power belongs to place itself, and it is a power of gathering. (Casey, 1996, p. 24)

An interesting and recent conceptualization of Place theory is that of *assemblages*: according to Cresswell (2015), this post-structuralist theory has grown out of the work of the French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1987); a definitive and foundational work is that of philosopher Manuel DeLanda (2006) in *A New Philosophy of Society*. DeLanda described an assemblage as a distinct whole "whose properties emerge from the interactions between parts" (p. 5). Cresswell expands on this:

> Assemblages are distinct from organized structures which are also assembled from parts but depend on each part in order to exist. In an organized structure, if you take away a constituent part, the structure would cease to exist in a recognizable way. With an assemblage, constituent parts can be removed and replaced. The parts can then enter other assemblages and contribute to new "unique wholes". The ways in which parts are combined in an assemblage are not structurally necessary or pre-ordained. They are not directed by some higher force. Their combination is contingent. (2015, p. 52)

Places are characterized as natural candidates for assemblages: Here we are back to an interplay between the material and the meaning of places, but with an added dimension or axis. DeLanda's (2006) assemblage theorem indicates two axes: the first is that of the material and meaning/expression, and the second, according to Cresswell, "links forces that cohere

(territorializing forces) and those that pull it apart (deterritorializing forces)" (2015, p. 54). The same component, for example the phone or the internet, might act as both; here are tools that both connect us to one another across space, and disconnect us from our immediate environment by placing our attention (the phenomenologists would say our orientation or consciousness, also constituent of our 'self' [e.g., Husserl, 1970; Merleau Ponty, 1945]) elsewhere.

There has been much written by place theorists of diverse discursive fidelities about the relative importance of, or the intersection between, modes of production and social formation. Kulchyski (2005) argues for the importance of the distinction between them, as "the latter [social formation] allows for the situating of the former [modes of production] in history, with all of its contingencies, necessities and particularities" (p. 52). Kulchyski uses this same argument to critique the notion of "hybridity" – that is, Bhabha's (1994, p. 38) notion of understanding and accepting cultures as hybrid as opposed to relying on the 'exoticism' of multiculturalism or on diversity. Kulchyski writes:

> While the notion of hybridity is a critical lever that certainly has value in debunking all-too-dangerous claims of cultural purity, the rush to celebrate creolization and metissage leaves many critical questions unanswered.…Celebrating insurgent hybrid forms solely or merely for the fact that they are hybrid misses the point: there has to be some substantive aspect of a culture that is to be valued or criticized, and one cannot determine such an aspect without returning to a language of cultural forms and boundaries. Bhabha himself implies an evaluative process that would distinguish hybrid forms when he suggests 'the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy'.…It seems as insufficient as the notion of 'diversity for its own sake' in discussing cultures. It is particularly insufficient when we come to think of a political project that will be of some value to the people involved. (2005, pp. 53-54)

This notion of dynamism of culture and of social relations in the context of modernity and of globalization is taken up by Massey (1994) when she articulates the 'time-space compression':

> Time-space compression refers to the movement and communication across space, to the geographical stretching-out of social relations, and to our experience of all this. The unusual interpretation is that it results overwhelmingly from the actions of capital, and from its currently increasing internationalization. On this interpretation, then, it is time space and money which make the world go round, and us go round (or not) the world. It is capitalism and its developments which are argued to determine our understanding and our experience of space. But surely this is insufficient. Among the many other things which clearly influence that experience, there are, for instance, 'race' [sic] and gender. The degree to which we can move between countries or walk about the streets at night, or venture out of hotels in foreign cities, is not just influenced by 'capital'. (Massey, 1994, p. 147)

Massey (1994) goes on to describe what she terms the power geometry of time-space compression:

> Different social groups have distinct relationships to this anyway differentiated mobility: some people are more in charge of it than others; some initiate flows and movement, others don't; some are more on the receiving-end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it. (p. 149)

The examples she cites for this power geometry include CEOs, western academics and journalists; refugees and migrant workers; and culture producers in the favelas of Rio "who know global football like the back of their hand…who have contributed massively to global music…and who have never, or hardly ever, been to downtown Rio" (p. 150). The conclusion she draws is that the time-space compression of some can undermine the power of others.

In the face of this compression, how do humans relate to places in ways that are not necessarily essentialist or exclusive? How can competing articulations of, or claims to, place

make way for necessary understandings of interrelationship and accountability to the local and to the global?

> Critical perspectives on place, even those that are not explicitly concerned with "the natural environment," remain important to environmental education because a spatialized social analysis is sometimes necessary to understand how particular ways of knowing with regard to the environment are culturally and spatially constituted. (Greenwood, 2013, p. 94)

This question has particular significance in relation to Indigenous identities: If many Indigenous identities are connected to particular territories (Marker, 2006), what does it mean to be Indigenous if one no longer has connection to these particular places for any number of reasons, and mainly due to structural oppressions that have meant displacement and extraction? And, what if these connections are being enacted and sought in ways that are not in line with (western) conceptions of *Indianness* or *authenticity*? For, Indigenous identities are dynamic and vernacular.

> In the moral panic around Indigenous education more generally, we would be well served to understand these young people as creative, active agents whose interest in cultural learning is a sort of remembering, a seeking of personal and communal healing in the context of conjoined cultural, social, and ecological worlds. (Friedel, 2011, p.540)

Friedel (2010, 2011) and Métis scholar Cora Weber Pillwax (2001, 2004) have written about Indigenous education, Place and authenticity, troubling the contexts and celebrating the resistances of Indigenous learners in various programs, and arguing for a more dynamic understanding of Indigenous identities, practices and lifeways.

Some Place theorists call for a more dynamic understanding of how places constitute identities: Soja (1999) contributes to Place theory by arguing on place as process. In this he is echoing Massey (1994), that places are not simply the binary of the material (Firstspace) and the

meaning (Secondspace), but that they are also practiced and lived (Thirdspace). I appreciate this *trialectic of spatiality* since it allows for places to be dynamic and productive. This was used to develop Lefebre's (1991) definition of social space (lived and meaningful space) and places the term space closer to place (as dynamic instead of static or fixed) (p. 19).

The analogy of 'space' being an extension of the term *terra nullius* (Coulthard, 2014) has further implications for the theorizing about place, as mentioned earlier in this dissertation. Placelessness, as a concept linked to the increase in mobility linked to globalization, is perceived as an argument that attachment to place is outdated or outmoded. If the materialities of place are constitutive of human beings and their physical, emotional, mental and spiritual beings, and the meanings of places are dynamic in nature, just as are cultures, economies, and languages, then is it possible for a person to truly be placeless? Again, the only way for this to be true is if no consideration or value whatever is understood in relation to Indigenous knowledge, people or communities.

I appreciate the critical and dynamic scholarship on Place in the discourses of Borders, Indigenous scholarship, and intersectional feminism. In particular of the Place theorists, I argue that Malpas (1999) supports the discourse as I see it; he describes himself as a Place philosopher, and does a good job of arguing against the conventions in Place discourse to situate place either as a site of ownership or of exclusion or of an outdated and unuseful attachment in the face of globalization:

> In [recent] discussion, place…has been viewed with a great deal of suspicion as a romantic affectation or as arising out of some sedentary conservatism. But, if the arguments of the preceding pages are taken seriously, then place can neither be dismissed in this way nor can it be unproblematically taken to give support to any particular form of conservatism. The complex structure of place, its resistance to any simple categorization or characterization, its encompassing of both subjective and objective elements, its

> necessary interconnections with agency, all suggest that the idea of place does not so much bring a certain politics with it, as define the very frame within which the political itself must be located. It is only from out of a grasp of place within which the political can arise that we can even begin to think about the possibility of a politics that would do justice to our existence as fundamentally an existence in and through place. (Malpas, 1999, p. 198)

A significant contributor to the discourse of Place who emphasizes the imperative of living well and responsively in place is Casey (1998); Casey argues that all of our lived experiences as humans are place-based and that to survive and adapt as a species on the planet we need to respond to the places in which we find ourselves. Casey (1996), like Evernden (1985), describes the body as the source of all experience in, and access to, the world. The term 'field of care', originally encountered in the work of Tuan (1977), grows out of Evernden's discussion of the seminality (and I do mean seminality) of Heidegger's philosophical views on existence in the reconception of people's place in the natural order:

> One does not really experience the boundary of the self as the epidermis of the body, but rather as a gradient of involvement in the world….Instead of considering the extension of the self into the world as akin to the making of a body image or a 'phenomenal body', here we are talking about a field of concern or care. (Evernden, 1985, p. 3)

When I started graduate work, new to environmental and Place theory, Evernden's famous quote really spoke to me: Each "secretly hears his [sic] own name called whenever he hears any region of Being named with which he is vitally involved" (Evernden, 1985, p. 65). At the time, I found that this resonated with how I feel in the places that I love. Now, having lived in many different environments, I find that my own body does react differently in different places, and that I relate differently to my environment according to what I recognize. The tiny versions of familiar plants that I see in the Arctic make me both delighted at the recognition and increasingly aware that I

am far from ‘home’. There have been ravens in every place I have ever lived, and these ‘more-than-human’ relations make me feel grounded. Discovering the names, uses and stories about these beings in different places connect me more deeply to the territory I am in; it is these deep listening and learning practices that I seek to highlight in teacher education. (see also Blenkinsop & Beeman,2010; Piersol, 2014).

I have frequently used the term ‘field of care’ in teaching environmental education to indicate that as learners come to know and be involved with a particular place or location, they will care about it more, and hopefully make decisions that reflect this care. This conceptualization of human being in place is also found in Albertus (1514) *dwelling*, and reappears in the writing of David Orr, another significant scholar in the fields of Place-based and environmental education:

> A resident is a temporary occupant, putting down few roots and investing little knowing little, and perhaps caring little for the immediate locale beyond its capacity to gratify. As both a cause and effect of displacement, a resident lives in an indoor world of an office building, shopping mall, automobile, apartment and suburban house, and watches television an average of four hours per day. The inhabitant, in contrast, ‘dwells’, as Illich (1984) puts it, in an intimate, organic, and mutually nourishing relationship with a place. Good inhabitance is an art requiring detailed knowledge of a place, the capacity for observation, and a sense of care and rootedness. Residence requires cash and a map. (Orr, 1992, p. 129)

While terms and categories like *gatherings, assemblages and hybridity* are present in Place discourse, I still find little explicit inclusion, let alone centering, of Indigenous peoples, histories and practices in the Place literature. Chambers (2006) calls for the curriculum of place to be one where the activities “engage children in the very activities they need to dwell in this place, to be nourished by this place and to nourish it” (p. 120). As I have learned more and more

about Indigenous peoples and Lands, it has become more and more evident to me how dysconscious people are of the places where they live, work, study and recreate regarding the histories and present realities of these Indigenous lands and communities. Terms like *wilderness*, or my pet-peeve "the middle of nowhere", show how pervasive the Western conception of place is: It is not a place to people who have grown up formed by Western thought until it has been interacted with in a way that is recognized as inhabitance. Recently, in the controversy surrounding author Joseph Boyden and his Indigeneity, I heard him use that term – "the middle of nowhere" – to refer to the location of his cottage.

This pronouncement really struck me: This is a term that may seldom be used by Indigenous peoples and communities. Here is Malpas again:

> Indigenous accounts of place emphasize the way in which place is formed and sustained through journey and movement, pathway and track. Not only does this suggest that our relationship with place is always one of active engagement with place and with that which is found within it, but it also means that place has to be understood as itself a dynamic and relational structure in which we are already embedded, rather than some static object over which "ownership" can simply be asserted.
>
> I have tried to capture this idea through an analogy with old-fashioned methods of topographical surveying in which one comes to understand a landscape or stretch of country, not through mere observation from a distance, but rather through one's engagement with that landscape as one undertakes repeated triangulations between landmarks, measuring distance and angle, as one traverses the distance from one landmark to another. The place that is the entire landscape is thus grasped as made up of a network of places, joined by the paths between, while those places are themselves made what they are through the way they are located in relation to each other within that larger landscape.
>
> On this account, then, place has to be understood as essentially relational in character,

> and our own connection to place—our "sense of place"—is seen as emerging through our active engagement with that place and our embeddedness in the relations that make it up. Both these features clearly connect with features evident in Indigenous accounts of place. (2009, p. 25)

Places are agentic in and of themselves, and the web of relationships between locations, humans, and all of the more-than-human inhabitants renders this notion of 'nowhere' impossible.

The near-total absence in Place literature of acknowledgement and investigation into Indigenous knowledges and realities as Place-inhabitants is further evidence of the epistemic and material violences that Eurocentrism and colonization continue to enact. As I revisit the scholarship on Place, this has become even more uncomfortable for me.

Place, Land and Indigeneity. The older I get, the more powerfully the teachings I received at Trent in the mid-90s resonate in me, and have ever-greater impacts on the way I see my surroundings and the more-than-human (Abram, 1996) web of relations I am in. I am sitting in an office in the Quebec Arctic now, and what I have learned from my colleagues here reinforces what I learned at Trent: places, and the more-than-human beings in them, are agentic in and of themselves. They are beings. It is uncomfortable to assert that both as a white person and as a western scholar writing a formal dissertation, but this is how I see it. The recent publication in the field of geography *Being together in place; Indigenous coexistence in a more than human world* (Larsen & Johnson, 2017) strongly supports this assertion. In her amazing 2005 work, Julie Cruikshank put it this way:

> Glaciers appear as actors in this book. In accounts we will hear from Athapaskan and Tlingit oral tradition, glaciers take action and respond to their surroundings. They are sensitive to smells and they listen. They make moral judgment and they punish

> infractions. Some elders who know them well describe them as both animate (endowed with life) and as animating (giving life to) landscapes they inhabit. (p. 3)

Cruikshank describes one of her objectives for this text as providing "an account of how interpretations of natural, social and cultural worlds became gradually disaggregated in a place where they were formerly viewed as unified, and to examine the consequences of that fragmentation" (2005, p. 4). This statement mirrors my own learning journey relating to the many theories and investigations of *Place* from different discursive and epistemological traditions.

I appreciate the field of critical cultural geography and urban planning for the investigations into the social constructions of places as sites of resistance, inclusion, and exclusion (e.g., hooks, 1990; Massey, 1994); indeed, this was central to my master's work. In my case studies on Environmental education facilities in the Don River Valley in Toronto, I carefully examined the blueprints of the buildings, the garden plans, and the plant choices, all to inquire into "who are these places for?" What is being communicated through these designs, choices and constructions? This, for me, is where the concept of Place becomes really powerful. "Place was not simply an outcome of social processes though; it was, once established, a tool in the creation, maintenance and transformation of relations of domination, oppression, and exploitation" (Cresswell, 2015, p. 46). But even if, as the cultural geographers would have it, places are socially constructed, or, as the philosophers would have it, they constitute human existence, both/each require human attention for significance, for being.

Malpas' (1999) argument that societies are geographically constructed and responsive is more useful for me, and comes closer to resonating with Indigenous perspectives on Land and place:

> Place is instead that within and with respect to which subjectivity is itself established – place is not founded on subjectivity, but is rather that on which subjectivity is founded. Thus one does not first have a subject that apprehends certain features of the world in terms of the idea of place; instead, the structure of subjectivity is given in and through the structure of place. (p. 35)

In other words, namely in Cruikshank's (2005) other words, "local knowledge is never crudely encapsulated in closed traditions, but is produced during human encounters, rather than 'discovered'. It is dynamic and complex, and it often links biophysical and social processes" (p. 4). More recently, Place theorists from many disciplines are concerned about the ways that globalization and modernity are exacerbating the eliding of place-connections, and that this is having a negative effect on people's awareness of, and implication in, the dual oppression of nature and people.

As I came to understand through my excellent classes at York in Urban Planning, cities present particular obstacles to people understanding themselves in relation to *nature*; in some ways, it could be said that cities elide the dependence of people on nature at every turn. City dwellers buy food from markets, rarely seeing the production of food, water comes from taps, and green space is carefully planned or contained. There are deep value judgments ascribed to urban *nature*; vacant lots bursting with plants (weeds) are eyesores, and trees and plants in containers might be akin to animals in zoos (Blekinsop, Affifi, Piersol & Sitka-Sage, 2017). Cities certainly have profound needs for, and effects upon, the nature that they require: Toronto is built upon rivers and creeks, and there are significant issues with the sewage and bacteria run off after every storm event or spring melt (Lake Ontario Waterkeepers, ongoing sewage bypass alert).

Cities have presented a particular opportunity and challenge to place theorists and to environmental educators. Feminist, black, Indigenous and intersectional theorists have pointed out that the Place canon up until the 1970s did not sufficiently account for the diversities of culture, race, gender, class, sexuality and ability that contribute to Place, understood both as material and subjective. One of the imperatives that Gruenewald (2003) articulates for joining the fields of critical pedagogy and place-based education is related:

> One result of these primarily ecological and rural associations [of PBE] has been that place-based education is frequently discussed at a distance from the urban, multicultural arena, territory most often claimed by critical pedagogues. If place-based education emphasizes ecological and rural contexts, critical pedagogy—in a near mirror image—emphasizes social and urban contexts and often neglects the ecological and rural scene entirely. (Gruenewald, 2003, p. 1)

This has particular implications for Indigenous people: In my classes, there was little awareness of the large Indigenous population of Toronto, for example.

Urban Indigenous person was another example of, "Not the Indian they had in mind" (T. King, 2007). Additionally, as the urban Indigenous populations across Canada grow rapidly, cities must be understood as places of enclosure and exclusion, and also of resistance. While the reserve system sought to segregate Indigenous peoples and dispossess them of Land, relationships and economic base, as the Indigenous populations of the cities in Canada steadily increase, gentrification and segregation initiatives proliferate in urban Indigenous spaces. Here is Razack:

> The city belongs to the settlers and the sullying of civilized society through the presence of the racialized Other in white spaces gives rise to a careful management of boundaries within urban space. Planning authorities require larger plots in the suburbs, thereby ensuring that larger homes and wealthier families live there. Projects and Chinatowns are created, cordoning off the racial poor. Such spatial practices, often achieved through law

> (nuisance laws, zoning laws, and so on) mark off the spaces of the settler and the native both conceptually and materially. The inner city is racialized space, the zone in which all that is not respectable is contained. Canada's colonial geographies exhibit this same pattern of violent expulsions and the spatial containment of Aboriginal peoples to marginalized areas of the city, processes consolidated over three hundred years of colonization. (2002, p. 129).

Lawrence (2004) asserts that Indigenous resurgence will require a reconceptualization of Indigeneity that rejects the colonial divisions of urban/reserve that have been reinforced through the racist and sexist policies of the Indian Act, including enfranchisement. Additionally, Lawrence calls for urban Indigenous peoples to have "some form of mutually agreed upon, structured access to Land-based communities" (p. 232).

While it may be true that we are never far from Land (we *are* Land), time spent learning from and attending to the relationships that produced Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies is important. There are some obstacles, both internal and external, to participating in education in this way and for these aims: Foremost among these is colonization (this will be taken up further). Attending to these relationships and entanglements must be a central concern of critical place based education.

Critical Pedagogy + Place Based Education = A Critical Pedagogy of Place

The Land-based learning that has been successful in my classes is arguably related to the pedagogical family of Place-based education (PBE) (see Bowers, 1993; Greenwood, 2009; Gruenewald, 2003; Gruenewald & Smith, 2008; Maori scholar Graham Smith, 2002; Sobel, 2004; Wattchow & Brown, 2011). More specifically, centering Land and place in Canadian teacher education is enacting Gruenewald's (2003) *critical pedagogy of place*, a blending of the discourses of critical pedagogy and Place-based education. He synthesizes the fields of critical

pedagogy, a libratory educational praxis of social justice (Freire, 1970, H. Giroux, 1981, 2009; McLaren, 2003), and PBE. Darder et al. (2009) write:

> Critical pedagogy is fundamentally committed to the development and enactment of a culture of schooling that supports the empowerment of culturally marginalized and economically disenfranchised students…. In an effort to strive for an emancipatory culture of schooling, critical pedagogy calls upon teachers to recognize how schools have historically embraced theories and practices that serve to unite knowledge and power in ways that sustain asymmetrical relations of power. Under the guise of neutral and apolitical views of education, practices of meritocracy, for example, rooted in ideologies of privilege, shaped by power, politics, history, culture and economics have prevailed. Schools, thus, function as a terrain of on-going cultural struggle over what is accepted as legitimate knowledge. (p. 10)

Just as Place theory emerges in many discursive traditions, so too does PBE. PBE has been invoked in environmental education, education for sustainability, experiential education, ecological education, constructivist education, outdoor education, Indigenous education, and at the roots of critical pedagogy, too. In the 1900s, John Dewey, who is situated as the *father of the progressive education movement* in western education discourse, articulated in some of his core principles of education some tenets that are central to Place-based education. These include: "the notion that education must engage with an enlarged experience; that thinking and reflection are central to the act of teaching; and that students must freely interact with their environments in the practice of constructing knowledge" (Darder et al., 2009, p. 2).

PBE has developed along the trajectory of experiential environmental education and practice:

> One of the core objectives [of PBE] is to look at how landscape, community infrastructure, watersheds, and cultural traditions all interact and shape each other…. Emphasizing hands-on, real-world learning experiences, this approach to education

> increases academic achievement, helps students develop stronger ties to their community, enhances students' appreciation for the natural world, and creates a heightened commitment to serving as active, contributing citizens. Community vitality and environmental quality are improved through the active engagement of local citizens, community organizations, and environmental resources in the life of the school. (Sobel, 2004, p. 7)

Over the last couple of decades, outdoor and environmental theorists such as Orr (1992), Sobel (2004), Thomashow (1996) and Woodhouse and Knapp (2000) have called upon fellow practitioners to attend more carefully to the local in their education practices. As a product of the Ontario summer camp system, and of the outdoor education field both as participant and as practitioner, it has become increasingly clear to me as I make sense of my experiences that these fields are at best uneven in how they attend to place.

When I ask the campers at TSC about the territories that they travel through in their canoe trips, they have not learned to attend to where the places are in relation to the province, let alone to the Indigenous territories they are in. They have not been taught to recognize or honour the more-than-human relations in the Lands they travel through, despite each having spent over 150 days in remote wilderness travel. I hear reports of encounters with "charismatic megafauna" (bears, lynx, moose), and perhaps a loon count, but they have not been encouraged to develop their knowledge of being attuned to their more-than-human co-inhabitants, despite my (admittedly meager) efforts. While they hold a deep love for the Land and for their experiences, it is troubling to me that they do not seem to see themselves as implicated or entangled in the web of relationships that supported and accompanied them through these journeys—at least not in the way that I would like, where they would have learned more about the beings and lifeways they are enmeshed with.

The experiences that the campers have been immersed in exist in a culture that emphasizes speed and efficiency of travel, and relationships within the group. This relational dynamic is very much, still, the *frontier*, instrumental, skills-based and character education mentality of the turn of the last century (Cronon, 1996), to say nothing of how the outdoor education field has much to answer for in the way that it excludes based on race, class, ability, fatness, and how damaging and archaic Eurocentric gender norms are reified. This dynamic is unsurprising, given that the field grew out of the conceptions of nature (frontier, wilderness, *terra nullius*) theorized earlier in this dissertation. This is, of course, not true in every program or context, but is true in all that I have been a part of. I see signs of change in the field, but more needs to be done. In teaching the Outdoor Experiential Education course at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, my perception that critical perspectives and topics are still seen as external to outdoor and experiential education was confirmed multiple times, by participants and by leaders. Some from Lakehead, such as Root (2010) and Lowan (2010, 2011), have addressed the need for decolonizing practices in outdoor education.

From another angle, in attending conferences and in reading widely in environmental education and in education for sustainability, and in many educators who are advocating for PBE, I see a great emphasis on environmental science, on gardens as places of learning, and on the dire need to foster love and care for *nature* in young learners (Richard Louv's [2008] pathologizing of children in his book on *nature deficit disorder* is troublingly ubiquitous). All of these are powerful practices that can include critical practices and perspectives, and yet, I still notice a distinct absence of attention to crucial elements of Place such as gender, race, class, and ability that have been called for by eminent theorists for decades (e.g., hooks, 1990, 1992; Massey,1994; Malpas, 1999, 2009). With respect to the context of this work, attention to, and

respect for, Indigenous knowledges and territories must be included in these programs that all take place on Indigenous Lands.

Bowers (1993, 2001) strongly derided critical pedagogy for not attending to the ecological contexts of human culture. Conversely, while the ecological may have been attended to in PBE, the social and political is often elided or ignored, as argued by Gruenewald (2003):

> In a parallel story of neglect, place-based education has developed an ecological and rural emphasis that is often insulated from the cultural conflicts inherent in dominant American culture [race, gender, ability, sexuality]. Additionally, in its focus on local ecological experience, place-based approaches are sometimes hesitant to link ecological themes with critical themes such as urbanization and the homogenization of culture under global capitalism (p. 4)

Further, Gruenewald (2003) argues that each discourse needs the other; critical pedagogy needs the ecological emphasis of place-based education, and place-based education needs the troubling of dominant ideologies and the emphasis on social, economic and political complexities that critical pedagogy requires. He writes:

> The purpose of critical pedagogy is to engage learners in the act of what Freire called *conscientizacao*, which has been defined as 'learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality' Freire, 1970 & 1995, p. 17). A critical pedagogy of place has the same aim, and identifies 'places' as the contexts in which these situations are perceived and acted on. (Gruenewald, 2003, pp. 4-5)

In later writing, Greenwood (formerly Gruenewald) writes that "place consciousness provides a frame of reference from which one can identify, and potentially resist, the colonizing practices of schooling as a function of the larger culture and its political economy" (2009, p. 1). This is a reaffirmation of the assertions of Fanon (1967), Memmi (1991, 2006), Said (1978) and Spivak

(1993); the importance of complexity and multiple sites of resistance in the decolonizing of identity. Gruenewald again:

> A critical pedagogy of place aims to (a) identify, recover, and create material spaces and places that teach us how to live well in our total environments (reinhabitation): and (b) identify and change ways of thinking that injure and exploit other people and places (decolonization). (2003, p. 9)

At the centre of education for Indigenous futurity is the site itself: The Land.

Critical Place-based education, Meet Land Education

Place-based education (PBE) has not always sufficiently centered Indigenous presence and epistemologies (see Tuck et al., 2014), though this began to change just over a decade ago. Critical PBE (cPBE) can be an effective pedagogy to create a respectful/accurate/unsettling context from which to at least begin the process of relearning the treaty implications of Canadian citizenship where settler futurity is disrupted, and Indigenous sovereignty is centered. In scholar/poet Gruenewald's (2003) philosophical writings on the field of PBE, he calls for decolonization as a crucial element of education in critical place-based pedagogy. Battiste (1998) and Donald (2009), among other scholars in Canada (e.g., Battiste et al., 2005; Chambers 2006, 2008; Korteweg & Russell, 2012; Scully, 2012; Tupper & Cappello, 2008), have asserted the importance of territorial specificity in decolonizing perspectives in Education.

> The formal process of education often obscures and distorts relations to place, especially with respect to land… My purpose is to contribute to a theory of environmental education that is culturally responsive, and committed to care for land and people, locally and globally. (Greenwood, 2013, p. 93)

In this work, I show how cPBE with Land at its centre are working to uncover and recover *right relation* in education for just Canadian citizenship. In this section, I describe some of the

experiences and scholarship in teacher education that show the importance and the challenges of this work.

The intersection between education and economic imperatives continues to have particularly grave implications for the Indigenous peoples and Lands in Canada. Critical Place-based education provides a framework and a discourse to address this. Orr's (1992) assertion that "*all education is environmental education*/By what is included or excluded we teach students that they are part of or apart from the natural world" (p. 52, emphasis in original) points to the way that Canadians are educated about their connection to, and dependence upon, Land. Just as there is an absence of learning about Indigenous history and peoples in Canada, there is an absence of exposing the connections that all humans have with the 'environment'. Both of these absences serve the existing political economy at devastating cost to Land and people–particularly to Indigenous people–in what Greenwood (2010) terms the "eco and genocidal politics of empire" (p. 10).

Indigenous sovereignty and identity are based on collective, territorially specific communal rights and agreements that stand in direct opposition to the foundations of neoliberal ideologies, politics and practices (Kulchyski, 2013; Marker, 2006). "In particular, Indigenous knowledge is an affront to individualism and progress" (Marker, 2006, p. 497). Critical PBE with Land at the centre resists this imperative.

As Gruenwald/Greenwood (2003/2009, 2010) argues, cPBE offers what environmental education has sometimes ignored: That ecological and social discourses are interconnected, and must be taught as such to resist the colonizing forces of schooling as a tool of empire. The potential for an interdisciplinary and critical practice of PBE has also been argued for by Ardoin (2006), Somerville, Power, & De Carteret (2009), among others. In particular, Blenkinsop et al.

(2016, 2017) write about the continuing colonization of the more-than-human world.

What local, cPBE provides is a way of seeing common ground in a different light. This was the gift of cPBE, when I learned about the field during my master's degree: Here was a conceptual framework that supports a practice where the rich possibilities for learning and connection that are available wherever we are is celebrated and investigated. Through this cPBE lens, each student that comes into my classes has their own web of relationships – they carry with them their own deeply entrenched ways of seeing and habits of knowing. While it is my sincere wish to honour that, and to help bring these into the learning in the classroom, it is also my work to help them to see that theirs is one of many ways of seeing and being. As cautioned by important cultural works from Rashomon (1950) to Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's acclaimed and widely seen TED Talk. *The danger of a single story* (2009), there are as many different ways of seeing a situation, event, place or person as there are people looking. We must open ourselves to the multiple stories and perspectives if we are to make choices in service of equity and justice and wellbeing for all.

These perspectives and materialisms are not on equal footing, for all take place in one Place – on Indigenous Land. As will be demonstrated in the conversations section of this dissertation, and as shown in the literature, education for social justice holds an important place in Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education (Dion, 2009; Madden, 2014; Schick, 2000; St. Denis, 2007; Tompkins, 2002). Now, there is greater attention being paid in environmental education and in education for sustainability to the concept of intersectionality: This is of particular importance in any discussion of place.

> What is intersectionality? Most references in intersectional scholarship point to Kimberlé Crenshaw's 1991 Stanford Law Review article 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color' as the initiation of

> intersectionality as a concept into academia. Crenshaw combines literature on critical race theory to examine antiracist and feminist discourse on women of color as victims of sexual violence, arguing that racism and sexism act as mutually interlocking systems of oppression, resulting in a form of disadvantage that affects Black women uniquely at three levels. Structural intersectionality refers to where systems of domination converge; political intersectionality addresses how individuals who identify with multiple subordinate groups may face challenges due to conflicting agendas of political discourse; and representational intersectionality involves a political discourse that acknowledges the significance of other discourses in addition to the power relations that both challenge and strengthen them. First and foremost intersectionality is a product of Black feminist thought. Any discussion of intersectionality that fails to incorporate this intellectual history lacks a fundamental understanding of its purpose. (black feminisms, 2017)

As such noted scholars as hooks (1992), Razack (2002) and Massey (1990) have argued, an important element of the praxis of Place lies in understanding and articulating how places expose, reproduce and resist multiple oppressions. In this context of Indigenous education, and, I would argue, in the context of Canadian education writ large, cPBE must centre Indigenous knowledges and communities, both in celebration, and also to contend with the violences done to Indigenous peoples and lands by Canada.

I am committed, in my classes, to confronting the legislated racism and oppression in Canada, and to showing how all Canadians are implicated in this. I am not afraid to make people angry, and according to my instructor evaluations, I sometimes do. In the literature about Indigenous education in teacher education, anger and resistance is well documented (Dion, 2009; Regan, 2010; Schick, 2000; Strong-Wilson, 2007). As DiAngelo & Sensoy (2014b) report:

> These reactions are not surprising because mainstream narratives reinforce the idea that society overall is fair, and that all we need to overcome injustice is to be nice and treat everyone the same. Yet while comforting, these platitudes are woefully out-of-sync with scholarly research about how society is structured. The deeply-held beliefs that inform

> our emotional responses make studying and teaching from a critical stance very difficult. (p. 2)

cPBE asks learners to contend with the ‘myth of the level playing field’ in multiple ways, and people respond to the ‘new’ knowledge of their positionality and, especially in the context of Indigenous territories, of the very location of the field with varying degrees of emotion and acceptance (or lack thereof). “Every conception of humanity and education begins from a human body in territory and a consciousness in which a specific place takes prominence” (Battiste, Bell, Findlay, Findlay, & Henderson, 2005, p. 8). Casey (1996) puts it this way: “To live is to live locally, and to know is first of all to know the place one is in” (p. 18). Canada is Indigenous territories. Learning from and about Indigenous people in context is therefore possible everywhere. This is a powerful and empowering realization that should pre-suppose the centering of Indigenous peoples and epistemologies in cPBE in Canada. However, Indigenous peoples, communities and knowledges have not been well-respected or acknowledged, let alone centred, in the interdisciplinary conceptual trajectory of Place.

Education for *Right Relation*: Starting with Land

> Indigenous education is not Indigenous or education from within our intellectual traditions unless it comes through the land, unless it occurs in an Indigenous context using Indigenous processes. (Deloria Jr. & Wildcat, 2001, pp. 58-59)

There are the two main elements necessary for fostering *right relation* between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. First, it is crucial that Canadians know the history and the current, legislated relationship we all have to each other in this binary context of Indigenous/non-Indigenous people. At Trent University, I was taught that the most respectful and effective way of learning about and from Indigenous people is to build relationships within local

community. This also appears in scholarship: “The legitimacy of Indigenous knowledge comes from social relationships and cannot exist without them. These relationships are not only embodied by human beings but also by animals, plants, spirits, water and mountains” (Kermoal & Altamirano-Jiménez, 2016, p. 8).

Second, cultural and territorial specificity are crucial components of respectful and accurate Indigenous education (Scully, 2012, p. 156). This central tenet of Indigenous education (see Battiste, 1998; Donald, 2009) is echoed and reinforced in the discourse of cPBE, where learning in/from/with specific places is a pedagogy of resistance to the devastation of people and lands enacted by globalization and industrial capitalism (Bowers, 1993; Gruenewald, 2003); as Cajete (2009) phrases it, “learning relationship in context” (p. 183).

At the centre of learning from/with Indigenous peoples and epistemologies is the Land. In many cases, when Indigenous scholars, wisdom keepers and community members articulate what it is to be Indigenous, the common factor is a profound connection to Land – to particular places.

Indigenous territories are the foundations and repositories of languages, economies, political structures, health and wellbeing, and community memory: Specific places hold the blueprint to how to be, how to live well on/with those places (Benton-Benai, 1988; Cajete, 2009; Deloria Jr., 1994; Manitowabi, personal communication, 1996; L. Simpson, 2011; Métis scholar Cora Weber-Pillwax, 2001, 2004). The diversity of ecosystems in Canada also supports the understanding of the diversity of Indigenous nations and cultures in Canada: As stated earlier in this paper, while there is a common experience of being Indigenous in Canada, due to 400 years of institutional oppression, a central concern of this work is to emphasize the incredible diversity of Indigenous peoples, cultures and experiences from coast-to-coast-to-coast. Bringing attention

to the Land where schooling happens is a crucial tool in disrupting the monolithic perceptions of Indigenous peoples in Canada.

I have long capitalized Land in reference to my own understanding of *Land as First Teacher*, as articulated by Cajete (2009), Deloria Jr. (1994), Lowan (2010), Anishinaabe Elders Peter O'Chiese and Jim Dumont[11], and L. Simpson (2011). More recently, Styres et al. (2013) characterize their observance of this convention as denoting the "primary relationship rather than when used in a more general sense" (p. 300). Anishinaabe scholar Megan Bang et al. (2014) articulate this in two ways:

> Indigenous scholars have focused much attention on relationships between land, epistemology and importantly, ontology. Places produce and teach particular ways of thinking about and being in the world. They tell us the way things are, even when they operate pedagogically beneath a subconscious level…. Similarly, we might imagine that ontology of place-based paradigms is something like 'I am, therefore place is,' in contrast, the ontology of land-based pedagogies might be summarized as 'Land is, therefore we are.' (pp. 44-45)

This last quote is a very powerful one for me. Malpas (2009), in particular of the Place theorists, does articulate a similar perspective, and does so while invoking Indigenous thought. Bang et al.'s (2014) formulation goes further, though, and articulates what I was taught at Trent. I had very good teachers, and it had not occurred to me to articulate what difference there might be between *Land* and *place* – Land is always first teacher. Humans, in Anishinaabe ontology, are the fourth order of creation – subject to Land and rock, to plants, and all other inhabitants of Land (Manitowabi, personal communication, 1996).

[11] Anishinaabe Elders Peter O'Chiese and Jim Dumont are foundational Elders in contemporary Anishinaabe epistemology and practice. Their teachings have been invoked by each and every Anishinaabe Elder that I have ever worked with and learned from (Mark Douglas, John Snake, Biboon Nimkii, Gerry Martin, Edna Manitowabi, Jacqui Lavallee, Doug & Shirley Williams). I cite them out of respect, and, breaking somewhat from academic tradition, without date).

I use the word ‘place’ out of work in my master’s degree, because I conceptualize place as encompassing not only Land, but also the buildings, habits of use, designs, intentions, civic responsibilities, privileges, politics and values that are inscribed on particular places, especially in an urban setting. These complexities have been explored in many disciplines through Place theory, and some of this has been included in the exploration of Place theory in this dissertation.

In this way, I am acknowledging that place-connection looks different for different people, and that diverse and complex Indigeneity can encompass those Indigenous people who do not have a close relationship with Land. From these scholars, I value and am learning the reasons why Land must be articulated in the context of cPBE as part of the work of decolonization, in that the interruption or absence of this relationship in these Indigenous identities is as important as the presence of it. What has become clear to me through this work is that settler separation from Land poses a massive and interrelated challenge to learning well from Indigenous peoples and Land-based epistemologies. In learning who the people of the Land are, and what has been done to them, pre-service teachers come to question how they did not know this before, and can come to see how much there could be to learn to live well in that place, and to act in support of Indigenous futurities.

The understanding of *Land as First Teacher* (Cajete, 1994, 2009; Deloria, Jr., 1994; Dumont; O’Chiese) is of great importance to my conception of place and of interrelationship, and is central to what I have learned from Indigenous communities, teachers and scholars. Mexican/Tiguan scholar Dolores Calderon (2014) and Styres et al. (2013) have recently forcefully addressed the importance of Land as a crucial element that is missing from Place-based education, or that at least needs to be more clearly emphasized. I agree. I consistently talk about Land in my conference presentations; what I have learned leads me to take this articulation

of Land even further than Calderon (2014) in that I see the need to centre Land not only in that it is the common ground upon which these socio-cultural-political claims are being waged, but I also argue that Land is agentic in and of itself. This is the understanding of *Land as First Teacher* – Land shapes people, capital, communities.

The oppression of Land by Western-derived epistemologies is massive, and has a massive effect on all of its inhabitants. As mentioned earlier, the epistemologies, ontologies, bodies, governance systems, and economic systems of Indigenous communities are rooted in *Land*, not in *time*, as they are in the Western traditions (Deloria Jr., 1994). These communities therefore carry the original instructions of how to interact with Land: “Indigenous place-stories and mapping conventions are expressions of sovereignty that are deeply influenced by wisdom traditions and provide specific examples of how to recognize the land as relative and citizen” (Donald, 2009, p. 19). The languages, stories, and economic systems of Indigenous peoples are crucial blueprints to how to live reciprocally and well on this Earth. Cajete (1994) writes of the ancientness of earth-centred education within Indigenous societies in his widely-acclaimed book, *Look to the Mountain*:

> This exploration of Indigenous education attempts to develop insights into the community of shared metaphors and understandings that are specific to Indian cultures, yet the nature of human learning as a whole. Traditional systems of Indian education represent ways of learning and doing through a Nature-centered philosophy. They are among the oldest continuing expressions of ‘environmental’ education in the world. Taken as a whole, they represent an environmental education process with profound meaning for modern education as it faces the challenges of living in the twenty-first century. These processes have the potential to create deeper understanding of our collective role as caretakers of a world we have thrown off-balance. (p. 21)

The disruption of this understanding of the human interrelationship with, and dependence upon, nature through the false promises of progress has resulted in inequity, genocide and ecocide on a massive scale (Kahn, 2010). This must be remembered and re-taught on the Land: Land is agentic in and of itself, and must do its work in teacher education instruction. As settlers learn how to understand themselves as interrelated with Land, place and with Indigenous peoples, Indigenous knowledges will play a strong role. Lumbee scholar Brian Brayboy and Emma Maughan (2009) assert that Indigenous knowledge systems are historical, complex, dynamic and powerful; these knowledge systems must be included in the 'academy' writ large, and certainly in teacher education. Doing this respectfully is, and will continue to be, a huge challenge.

Potawatomi scholar Robin Kimmerer (2013) writes beautifully about learning the Land; as a scientist and an Indigenous person learning her heritage language and epistemology positions, she describes herself as bilingual:

> When I am in the woods with my students, teaching them the gifts of plants and how to call Them by name, I try to be mindful of my language, to be bilingual between the lexicon of science and the grammar of animacy. (p. 56)

Kimmerer (2013) describes the 'grammar of animacy' that she has discovered in learning her language, Potawatomi, as a web of relations:

> Imagine seeing your grandmother standing at the stove in her apron and then saying of her, 'Look, it is making soup. It has gray hair.' We might snicker at such a mistake, but we also recoil from it. In English, we never refer to a member of our family, or indeed to any person, as *it.* That would be a profound act of disrespect. *It* robs a person of selfhood and kinship, reducing a person to a mere thing. So it is that in Potawatomi and most other indigenous languages, we use the same words to address the living world as we use for our family. Because they are our family. (p. 55, emphasis in original)

Kimmerer (2013) goes on to list some of the beings that are understood and named as animate in her language and in other Indigenous languages, including plants and animals, and rocks, mountains, water, fire, places, medicines, songs, drums and stories (pp. 55-56). She is careful to explain that her biology students must still learn scientific roles and Latin names while she is imparting the gifts of the plants, and invokes the writing of ecotheologian Thomas Berry: "we must say of the universe that it is a communion of subjects, not a collection of objects" (Berry, in Kimmerer, 2013, p. 56).

It is of great interest to me that in reading Cajete's treatise on the limits of the Western education system in its capacity to 'educate' Indigenous peoples, Thomas Berry was again invoked in a very different light:

> Many creative Western thinkers have embraced essentially Indigenous environmental education views and are vigorously appropriating Indigenous concepts to support the development of their alternative models. For example, cultural historian and philosopher Thomas Berry proposes a new context for education that essentially reinvents the roles and contexts inherent to Indigenous education:
>
> > The primary educator, as well as the primary law giver and the primary healer would be the natural world itself. The integral community would be a self-educating community within the context of a self-educating universe. Education at the human level would be the conscious sensitizing of humans to the profound communications made by the universe about us, by the sun, the moon, and the stars, the clouds, the rain, the contours of the earth and all its living forms. All music and poetry of the universe would flow into the student: the revelatory presence of the divine, as well as insight into the architectural structures of the continents and the engineering skills whereby the great hydrological cycle functions in moderating the temperature of the earth, in providing habitat for aquatic life, in nourishing the multitude of living creatures would be as natural to the educational process. The earth would also be our primary teacher of sciences, especially biological sciences, and of industry and economics. It would detach us a system in which we would create a minimum of entropy, a system in which there is no unusable or unfruitful junk.
> >
> > Only in such an integral system is the future viability of the humans assured. (Berry, T., 1987, p. 79)[12])

[12] Thomas Berry, The Viable Human, *Revision 9*, No.2, 1987, p. 79

> Berry's comments mirror contemporized exposition of the Indigenous education processes of Tribal societies. (Cajete, 1994, pp. 22-23)

For, while Berry is writing/thinking about connection with place/nature, and has inspired many people that I know and love, there is an uncomfortable sense that this perspective is somehow new. I struggle with this a great deal, and also in writing this dissertation.

I am inspired by and agree with many non-Indigenous writers and scholars as they advocate for, and write and teach about, the need to understand human interrelationship with and dependence on nature, and with place (many have been included in this dissertation). This is a profound violence and there is an absence when it is done without Indigenous peoples, knowledges, and languages, and in places where this has been known and practiced for thousands of years. This haunts me. When I see environmental and sustainability education, ecoliteracy, nature-deficit disorder, and the multitude of other 'greenings,' I feel deeply that when this is done without Indigenous knowledges or communities, then it cannot be a true or profound respectful connection with Land, with beings, with place.

This absence makes evident the axiology of the theorists and practitioners: we (the consumer) are being shown what information counts as knowledge, and what epistemologies and ontologies are worthy. I was told, when training to be a scholar, that we stand on the shoulders of giants – that we must be well-versed in the discourses that we are asking to be certified as experts in. How, then, can these discourses, and these scholars, claim expertise when there is so very much knowledge that has not been valued or acknowledged? This is a powerful example of Foucault's "regimes of truth" that are reified "through the manner in which particular knowledge was legitimated within a variety of power relationships within society" (Darder et al., 2009, p. 6).

At a small conference in my third year of PhD studies, I was witness to a prominent white scholar claiming a 'new' or 'groundbreaking' move in environmental thought: They announced

that their theoretical innovation was that rocks were animate – that they have agency and being. I though my head was going to explode. Many Indigenous peoples all over the world have held this to be true for thousands of years, and the scholar was claiming this as revolutionary. There were Indigenous scholars in the room. I challenged the scholar on the assertion that this was a conceptual innovation, citing the teachings of the Anishinaabe Elders at Trent regarding Land and Rock being the first order of creation, and that they were beings. I got what I interpreted as a condescending response. Afterwards, I was approached by several people and commended/warned about challenging a senior scholar. That had not even occurred to me; I was so outraged by the arrogance and ignorance of the epistemological claim[13].

In retrospect, I am very uncomfortable that I verbalized the Anishinaabe teachings I learned; these are not mine to teach, and I have assiduously declined to share them, since it is not my place as a settler. I have written about them a little bit in this work, to argue for their place and inclusion in scholarship related to Land, but asserting them in person felt different, and it was perhaps not my place. It is interesting to me that colleagues affirmed a power differential in that context that I did not feel: What power could this senior scholar have over me? I am not sure. This incident also echoes another of Foucault's assertions—power relationships are more dynamic and complex than the dichotomy of domination or powerlessness (Darder et al., 2009, p. 7), and this has positive implications for resistance. In this circumstance, was this resistance mine to enact?

There is a strong assertion by some Indigenous scholars and community members that Indigenous knowledge is not for non-Indigenous peoples; I have been hearing this since my early

[13] I noticed, in reading briefly about New Materialism as a discourse (Barad, 2007; Deleuze, & Guattari, 1987) that this same criticism has been levelled at this field. "What is new about new materialisms?" was the title of an interdisciplinary 2012 conference at Berkeley.

days at Trent, and I understand this. The long history of the abuse and appropriation of Indigenous knowledge the world over makes this a serious concern. Moreover, in the face of the diminishing availability of knowledge holders and Indigenous language speakers because of the colonizing forces, who should this knowledge be for? Should available resources and access to teachers be used for non-Indigenous learners? These powerful knowledges need to be respected and supported in their flourishing for this knowledge to continue to be as dynamic as the ecosystems and cultures that they emanate from. Place-study is vital for understanding how human and other species adapt to ecological and cultural changes on a planet in continual flux (Greenwood, 2013, p. 94). For me, learning from/with Indigenous peoples is, in part, a pragmatic consideration and an epistemological choice in learning the Land.

The Indigenous languages, lifeways and stories that emanate out of places are the most profound understandings of those places, constructed out of millennia of observation, pattern recognition, and experience. Additionally – these foundational understandings of places allow for and account for dynamic change – of ecosystems and of cultures. As humans come to understand and bear ever-more-violent implications of the damage that has been done to Earth, these understandings and ways of living with Land are more and more crucial. However, learning from and with Indigenous people must not be another colonization. I am not sure that my assertion that these knowledges must take their place as foundational and crucial understandings of Land is commensurate with the requirement that this be done respectfully, with affirmative and ongoing consent and consensus from each knowledge community. What then? I have no idea. And yet, these knowledges are crucial for justice, for Indigenous futurities, and for living well on the earth.

The discourse of Environmental Education (EE) is full of theorists who assert the need to recover/discover/forge/perceive the connections between humans and the more-than-human world (e.g., Cronon, 1996, Evernden, 1985; Livingston, 1983; Louv, 2008) – with the implicit assumption that everyone has lost the connection. This elides the simple truth that all people are, at all times, completely dependent upon and connected to nature, even though we may behave as if we are not. One can never be 'disconnected' from Land – it is in us (Kulchyski, 2005). As non-Indigenous scholar Haig-Brown (2009) writes:

> So what do I mean by Indigenous thought? Let's start with what it is not: not the naive and self-serving idea that anyone who digs their hands in the dirt has Indigenous knowledge. I am referring to the contemporary knowledge that arises from innumerable generations of people living in relation to a specific land and seeing it as the source of all their relations. And by land, I reach beyond any simple material notion to the spiritual, intellectual and emotional dimensions thereof. Land includes rivers and streams, air and wind as animate beings in our existence. Indigenous thought is founded in a deep understanding that we all live in relation to land. Whether we are city dwellers in profound denial or Aboriginal people drawing on old ways to regenerate new knowledge, we live in relation to land—we bundle up when the snow comes, we fuss when spring is late, we breathe deeply and restore our souls when the sun warms us into a new season. (p. 18)

Thus, it can be seen that environmental education (EE) has faced many of the challenges that are also faced by PBE and by decolonizing education – that is, that good environmental education must be critical, must be complex, must be contextualized to be useful, or else it runs the risk of serving the very institutions and indoctrinations that it may seek to challenge (Bell, 1997; Russell, 1999).

There has been recent work calling for the need to decolonize EE, and to center Indigenous scholars and epistemologies in EE (see Lowan/Lowan-Trudeau, 2010, 2011, 2012;

O'Riley & Cole, 2009; Root, 2010). As mentioned earlier, Korteweg & Russell's (2012) special issue of the *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* was concerned in particular with the ways that EE must be Indigenized. In an increasingly globalized world, and in light of the widespread migration around the planet, what is it to be place-connected? How can cPBE, with Indigenous knowledge at the centre, shift or even displace EE to support the right relation that is necessary for healthy futures for beings on Earth?

Being place-connected is different from being Indigenous to a place – the differences lie in the contentious and political fields of individual and communal land rights, and of individual and communal identity, of socio-historical location and materialisms. Indigeneity is bound up with relationship to place as dictated through ideology, cosmology, *and* through the specification of individual and communal rights of land use, and status (in Canada) (Bang et al., 2014; Cajete, 1994; Coulthard, 2014; Marker, 2000). I think that being *critically* place-connected as a settler requires consciously, actively respecting the knowledge of the Indigenous peoples of that place, because being Indigenous to a place means belonging to a cultural community where the practices, languages and worldview of that people have grown out of that place – the Land has informed the culture of that place in a way that it would be wise to listen to. This seems only logical; it is pragmatic at a fundamental level to learn from peoples who have inhabited that land for millennia.

While in Inukjuak, Quebec in the winter of 2017 as I write this, I am learning the land in Nunavik. The other day, I learned the Inuktitut word for 'west', here[14]: *niggiq* is the word. I was carefully told, though, that what this word indicates is 'where the sea is'—*niggiq* will change according to where I am in the territory (Inuit knowledge holders Jobie Epoo, Jobie Kutchaka,

---

[14] Inuktitut has many (place-specific) dialects.

Charlie Nowkawalk & Sala Padlayat, personal communication, February 16th, 2017). In Salluit, on the north coast of Nunavik, *niggiq* will always be to the north. Here, it is fundamentally important to know where the sea is for survival, for navigation, for food; *niggiq* is the fixed point for conceptual understanding of place. This is a powerful example of how Indigenous knowledge of place is seated in language, is territorially and culturally specific, and is fundamental to living well (or at all), on the Land in a particular territory.

Learning the Land in a way that ignores the reciprocal relationship that the Land has with the Indigenous peoples of that Land means a violence to the human history of the place; both in terms of the impact the humans have had on the place, and the impact the place has had on the humans. While the Place theorists and many outdoor and environmental educators account for this reciprocity, they still seem to largely ignore Indigenous histories and territories. From a settler standpoint, ignoring the Indigenous history of the places that are important to me in Ontario would also mean a denial of my own complicity in the continuing oppression and colonization of Indigenous people. Decolonizing my own perceptions of place, and my practice as a teacher of/in places, means valuing the Indigenous history, peoples and knowledge born of that place, and acting accordingly. Going forward, I hope this means participating in active restitution to Indigenous peoples and communities (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005). In this way, I may be able to inhabit these places in a way that respects land and people and fosters reconciliation between the peoples and the lands of Canada. "To have a sense of place is not to own but rather to be owned by the places we inhabit; it is to 'own up' to the complexity and mutuality of both place and human being" (Malpas, p. 2009). (I think that the 'we' that Malpas writes of is humans, writ large, but I am perennially uncomfortable with writing that seeks to essentialize in this way.)

Learning Land is central to learning Indigenous education in teacher education; as Land is the foundation of Indigenous epistemologies, languages, and traditional economies, it is also at the heart of the violent historical and ongoing oppression of Indigenous peoples in Canada. For Canadians to move forward in supporting Indigenous futurities means understanding how all Canadians are implicated in these oppressions and in this reordering of our relationships to Lands and to peoples. These relational understandings and processes require decolonization.

Decolonization? The term decolonization seemed to be joining the ranks of words that were originally revolutionary, but then lost meaning and power from over- and ill-use. Recently, it is regaining traction. Decolonization must be understood as a concept and a process that is central to the fields of a critical pedagogy of place, Land education, and Indigenous education. In this section, I will explore the meanings and uses of the term as they relate to Indigenous education in teacher education in Canada.

In Indigenous education in teacher education, and indeed, in the discourse of Education, *colonization* must be understood as a central organizing principle.

> By colonization I refer to: a) the historical practice from the colonial era through the present of dominating other people's homelands and territory, and other people's bodies and minds, for the production of privilege maintained by military, political, and economic power, and; b) other assimilative cultural patterns (e.g., schooling or consumerism) that over-determine or restrict possibilities for people and the places where they live. (Greenwood, 2014, p. 8)

What is very clear from the writings of the Place philosophers, environmental theorists and educators, geographers, and from the absence of knowledge of the pre-service teachers in my classes regarding Indigenous territories and communities, is that colonization was not a discrete action or a finite series of events; it is an ongoing process. Colonization is a term for the political,

economic, social, and cultural oppression of one people by another: “In the Arctic, colonial power can be identified with any process that ‘totalizes’, working to reshape Indigenous peoples and their lands so that they will come to embody and reflect the colonized” (Kulchyski, 2005, p. 17).

Colonialism also refers to the practice or process by which European rule was expanded globally over many hundreds of years. “Colonialist discourse implicitly justifies this process, while Eurocentric discourse “normalizes” the hierarchical power relations generated by colonialism” (Shohat & Stam, 1994, p. 2). Eurocentrism is the concept that: “The residual traces of axiomatic European domination inform the general culture, the everyday language, and the media, engendering a fictitious sense of the innate superiority of European-derived cultures and peoples” (Shohat & Stam 1994, p. 1). Within the Eurocentric, colonial belief-system, society has progressed along a “linear historical trajectory” (Shohat & Stam, 1994, p. 2). This progression began in classical Greece, and evolved through the succession of the empires of Rome, Spain, Britain, and the United States, and through the economic systems of subsistence, feudalism, and the current model of industrial capitalism.

Four major theorists in the discursive resistance to Eurocentric colonialism are Fanon (1967), Memmi (1991, 2006), Said (1978), and Spivak (1993). In researching the term *decolonizing*, I came across several permutations of this idea/practice. Other terms that have similar connotations are anti-colonialism (Fanon, 1967) and post-colonialism (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin,2003; Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1990). Said often uses the term imperialism interchangeably with colonialism. While colonialism and imperialism have different functional definitions—colonialism implies control of a colony by oppressive communities that live in the colony, and imperialism exercises authority without the same landed presence through

diplomacy or military force—the oppression that these systems exercise is similar in ideology. The roots of the decolonizing discourse address these oppressions in the context of Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. Fanon's message is that a major danger of anti-colonialism is essentialism, but that it is both necessary in terms of sheer numbers, and in terms of the shared experience of colonialism, and that it is insufficient, in terms of the eliding of complexity that is an oppressive tool of colonialism. Said, like Fanon before him, problematizes essentialism as a method of resistance, in that resisting or attacking Eurocentrism can sometimes still place it at the centre of the fight. Said calls instead for an acknowledgment of the interrelated histories and cultures of imperialism and colonialism, and for the space for complexity in cultural identity. Spivak warns against the potential for creating a once-again monolithic discourse of post-colonialism through the overemphasis on certain subalterns (oppressed peoples) that might have more access or privilege in getting heard… she emphasizes the importance of the perception of people as historical agents with many dynamic elements to their identity. What is monolithic, Kulchyski writes, is the continuing structural support of colonization:

> In the north the power is institutionally supported by a trajectory of policies; no single overriding policy or plan says modernization and assimilation are the ultimate destination. Rather, the presuppositions of a whole set of institutional plans and practices in the areas of education, health care, housing, infrastructure, justice, family services, economic development, and all the rest work relentlessly to underwrite the continuing conquest. (2005, p. 4)

Can this continuing colonization be interrupted through attention to Land in a critical pedagogy of place? The feedback in my classes, and the increasing attention being paid to Land and Place in universities and in K-12 classrooms in Canada would suggest that there is an increasing awareness that it might be.

Battiste (1998) and Calderon (2014) call for decolonization as a necessary process in

education for justice, for Land, and for Indigenous communities. L. Simpson (2011) writes: "Canada must engage in a decolonization project and a re-education project that would enable its government and its citizens to engage with Indigenous Peoples in a just and honourable way in the future" (p. 22). cPBE is predicated on the understanding that what is necessary for the well-being of people and of planet is connection to Earth – reinhabitation (Gruenewald, 2003). Without a centering of the understanding that many of the places being reinhabited are Indigenous territories that have been violently assaulted and stolen by colonial practices, cPBE, and by extension this teacher education, may serve to repeat these assaults in service of the settler colonial aim – to lay claim to Indigenous territories from a position of right or moral authority (*terra nullius* continues), and to erase/incorporate Indigenous bodies into the new societies. As Malpas (2009) writes, "is it really the case that the assertion of our connection *to* place is merely another way of asserting control *over* place?" (p. 4, emphasis in original). This is a serious concern, and one that again invokes Tuck and Yang's (2012) "move to settler innocence". If settlers claim decolonization in theory or practice, might this be, like acknowledging whiteness, a version of Probyn's (2006) *good white*, where the settler/oppressor is the colonizer – the very thing we are but do not want to be? Sometimes? Often? Again: my hope and intention is that this is not the case; that decolonization, even by settlers, can be a "process of cultural and historical liberation; an act of confrontation with a dominant system of thought" (hooks, 1992, p. 1).

In another site of potential "moves to settler innocence" (Tuck and Yang, 2012), re-inhabitation, one of Gruenewald's twin goals of a critical pedagogy of place (2003), must not be another colonization. The second of Gruenewald's twin goals of a critical pedagogy of place is

decolonization; early in his 2003 piece, he cites bell hooks and qualifies decolonization as cultural, which makes sense in the context of the discourse kinships he cites:

> Decolonization involves learning to recognize disruption and injury and to address their causes. From an educational perspective it means unlearning much of what dominant culture and schooling teachers, and learning more socially just and ecologically sustainable ways of being in the world. (p. 9)

Gruenewald goes on to include Bowers' (2001) argument that decolonization also depends on "recovering and renewing traditional, non-commodified cultural patterns such as mentoring and intergenerational relationships" (2003, p. 9).

Calderon (2014) characterizes this move of Gruenewald's, that is, centering decolonization, as a "step in the right direction" (p. 26). In my own writing, I have suggested adding reconciliation to these twin poles (Scully, 2012). Another caution here, though: in the popular CBC radio program *Canada Reads 2013*, Anishinaabe media personality (now politician) and advocate Wab Kinew stated that "reconciliation must not be another attempt at assimilation"; as with reinhabitation, this must not be another "move to settler innocence" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 1), where the gesture does not follow through into action/justice, but is merely performative. L. Simpson (2011) calls attention to the danger of a narrow interpretation of the term reconciliation leading to a perception of a one-time transaction (paying survivors of the Residential School system) that will "level the playing field" (p. 22). Over the last few years, I have grown increasingly uncomfortable with the term reconciliation and the industry that has grown up around it. Reconciliation may be for settlers; it is about accountability, truth, and implication in ongoing structural oppressions. For sovereign Indigenous futurities, terms like restitution, resurgence, and rematriation may ring truer.

Colonialism and its institutions continue to affect the lives of all Canadians, albeit differently, on these Indigenous territories that are now Canada. Reconciliation must include decolonization, and means contending with ongoing settler colonial structural oppressions in support of a better future for Indigenous peoples. Reconciliation, as a concept/term/framework, is falling increasingly out of favour with Indigenous advocates and scholars, falling squarely into Tuck & Yang's (2012) "moves to innocence". Anishinaabe writer and comedian Ryan McMahon has initiated a series entitled *Wreck-on Silly Nation* (n. d.) in response to the inefficacies of the policies and announcements intended to perform reconciliation by the current Canadian government. In 2017, the year of Canada 150, it seems that the glaring inequities in Canadian policy and practice regarding, in particular, the funding for, and care of Indigenous children in care are harder to live with in the light of the frequent and seemingly empty announcements meant to show Canada's commitment to reconciliation.

In Donald's (2009) concept of Indigenous Métissage, one of the main challenges of decolonization is to "contest the assumption that the historical experiences and perspectives of Aboriginal peoples in Canada are their own separated cultural preoccupations" (p. 6). The history of Canada is the history of the forging of relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in and with the Land of what is now called Canada. In non-Indigenous scholar FitzMaurice's (2010) words:

> To paraphrase Elder Jim Dumont, it is a core value stemming from the Anishinaabe creation story that the Aboriginal self and the white Other are so inextricably intertwined that they are almost the same, connected by the spirit, and of the same mother, the Earth. Moreover, it is a relationship that needs ongoing attention and care as it changes over time, in perpetuity…. Indigenous knowledge suggests more than a world of coherent and separate identities based in fear and competing power. Rather, it offers the possibility of a theoretical, spiritual, and experiential understanding of interconnectivity,

> interdependence, and community within a view of power that is based in collectivity and spirit rather than being entirely about force. (pp. 362-363)

Critical Place-based education offers a critical perspective and a set of pedagogical practices that have been used with success in my own practice in changing what non-Indigenous Canadians 'know' about Indigenous nations, peoples and resurgence in Canada; this research investigates whether the same is happening in other faculties of education in Canada, and what it looks like for the instructors who are doing this work. Ray Barnhardt, of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, has undertaken a long-term project (almost 20 years), most of these in partnership with Yup'ik Elder Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley, addressing the importance of cPBE in Indigenous education in Alaska: *Creating a Place for Indigenous Knowledge in Education: The Alaska Native Knowledge Network* (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005). According to my searches on the ERIC education database, Google Scholar and CBCA, no empirical study has been undertaken in Canada to explore cPBE practices in diverse Canadian teacher education contexts. Certainly, colonization and decolonization are topics that seem to have permeated critical education discourses over the last few years, and are even being heard in political speeches and statements from the current Canadian government. It remains to be seen how decolonization can be enacted in education, and in Canada writ large.

Indigenous Education in Teacher Education in Canada

Indigenous peoples in Canada are the original inhabitants of this land, and they are founding peoples of the nation of Canada. Education is a guaranteed treaty right in the letter and the spirit of the original nation-to-nation agreements between the British Crown and the Indigenous signatories; these rights are enshrined in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, the British North America Act of 1867, the Indian Act of 1876, and the Constitution Act of 1982

(Henderson, 1995). The major educational systems in Canada perpetuate a lack of acknowledgement of Indigenous history and of current realities while continuing to exclude and marginalize Indigenous learners (Godlewska, Moore & Bednasek, 2010). The failings of Canadian education systems are becoming more evident as the Indigenous population rapidly expands.

In the context of Ontario, according to the Ontario Ministry of Education [OME] (2013) publication concerning Aboriginal Education, *A Solid Foundation,* Statistics Canada's 2011 National Household Survey identified that there are 78,000 school-aged Indigenous peoples (ages 5-19) in Ontario. Approximately 14,000 of those live on reserve and attend First Nations schools (federally funded), so about 64,000 Aboriginal students are attending provincially funded elementary and secondary schools in Ontario, only 44% of whom have self-identified as Aboriginal (OMOE, 2013, p. 11). Sixty to 80% of Aboriginal youth leave secondary school without graduating (Haig-Brown & Mohawk scholar John Hodson, 2009).

In the People for Education (2013) report on Aboriginal education in Ontario entitled *First Nation, Métis and Inuit Education: Overcoming the gaps in provincially funded schools*, the introduction to the recommendation section reads as follows: "Education is crucial for the future of First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities; just as education about contemporary Aboriginal issues and the history of colonialism is vital to all Canadians" (p. 13). The report goes on to express some key recommendations, including that

> all Ontario educators receive high quality professional development to support them in understanding and teaching about the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians; and that the province include a mandatory Aboriginal education unit in the newly expanded bachelor of Education program. (p. 13)

Other recommendations include working with Indigenous organizations around the co-creation of educational goals, boards providing educational and social supports to Indigenous students, and teacher education that develops pre-service teacher competency to teach Indigenous students effectively in ways that respect their histories, cultures, territories and complex contemporary contexts. This education is vitally needed, for the well-being of Indigenous learners and to address the knowledge gap that currently exists about Indigenous peoples and history in Canada. Currently, this education happens only minimally in faculties of Education across Canada, although this is changing quickly: furthermore, little is known about how instructors approach their teaching, how many use a critical place-based approach or how they see this approach, or how receptive their students are to this pedagogy. These are serious gaps.

In Canada, Indigenous education in teacher education must in part be about redressing 400 years of violence and oppression that continues to be perpetrated upon Indigenous peoples and communities in the name of settler colonialism. Indigenous pedagogies and perspectives are of inherent and enormous value not only in the resistance they offer to colonizing history, practices and perspectives, but first and foremost as holistic and sovereign epistemologies. The contributions of Indigenous peoples to governance, technology, knowledge and economy and to the creation and defense of the Canadian state are legion, and must be recognized and celebrated. In my experience, and as reflected and expressed by some of the community of practitioners in this field, the considerable challenges of this field include contending with whiteness (Madden, 2014; Schick, 2000; Tompkins 2002), and unsettling, revealing and recovering Canadians' existing citizenship implications related to Land and to Indigenous peoples (Alfred, 1999; Chickasaw/Cheyenne James (Sakej) Youngblood Henderson, 1995; Scully, 2012, 2015). Critical

Place-based Indigenous education, with decolonization and Land at the centre, can support the intercultural and territorial awareness of pre-service teachers, and in this way change education to serve a just future for Indigenous peoples in Canada.

Resistance: Uncommon Canadian knowledge. Non-Indigenous teachers and teacher educators need to decolonize their own perspectives and practices in order to transform Indigenous education in Canada for increased success by Indigenous learners, justice for Indigenous peoples, and greater cross-cultural understanding by non-Indigenous learners (Den Heyer, 2009; Dion, 2009; Godlewska et. al., 2010; Haig Brown & Hodson, 2009; Kanu, 2005; Schick, 2000; St. Denis, 2007; Tompkins, 2002; Tupper, 2012, 2013). Common across all of these authors' work is the documentation of resistance on the part of teacher-candidates to examining or changing their own perspectives and practices, and the insistence that either there is no problem, or that inclusion of Indigenous materials or perspectives connotes a privileging of Indigenous cultures over the other cultures represented in the classroom. Teacher educators also encounter frustration amongst their students at the lack of 'practical' solutions to address the problem: In all of the classes I have taught, I have heard, at least initially, that they 'cannot' incorporate Indigenous perspectives and pedagogies into their teaching, because there are no resources or references to help them do so, and their lack of familiarity with the material will mean their attempts may be racist/disrespectful. As mentioned earlier, Dion (2007, 2009) calls this phenomenon the *perfect stranger* stance. 'I do not know, therefore I cannot know' is a simple way of explaining this concept. Higgins, Madden & Korteweg (2013) explore this stance further in their study of white teachers.

Reading these articles was very affirming; as I have recounted, I have encountered these resistances in the classes that I have taught. The perception that Indigenous history in Canada is somehow discrete from settler history is evident here (Donald, 2009). There is also the problem of managing ‘competing marginalities’ (Sefa Dei, 2005); many of my students felt that they were more likely to encounter non-Indigenous students from cultural communities that were not Euro-derived, and that these largely ‘immigrant’ learners were somehow more important to learn about – this was central to their perception that *EDUC 4416* was privileged as a mandatory course over *Multicultural Education*, and should not have been. Certainly, in some of the contexts that these pre-service teachers will work in, there may be a large proportion of recent immigrant learners in their classrooms. Relating to these students with grace requires teachers who understand personal location, and who enact culturally responsive pedagogies (Carson et al., 2009). This job is especially crucial as these classrooms are shaping Canadian citizenship and communities.

I encounter little understanding of the different relationship that the Canadian government, and by extension Canada’s citizens, have with Indigenous peoples versus with settlers or with immigrants, in the context of education. This relationship is described by Henderson (1995): “The prerogative Treaties are sacred documents to First Nations because they empower the older values of Aboriginal society and because they are a sacred vision of the future of the first people among multicultural immigrants” (p. 246). The early European migrant workers and immigrants – the Voyageurs, trappers, whalers and settlers – learned to live, travel, and harvest from the Indigenous peoples here; these early relationships predate Canada and enabled its eventual founding. The root of what it is to be Indigenous from an epistemological and from a legal perspective is the Land (Cajete, 2009; Coulthard, 2014; Deloria Jr., 1994; Donald, 2009, Kulchyski, 2013). These rights are certainly older than Canada; in the Canadian

context they are held in the very first agreements between the European explorers and the First Nations such as the Two-Row Wampum, and the Peace and Friendship Treaties (Henderson, 1995). They are supported in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, the Treaty of Niagara of 1764, in the oral testimony and the written and wampum records of the Treaties, in the Constitution Act of 1982, and in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Henderson, 1995; Manuel & Derrickson, 2017; Palmater, 2012). The nation of Canada has been built on this relationship; all Canadians are implicated in this dynamic. However, this fundamental is not well understood by Canadians.

Two thousand and fourteen marked the 250th anniversary of one of the founding constitutional Treaties and events that helped form the country of Canada – The Treaty of Niagara, part of the Silver Covenant Chain Treaties. Although the Royal Proclamation of 1763 is often invoked as the founding constitutional document of Canada – issued by King George after the British won the Seven-Years War – it was the meeting and agreements the next year in Niagara that led to the peace and to consensus on territorial boundaries and understandings between the British and the 24 nations that were signatories to the treaty. The Treaty of Niagara was signed by the British Crown and by the Six Nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, the Wyandot, Menominee, Algonquin, Nipissing, Ojibwa, Mississauga, and Chippewa, all member nations of the Western Great Lakes Confederacy. This was a great gathering: there were 2000 people in attendance, and this was an important affirmation and acknowledgement of the fundamental importance of the necessity of a good relationship between the First Nations and the British Crown in the territory that would become Canada (Brian Charles, Chippewas of Georgina Island band member, personal communication, February 26th, 2014).

This should be Canadian common knowledge, particularly in the territories of the nations that participated. Education for just citizenship in Canada should include this and many other understandings regarding First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples as founding peoples of Canada; moving forward, I hope it can. Critical, territorially and culturally specific PBE offers this and practices to break down teacher-candidate resistances. As is often invoked in the context of the methodological field of Self-Study, the 'how' of teaching is easily as important as the 'what' (T. Russell, 2006). Many education theorists from Freire (1970) to the PBE scholars cited earlier agree that it is of vital importance to relate classroom learning to the lifeworld of the student. As PBE theorists would have it, constructivism works

> from the premise that the learner's basis of meaning is found in her or his direct experience with a dynamic and responsive world.… with this conception of cognition, knowing does not reside in the brain.… the biological body is not a structure through which one learns, but a structure that learns.… hence, a main concern of teaching is the provision of rich activities that might be interpreted… Complex theories of learning suggest that learning is not about acquiring or accumulating information. Rather, learning is principally a matter of keeping pace with one's evolving circumstances. The learning agent – whether immune system, person, collective, culture or species – is possibilities. Knowledge is contingent, contextual, and evolving; never absolute, universal or fixed. (Davis, Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 2000, p. 66)

While Indigenous education in teacher education can be very unsettling, and can produce great resistance within teacher candidates, connecting the learners to the 'new' understandings through the relationships that they already hold with place can be a generative and productive practice. This emphasis on relationships as a core practice of education for empowered citizenship, including "moments of beauty and enjoyment out in the world" (Darder et al., 2009, p. 4), was a central tenet of the education philosophy proffered by prominent educational

philosopher Maxime Greene (1988). Without repeatable and relatable experience, decontextualized information has little meaning or relevance to the learner. It is the very decontextualization of learning and of information about Indigenous peoples and about Land that supports the fallacy that all Canadians are not implicated in the unjust conditions and exploitation of both.

Our first assignment in the *Native Studies 101* class at Trent was called the Homelands Assignment. In it, we were to identify the treaty region and the traditional territory of the place we called 'home'. I took this class in 1996 – I use a variation on this assignment in my classes to this day. I did poorly on the assignment in that class: I knew very little about the treaty territories and about the Indigenous history of the place that I chose, which was my family's cottage in Muskoka, in Anishinaabe territory. That history is not easy to find; it has been obscured (*terra nullius*) in written and oral history of the place by settler and cottager 'history'. Doing poorly on the assignment showed me how much I had to learn about the place that I characterize as being the most important place in the world to me.

I still use this assignment: I call it the 'Local Assignment'. This assignment is, in my experience, an extremely simple and effective way of revealing a very simple but purposefully obscured truth – all of Canada is Indigenous territories. The shift in perspective that this simple and revealing assignment produces in my students shows the power in both learning that is connected to a student's own experience, in this case of a particular community, and in learning to see that place from a different view. This new understanding of the 'common ground' of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada is the beginning of a new understanding of citizenship. I do not place a high overall assessment value on this assignment, as it is a challenging one for most pre-service teachers; the value lies in the unsettling of their

perspectives. This opening move that I learned from Crystal Whetung in 1996 at Trent University can be seen as cPBE. This assignment resists Canadian 'common knowledge' by investigating Treaty and territory information and uncovering the relationships that the teacher candidates are already a part of, living on Indigenous territories.

Increasingly, theorists in PBE such as Chambers (2006), Greenwood (2009) and Somerville (2007) are calling for a centering of Indigenous perspectives and knowledge of place for the purposes of living in a more socially and ecologically conscious manner. Indigenous scholars such as Battiste (2000) and Donald (2009) are calling for local cPBE as the best way to learn about and from Indigenous peoples and places in the interests of social and ecological justice. My own experience as a learner and as an instructor in Outdoor and in Indigenous education has shown this to be a powerful pedagogical practice. Centering Indigenous knowledge, and learning from local Indigenous communities, can serve a few interrelated aims: Justice, respect and revitalization for Indigenous peoples and communities, more informed and authentic citizenship of non-Indigenous Canadians, and deeper advocacy for, and understanding of, the Land. These aims are implied in the term *right relation*, explained earlier. Critical PBE can help to 'ground' the unsettling experience of decolonization.

More on decolonization. In the last 30 years, Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars in Australia and New Zealand, North America, and in Canada have taken up the decolonizing discourse. Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999, 2005) is one of the foremost Indigenous scholars in Indigenous Education and research methodologies. If, as Smith would position it, Indigenist research is the tool with the most potential in reclaiming and reshaping the representation of Indigenous peoples to one of respect, complexity and power, then education is

the tool of transmission of that representation. Both tools have been used as instruments of oppression and epistemic violence by colonialism and imperialism, and both have great potential in transforming power relations for and by Indigenous peoples and in changing what constitutes 'knowledge' and who controls it.

Battiste (1998, 2000) has written extensively on the cognitive imperialism that colonialism has enacted both upon Indigenous peoples and on non-Indigenous peoples. Battiste's writings emphasize the importance of language renewal as a crucial element of Indigenous education in support of self-determination and cultural transmission for Indigenous peoples. She also consistently problematizes the many sites of Euronormative colonialism that remain explicit and hidden in the education system available to Indigenous and non-Indigenous learners. It is widely reported that most non-Indigenous Canadian teacher candidates lack knowledge of Indigenous history – most notably the many sites of resistance to colonial oppression and assertions of Indigenous sovereignty – and of contemporary communities and Indigenous resurgence (see den Heyer, 2009; Dion, 2009; Higgins et al., 2013; Kanu, 2005; St. Denis, 2007; Tompkins, 2002; Tupper & Capello, 2008). This lack of knowledge is then perpetuated in Canadian students (Schick & St. Denis, 2003), and is particularly harmful to Indigenous learners.

Land knowledge, language, and the health of Indigenous peoples have been violently disrupted through colonialism in Canada, and through the use of education as a violent tool of colonialism. Reasserting, recovering and rebuilding these relationships and competencies are crucial to Indigenous resurgence and well-being. Education, and teacher education in particular, must be re-shaped to support these aims.

This is not, however, the only important goal. Dion (2009) writes:

> Justifiably, the focus of the work by parents, activists, teachers and curriculum planners has been on education by and for First Nations students. Although that work is critical

> and demands our continued attention and support, it is also important to question what non-First Nations students are taught about the First Nations and to investigate the challenges teachers confront in teaching this subject material. (p. 8)

Increasingly, teacher education programs across Canada are requiring instruction in Indigenous education, as recommended in the People for Education (2013) report. For example, The University of British Columbia has a required Aboriginal education class for all Bachelor of Education students as of 2012; as previously explained, Lakehead University has had a mandatory course since 2007 (*EDUC 4416*). More faculties of education are also requiring further integration of Indigenous perspectives into course content and pedagogy to align with federal and provincial policies, such as the *Ontario First Nation, Métis and Inuit Policy Framework* (OME, 2007), a non-binding policy framework.

As faculties of education respond to these challenges, it is crucial that teacher educators learn how to do this work well. As argued earlier in the place-based education section, theories of education highlight the importance of drawing upon the past and current experiences and knowledges of learners – in this case teacher candidates. Applying this theory to Indigenous education in teacher education is crucial: "Theoretical and conceptual notions about diversity and difference are ineffectual unless they translate into real-world practice in today's classrooms and unless they are grounded in the lived experience of beginning teachers" (Carson et al., 2009, p. 3). Learning from and about local Indigenous peoples and communities is part of regenerating the fundamental understanding that people are dependent upon natural processes, and are implicated in relation to human and ecological communities. We do not know, however, to what extent this is being done in faculties of education, or what all of the challenges educators doing this work face.

Indigenous education can be a practice of social justice in that the perceptions, beliefs and attitudes of non-Indigenous teachers and learners towards Indigenous peoples can be transformed through education, and the education system can serve Indigenous learners according to a new, Indigenous determination of what constitutes educational 'success' (Battiste, 1998; Cherubini, Kitchen & Hodson, 2008; Donald, 2009; Quechua scholar Sandy Grande 2015; Kanu, 2005; L.T. Smith, 2005). Both of these purposes can be effected through the provision of accurate information about Indigenous history and issues in Canada, collaboration with local Indigenous communities and community members, and the transformation of curriculum through the prioritizing of Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in the education system, and in faculties of education (Battiste, 1998; den Heyer, 2009; Donald, 2009; Kanu, 2005). All of these practices require decolonization – of pedagogy, of content, and of the teachers and learners themselves.

Decolonization is a term and a process that is central to Indigenous education, to PBE, and to just Canadian citizenship. There has been a great deal written about decolonization over the last 50 years; most recently, there have been exciting and challenging developments in this discourse from Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars in Canada and in the US. What is common across these developments is the centering of relationship to Land in the decolonizing discourse: Land as first teacher (Cajete, 2004; Deloria Jr., 1994; Scully, 2012; Styres et al., 2013; Tuck et al, 2014), territorial and cultural specificity in respectful Indigenous education (Battiste, 1998; Calderon, 2014; Marker, 2000, 2006; Scully, 2012), and the role of Land in settler colonialism as distinct from other forms of colonialism (Hinckson, 2012; Tuck & Yang, 2012).

What distinguishes colonialism from settler colonialism is that the former relied on the extraction of resources (including people) from colonized places for the economic benefit of the home state (what Veracini [2011]) called exogenous domination), whereas the latter also relied

on the erasure of Indigenous nations, peoples and lifeways to secure access to Land that was, and continues to be, Indigenous territories. Tuck et al. (2014) conjecture that settler colonialism has been theorized for around two decades in the field of settler colonial studies (p. 6). In broad strokes, the distinguishing factor between these fields, that is, colonialism vs. settler colonialism, is that colonialism was/is predicated on a need for labour – slavery – whereas settler colonialism demands space/land.

Indigenous education in initial teacher education is anti-oppression education – as such, it can be incredibly disruptive and unsettling. And it should be. By starting with the place-connection that each pre-service teacher brings to the classroom, and by connecting to the place/Land where we are learning through the "provision of rich activities that might be interpreted" (Davis et al., 2000, p. 66), pre-service teachers can come to the understanding that all Canadians are implicated in relation to Indigenous peoples and territories; again, we are always already in relation. Tuck and Yang write:

> Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity….Settler colonialism, and its decolonization, implicates and unsettles everyone. (2012, p. 7)

Tuck and Yang (2012) have, however, asserted that a significant danger inherent in cPBE is that it may serve to "rescue settler futurity" (p. 3). Tuck and Mackenzie (2014) write

> Any form of place or space theory that seeks to recuperate and not interrupt settler colonialism, to reform the settlement and incorporate Indigenous peoples into the multicultural settler colonial state, is invested in settler futurity. In contrast, Indigenous futurity forecloses settler colonialism and settler epistemologies. This does not mean that Indigenous futurity forecloses living on Indigenous lands by non-Indigenous peoples.

> That is to say that Indigenous futurity does not require the erasure of now-settlers in the way that settler futurity requires of Indigenous peoples. (p. 70)

To be clear: I am a settler, and I am passionately committed to living on this Anishinaabe Land – in my own future here. Being committed to decolonization does not preclude a future where settlers live on Indigenous territories, at least I hope it does not. It is perhaps easier for me to be fierce about rematriation[15] in part because I do not own property. Secwepemc advocate, activist and scholar Arthur Manuel responded to this question, also posed to him by settlers, of what was to be done, and how 'we' would live together afterwards in this way:

> I tell them the answer is simple. Canada needs to fully recognize our Aboriginal and treaty rights and our absolute right to self-determination. At the same time, we will recognize the fundamental human right of Canadians, after hundreds of years of settlement, to live here. Then we can sit down and negotiate a way that Canadians and Indigenous peoples can live on this vast shared land in a way that allows for prosperity for both societies and protects our environment for all of the generations to come. (in Manuel & Derrickson, 2017, p. 146).

Baldwin (2012) explains the need to address settler futurity in this way: "any politics seeking to challenge Whitenesses and their hold on racist social imaginaries may benefit by analysing how the future is invoked in articulations of White identity and how such future-oriented articulations shape geographies of all kinds" (p. 172). Baldwin's assertion here is that this learning – about whiteness, about colonization – must not be merely in service of reifying these power relations, but with a veneer of acknowledgement that permits continuing with the status quo – the

[15] I first heard the term "rematriation" used by Dr. Eve Tuck at a conference presentation in Ottawa (CSSE 2015), and have since seen it proliferate in Indigenous scholarship. I understand it in this way: "The Indigenous concept of Rematriation refers to reclaiming of ancestral remains, spirituality, culture, knowledge and resources, instead of the more Patriarchally associated Repatriation. It simply means back to Mother Earth, a return to our origins, to life and co-creation, rather than Patriarchal destruction and colonisation, a reclamation of germination." http://www.gift-economy.com/articlesAndEssays/rematriation.pdf

continuation of the privileging of settler claims to ‘natural resources’ (Indigenous territories and relations) and the inhabitation and proceeds from exploiting these Lands.

Indeed, this danger can be easily extended to both Indigenous and Environmental education (EE) – both, happily, trending in teacher education currently – these educations must be critical, must be complex, to be emancipatory. There is a danger that uncritical PBE, just calling something ‘decolonizing’, or insufficiently respectful/accurate/unsettling Indigenous education in teacher education, merely serves as what Sweincicky (2006) calls *The Rhetoric of Awareness Narratives* – it reinscribes settler claim, both moral and embodied, to Indigenous territories. A prime example of this is the increasing incidence of Land Acknowledgements—where proceedings, gatherings, etc. are preceded by a verbal acknowledgment of the Indigenous peoples and territories, and perhaps Treaties and/or specific or comprehensive land claims that pertain to the Land on which the acknowledgment is occurring. Is an acknowledgment more of a slap in the face to those communities? As in: ‘We know whose Land we are on, and that is the extent of our interest/action?’ Perhaps. And, I share Haig-Brown’s (2009) assertion that for some this is an important step.

Decolonization is not a metaphor (Tuck & Yang, 2012), it is a process that addresses the profound oppression and inequity that continues in the colonialist Canadian institutions of governance, of social services, and of education, and must address the rematriation of Indigenous land and resources. It is not enough to just name whose traditional territory one is on, to then feel good about being enlightened, and not to challenge ongoing colonialism and oppression. To refer again to Davis et al. (2000), who write about teaching and learning, the *interpretation* part of the provision of rich activities must be emphasized in effective pedagogy to do a good job of troubling simplistic generalizations of complex issues. That settler colonialism is ongoing, and

that non-Indigenous Canadians are implicated in these processes is often met with rejection and incredulity by settlers. As with many facets of Western epistemology, these are seen as events/structures that are situated in time, in the distant past (Deloria Jr., 1994; Veracini, 2011); Columbus, the administrators of the Residential Schools, Duncan Campbell Scott – these were the perpetrators of colonialism, not 'we'. Marker (2006) describes this trend: "racism towards Indian Other is unlike any other repressed minority, and is based on the long-held insecurity of the settler" (p. 485). As settler Canadians situate themselves in relation to place without acknowledging and respecting Indigenous territories and communities, this insecurity, manifested as claims to *terra nullius*, results in ongoing violent erasure.

Two other beliefs that I regularly encounter in my teaching that have been recorded in the works of Tuck & Yang (2012) and of Dion (2009), among others, are: Indigenous peoples in Canada were either a conquered people or disappeared through the 'natural' order of things – they were absorbed or died out as a result of inferiority – of culture, of capability, of resistance to natural 'progress'. This is related to the concepts of the Vanishing Indian (Francis, 1992), the frontier and calls for 'authenticity', explored earlier. The second is that we are all migrants from somewhere – that the difference of scale (time) is unimportant.

The first belief is rooted in the education project related to Canadian self-concept; that is, the founding myth of wilderness, frontier, the commons and *terra nullius*, in order to uphold the mistaken foundational belief that Canada is a 'good' nation (Saul, 2008). The second belief – the scale argument – must be rejected whole-heartedly. The shaping and the knowledge generated by thousands of years of uninterrupted 'feet on the ground' in a particular place – language, lifeways, bodies that are created out of the material and agency of Land – are the expression of that place. This is Indigenous nationhood, bodies and knowledge, science, economics,

governance – what Marker (2006) terms the "epistemic and moral authority of Indigenous relationships to land and spirit of land" (p. 486). Both of these beliefs are related to Baldwin's (2012) settler futurity – the moral rationalization for the continuation of settler appropriation and annihilation of Indigenous territories, rooted in the colonial past, towards a future that continues to benefit the settler at great and continued cost to Indigenous peoples and to land. Here is where the binary of Indigenous/non-Indigenous shows its importance.

As stated earlier, Calderon (2014) addresses the ways that settler colonialism is reinscribed in some current models of PBE; that is, through insufficient attention to Land and to decolonization. As expressed in the recent writing of Bang et al. (2014), a crucial piece of Indigenous education in teacher education that I continually encounter is the need to disrupt the 'settler zero point epistemologies' – that is, the profoundly mistaken belief that settler communities are the first to be in a particular place (*terra nullius* again), and that there are no Indigenous peoples or communities in a place (this was described earlier in the resistances to the Local Assignment). The 5000-year-old Mnjikaning Fish Fence is located at the Atherley Narrows, between Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching. My students were taught about this place, and some were taught in this place, by Elder Mark Douglas, who is the keeper of the Fence. Now designated as a national historic site, this gathering place is of huge and sacred significance to the Anishinaabe and Wyandot peoples who have gathered here for harvest and community strengthening for thousands of years (Elder Mark Douglas, personal communication, Sept. 20th, 2016). Many of the LU Orillia students passed over this site on a highway bridge every day on their way to school, and yet most did not know it existed.

Further north in Anishinaabe territory, the iconic Sibley Peninsula, known locally in Thunder Bay as the Sleeping Giant, is Nanaboozho in Anishinaabemowin – the Elder Brother

protagonist in many stories that are central to Anishinaabe epistemology (Anishinaabe scholar Edward Benton-Banai, 1988) – and was visible from some of my classrooms in Thunder Bay. We learned the local story of Nanaboozho – both the Thunder Bay tourism board version, and the ancient version. Now, when those students pass over Mnjikaning, or see Nanaboozho, they think an Anishinaabemowin word; they see Anishinaabe land. Additionally, (and possibly however), I have come to see the positivity and acceptance that the students in my classes have communicated about these Land- and community-based activities in a new way. This is the critical tension that I alluded to earlier, where there is a comfort communicated by the teacher candidates that points towards something else going on that may be counterproductive to the decolonizing process. This realization is a prime example of what S-STEP discourse calls a 'living contradiction' (Whitehead, 1993), and has been a catalyst for transforming my thinking and practice in the *4416* classrooms (Whitehead, 2000).

Three years ago, I was at a conference entitled *Decolonizing our Minds* at the University of Toronto, listening to the fierce and wonderful Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson. One thing that she said sent me reeling…. "we tell stories… so that the racists will listen" (A. Simpson, 2015). Perhaps the appreciation on the part of the pre-service teachers after an Elder visit or a community experience that I have characterized as progress all of these years is, in fact, anything but. Perhaps it is the respite that allows the dysconscious settlers in the class to slide into their Disney-informed comfort-space of what Indigeneity is… a funny, playful Elder with a long braid, accustomed to relating to a white audience, telling them that they are ok, and giving teachings that, filtered through their previous experience of Indigenous people – that is, Disney, Avatar, and so forth – are familiar and fill the spiritual void left by the consumerist capitalist culture that they are immersed in.

What if this quiet outdoor experience where they stopped, noticed, and listened, firmly supports all of their racist otherings of Indigenous peoples in Canada? What if the combination of this and my unpalatable anti-racist activities and information has both re-entrenched their resistance and certainty about their own perceptions while letting them proclaim enlightenment by proxy… by experience? This may all be true, and still not completely negate the positive outcomes of the activity. In reviewing the literature, and in my community connections, I have not encountered scholars who are writing about or discussing this troubling possibility, except A. Simpson. In this relatively new field, it may be that we are hesitant to discuss the seeming successes as potential sites of violence. Some light will be shed on this in the next stage of the research: in the Conversations.

Over the last seven years, I have been both proud, frustrated and humbled to be part of the new work in teacher education of re-educating all Lakehead teacher-candidates in Indigenous education. I have relied heavily on reflective journaling, dialogue with critical friends at the University and the local Indigenous communities, and to regular presentations of my research-in-progress to try to make sure that I am learning as I go, from my mistakes, challenges, and from the learners in my classes. In this research I have attempted to be accountable as a teacher/learner by documenting my interactions and learning from other teacher educators in this field, in this community of practice, to celebrate the work that is happening from coast-to-coast-to-coast, and to share successes and challenges that we are meeting along the way.

In teaching, in researching this work, and in conducting my literature review, I have discovered that there is much to learn from disparate discourses in the field of education such as Place-based education, Environmental education, Critical Pedagogy, and Indigenous epistemologies; there are ways of making sense of and articulating what seems to be happening

in these classes. What needs to be articulated more clearly in Indigenous education in teacher education is the fundamental need to situate the learning in relation to the place/Land/communities where this learning is happening. This research seeks to investigate the central importance of the specific Indigenous Lands, communities and places where the teaching is happening to interrupt settler futurity in service of Indigenous futurity. In this national project of Indigenous education, these specificities must be attended to for this work to be emancipatory. As a human, and as a Canadian, I see myself as implicated in my relationships with the human and more-than-human community, and I continue to learn from and about this responsibility in this place.

What has gone before

There have been significant studies that address Indigenous education in teacher education. Tanaka (2009) conducted a "phenomenological narrative study" regarding her experience as a facilitator in a course where non-Aboriginal pre-service teachers were engaged in Indigenous pedagogy, and taught by local Indigenous community members on Lkwungen Coast Salish territory as the participants worked with earth fibre textiles. Tanaka concluded that an eco/social/spiritual framework was useful in promoting cross-cultural learning and teaching.

Tupper (2012, 2013) has written and researched on the ignorances of, and potential of, Treaty education in the context of Saskatchewan, and what building teacher efficacy in this knowledge area could mean for Indigenous and non-Indigenous learners and citizens, as treaty education is mandatory in the province of Saskatchewan. There have been studies (see Cherubini, Kitchen & Hodson, 2008; Higgins, Madden & Korteweg 2013; Kitchen & Hodson, 2013) about how to educate teacher educators to be more effective, reflective and compassionate

educators for Indigenous learners. This work is of crucial importance; as Dion (2009) and the People for Education (2013, 2016) reports assert, Indigenous education must be about educating all Canadians differently. How their work differs from mine is in that I am specifically looking at Land-based education as a central component of critical Place-based education to expand teacher candidates understanding of themselves, and their educative practices, with relation to Indigenous histories, communities and futurities in Canada.

Dion (2009) conducted a critical ethnography where she observed teachers in classrooms taking up Indigenous stories, which are inherently place-connected, to teach for/about Indigenous peoples in Canada. Dion recounts the profound resistance and ignorance that she encountered, but persists in her assertion that this work is crucial to re-order settler understanding of their/our role in *right relation* in Canada, and crucial also in that Indigenous people reclaim – restory – their place on this Land.

Madden (2015) researched and wrote an incredible piece investigating ‘Pedagogical pathways for Indigenous education with/in teacher education’; in it, she reviews 23 studies with various approaches to Indigenous education in teacher education. This is required reading for this field, both in terms of her overview of the different approaches, and in terms of the care and questioning she employs in situating herself in relation to this work.

Where my work contributes to the literature on Indigenous Education in teacher education is in documenting practice as I, and other instructors, attempt to transform pre-service teachers’ understanding of themselves-in-relation to Indigenous peoples in Canada, and to Land in Canada. Is critical Place-based education, with Land in the centre, being used to disrupt settler colonialism, to trouble whiteness, and to work towards Indigenous futurities? How do we know what is working and what isn’t? What are we observing, what sense are we making of what we

experience, and how are we transforming the practice? What are the rich experiences, and how do we facilitate their interpretation in a way that supports the different understanding of implication in relation to Indigenous peoples and Land? As is shown in this review, there is a great deal of philosophical support for this work – I investigate my own teaching in relation to the practice of this work in faculties of education using the methodological framework of the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP).

Chapter 3: Methodology

"Always be passionately aware that you could be completely wrong" diane marino

For this research, I employ Self Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP)[16] (see Hamilton & Pinnegar, 1998; Kitchen, 2005a; Kitchen & Russell, 2012; Loughran, Hamilton, LaBoskey & Russell, 2004; Samaras & Freese, 2006; Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015). My research is grounded in my own experience teaching *EDUC 4416* Aboriginal Education over seven years; this is one of the reasons that S-STEP is a good fit for methodology. In considering different qualitative research methodologies, and in particular narrative and Indigenous research methodologies, I chose S-STEP as a hybrid methodology that that is flexible enough to incorporate Indigenous and critical Place-based emphases. S-STEP also requires a commitment to transforming practice: The goal of self-study is to investigate questions of practice "that are individually important and also of broader interest to the teacher education community" (Loughran, 2004, p. 9). S-STEP identifies reflective practice as a primary goal of teaching, and the literature consistently uses descriptive words in describing S-STEP such as *relational*, *humility*, *vulnerability* and *accountability* (Samaras & Freese, 2006). Openness about personal location (situated context) is a central concern (Samaras & Freese, 2006, p. 41). These characteristics of S-STEP were very attractive to me, and demonstrate the kinship of S-STEP to

---

[16] In Kitchen and Russell's (2012) publication for a polygraph series for the Canadian Association for Teacher Education (CATE), *Canadian perspectives on the self-study of teacher education practices*, the editors, in their introduction, make a conscious choice to use the acronym S-STEP instead of using the more common abbreviation 'self-study'. They indicate that this choice "reflects our view that both the self and teacher education practices must always be in view" (p. 3). In this dissertation, I will be using the terms self-study, S-STEP, and S-STTEP interchangeably, in agreement with the scholars that I am citing.

Indigenous methodologies (see Plains Cree & Saulteau scholar Margaret Kovach, 2009; Lowan-Trudeau, 2012; L. Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008).

S-STEP is described by Kitchen and Russell (2014) as "one way in which teacher educators can research their own practices in order to improve the learning of preservice and practicing teachers… the primary emphasis is on analysis of personal practice" (p. 1). S-STEP is particularly suited to diversity and justice in teacher education (Kitchen, Tidwell, & Fitzgerald, 2016; LaBoskey, 2009; Tidwell & Fitzgerald, 2006), as it emphasizes ethical relationality, personal & professional accountability, and the transformation of practice: "This reframing and reconceptualizing facilitates professional learning through an active change process by which the researcher, informed by the past (through research, literature and experience) examines present contexts and dynamics to enlighten future practice" (Tidwell & Fitzgerald, 2006, p. xvi). In my own personal location as a white settler in Indigenous education, and in education generally, I identify with Spraggins' (2006) call to be vulnerable, and his assertion that self-study appeals to persons committed to becoming better educators and as educators committed to excavating internal prejudices that inform their work (p. 19).

This research contributes to the community of practice of preservice teacher education across Canada as we seek to change what, and how, Canadian students learn about Indigenous peoples. My research question is: *How is critical Place-based education in Canadian teacher education supporting Indigenous futurities in Canada by interrupting settler colonialism*? In this chapter, I outline the discourse and practice of the methodology, and show how I have employed S-STEP methods to collect data. Using multiple qualitative methods, I have researched my practice in relation to the discourse and practice of Indigenous Education in initial teacher education.

S-STEP is a research approach "that attempts to examine and improve professional practice settings" (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 103). Self-study addresses teacher education practice looking at the connections between "the autobiographical, historical, cultural and political," taking "a thoughtful look at texts read, experiences had, people known, and ideas considered" (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 1998, p. 236). S-STEP is a dynamic and developing methodology that requires reflection, rigour and evidence-based analysis. In this section, I outline the theoretical underpinnings of this methodology and the methods that I used to enact it.

S-STEP: Requirements and Elements

In much of the S-STEP literature there are two themes: firstly, S-STEP is mainly concerned with qualitative research methods, and secondly, the methodology has been dismissed or disrespected as lacking clarity and uniformity of methods, analysis, and rigour. As a result, there is a great deal of literature that attends to the methodological procedures and requirements for rigour in this field. In 2004, LaBoskey outlined four requirements of an S-STEP inquiry:

1. Self-study is *improvement-aimed*, and "requires evidence of reframed thinking and transformed practice of the researcher"
2. Self-study is *interactive* and involves collaboration and interaction with colleagues, students, the literature and with our own previous work "to confirm or challenge our developing understandings"
3. "Self-study employs *multiple, primarily qualitative methods*", both commonly used and innovative…which "provide us with opportunities to gain different and thus more comprehensive perspectives on the educational processes under investigation"
4. Self-study requires that we "formalize our work and make it available to our professional community for deliberation, further testing, and judgement….Self-study achieves validation through *the construction, testing, sharing and re-testing of*

> *exemplars of teaching practice.*" (LaBoskey, 2004, pp. 859-860, emphasis in the original)

Central to the practice of S-STEP as a research methodology is that the research be of significance to one's own practice and that it also contributes to the community of practice. This methodology centers practitioner accountability, requiring vulnerability and transparency in terms of the personal location and reflections of the teacher/educator researcher. It also requires exemplar-based validation (Lyons & LaBoskey 2002) – clearly articulated examples of practices to be assessed by the community of practitioners for "trustworthiness".

Over the seven years of teaching *EDUC 4416*, and seeking to improve my own practice in relation to the rapidly expanding field of Indigenous education in teacher education, I employed many methods of data generation: ongoing inquiry into personal history / critical reflection, journaling, regular dialogue with critical friends, the design of successive syllabi, ongoing conference presentations and journal articles, administrative advocacy, and finally, research conversations with others in this field. Each of these provide evidence of my commitment to a personal and public critical analysis of my teacher education practice as required by S-STEP methodology, and these methods together contribute to the trustworthiness of my findings and analyses. I describe each of these below and discuss their fit with an S-STEP, and especially S-STEP in an Indigenous education, context. But first, I situate S-STEP in relation to Indigenous research methodologies.

S-STEP in relation to Indigenous methodologies

As a teacher educator who believes that Indigenous knowledges and practices are of crucial value in serving Indigenous futurities and who is striving to contribute to shifting the

perspectives of all Canadians, the context I am concerned with is centering Indigenous methodologies, pedagogies and knowings in cPBE in K-12 education as an ongoing relational practice. For example, the Indigenous Knowledge (IK) of the Anishinaabe that I have learned has been incredibly important to the development of my own citizenship – my connection with the communities where I have lived and worked. It is important to me that I continue to honour what I have learned in my teaching and research practices too.

Just as I make a concerted and ongoing effort to never claim or seem to claim expertise on Indigenous knowledge or experiences, I have consciously made a choice not to use an Indigenous methodology. However, I do want to honour what I have learned from some Indigenous methodologies about how I would like to conduct research, and how I would like to position myself. Wilson (2001) writes:

> To me an Indigenous methodology then becomes talking about relational accountability. As a researcher you are answering to all your relations when doing research. You are not answering questions of validity or reliability or making judgments for better or worse. Instead you should be fulfilling your relationships with the world around you. So your methodology has to ask different questions: rather than asking about validity or reliability, you are asking, 'Am I fulfilling my role in this relationship? What are my obligations in this relationship?' The axiology or morals need to be an integral part of the methodology so that when I am gaining knowledge, I am not just gaining in some abstract pursuit; I am gaining knowledge in order to fulfill my end of the research relationship. This becomes my methodology, an Indigenous methodology, by looking at relational accountability or being accountable to all my relations. (p. 177)

There are many talented and passionate educators who are engaged in this work. I am accountable to them, and to the present research, to investigate the work that we do. S-STEP methodology demands that I continually learn from these educators, and that I remain vulnerable and accountable to them as I conduct and share my work (Donald, 2009; Kitchen, 2005a, 2005b;

LaBoskey, 2004). For most methods that I have employed to conduct this self-study, there are threads that connect S-STEP to Indigenous methodologies. In the next section, I will describe the methods that I employed.

Methods

In this section, I detail the methods that I used to enact S-STEP methodology and to generate data. These methods include personal history writing, keeping journals, dialogue with critical friends, successive syllabi and course design, making my research public (conference presentations and publications), advocacy and reform, and research conversations.

Personal history self-study: personal location and relationality. Just as the discourse of Place-based education does (e.g., Davis et al., 2000; Gruenewald & Smith, 2008; Wattchow & Brown, 2011), S-STEP discourse refers to the social constructivist roots of teaching and learning; for example: “learning is processed through previous experience so personal history and cultural context must be considered; and learning is enhanced by challenging previously held assumptions through practical experience and the multiple perspectives of present and text-based colleagues” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 819). Samaras, Hicks, and Garvey Berger (2004) provide a comprehensive understanding of personal history self-study. They outline three elements of personal history; that this form of self-study can be used to “know and better understand one’s professional identity; model and test forms of reflection; and, finally, push the boundaries of what we know by creating alternative interpretations of reality” (p. 905). They write that the foundations of personal history self-study lie in the understanding that teaching is an autobiographical act (see Knowles & Cole, 1994; Pinar & Grumet, 1976), and that this approach

supports the belief that "who we are as people affects who we are as teachers and consequently our students' learning" (p. 906).

Personal storytelling has been a conscious pedagogical act on my part, as this practice has played a large role in my own schooling in Indigenous education and in Indigenous contexts. It is also a way of addressing some of the challenging questions and situations that have arisen in my classes, to avoid directly confronting students on potentially emotionally-charged issues of gender and race, and to support the sometimes steep and painful learning curve in these matters. I tend to answer questions with stories; this practice has been characterized by my students as frustrating at times. In this dissertation, I describe and recount, as a way of providing information and context for the topics and questions at hand. This narrative practice, this storytelling, is part of personal history self-study (Kitchen, 2009; Knowles & Cole, 1994), and is a practice that shows a point of kinship with Indigenous pedagogies and methodologies (Bishop, 1996, 1997, 2005; Métis & Cree scholar Fyre Jean Graveline, 2008; Kovach, 2010). "The truth about stories is, that's all we are" (T. King, 2008, p. 2).

Stories are at the heart of how people make sense of the world and see themselves reflected in it: Stories were foundational epistemological and ontological tools of teaching employed by Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee Elders and teachers at Trent University. This fits well with Connelly & Clandinin's (1990) conception of qualitative educational research. They put it this way:

> Humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, live storied lives. The study of narrative, therefore, is the study of how humans experience the world. This general notion translates into the view that education is the construction and reconstruction of personal and social stories; teachers and learners are storytellers and characters in their own and other's stories. (p. 2)

Making very sure that the stories are generalized enough not to compromise the identity of my former students, I use my personal stories as a teacher educator as touchstones throughout the study as I reflect on and analyze how the experiences of the research participants relate to my own experiences. In personal history self-study, being explicit and reflective about one's positionality, perceptions and practices is part of ethical relationality (Donald, 2009; Kitchen, 2005a, 2005b; LaBoskey, 2004); this is also an important tenet in Indigenous research methodologies. Kovach (2009) writes:

> In co-creating knowledge, story is not only a means for hearing another's narrative, it also invites reflexivity into research. Through reflexive story there is opportunity to express the researcher's inward knowing. Sharing one's own story is an aspect of co-constructing knowledge from an Indigenous perspective. (p. 100)

Again, we see overlap between Indigenous approaches and S-STEP.

In their early work, Knowles and Cole (1994) write that reflection refers to "the ongoing process of critically examining and refining practice, taking into careful consideration the personal, pedagogical, curricular, intellectual, societal (including social, political, historical, and economic), and ethical contexts associated with [professional work]" (p. 11). They later describe their self-study work as "situating their inquiry in the context of personal histories…to understand personal and early influences on professional practice" (Knowles & Cole, 1994, p. 51). The "critical" part is important. In order to approach the question about the role of cPBE, ongoing critical reflection and analysis of my own and and many, if not most, of my students' personal locations and contexts as white settlers has been necessary.

In self-study discourse, Brown (2004) addresses the need to understand issues of race, ethnicity and gender, and Kitchen (2004, 2005), among others, addresses positionality and relationships to students. Berry (2007) emphasizes the importance of uncovering tensions, rather

than confirming perceptions. It has been an important practice for me to continually question what I think is happening in my classes in terms of my own actions, my choices, pedagogies, and also the responses and actions of my students. Doing this work that is meant to be about accountability and openness to different readings of these situations and positions can easily slip into solipsism.

In a practice that parallels the danger of centering whiteness even when seeming to challenge it, in S-STEP, there is a need to actively reject teaching and research as centering the self in a way that seeks validation or self-aggrandizement – where the teacher educator / researcher is seeking affirmation. The very term *self-study* seems to describe a methodology organized around these very pitfalls – and yet this methodology requires quite the opposite: "Social interactions in self-study have been framed as a way to avoid the pitfalls of individualism and navel-gazing" (Kelchtermans & Hamilton, 2004, p. 790).

In S-STEP research, the teacher educator / researcher makes vulnerable their perceptions and reflections on personal location and practices so that they are holding themselves personally and professionally accountable to the community. Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) are frequently cited in S-STEP literature. They explain that the aim of a personal history self-study is to "provoke, challenge, and illuminate rather than confirm and settle" (p. 20). This, for me, has been both necessary and scary. After all, as Clandinin and Connelly (2004) remind us:

> We have helped make the world in which we find ourselves. We are not merely objective inquirers, people on the high road, who study a world lesser in quality than our moral temperament would have it, people who study a world we did not help create. On the contrary, we are complicit in the world we study. Being in this world, we need to remake ourselves as well as offer up research understandings that could lead to a better world. (p. 61)

As I wrote about earlier in this dissertation, there is always a danger that I am centering myself, my whiteness, and my white settler privilege, while intending to disrupt these structural oppressions. I aspire to join the ranks of the teacher/researchers who are, as Lather (1991) describes,

> intellectuals with liberatory intentions [who] take responsibility for transforming our own practices so that our empirical and pedagogical work can be less towards positioning ourselves as masters of truth and justice and more towards creating a space where those directly involved can act and speak on their own behalf. (pp. 163-164)

Part of my ongoing effort to both hold myself accountable and to be responsive to the learners in my classes was my practice of keeping detailed journals. These journals have been invaluable tools of reflection and transformation for this S-STEP research, and for my practice.

Journals. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) assert that "researchers are not in a strong position to make claims about their learning if they do not capture their learning in the process of that learning" (p. 112). They later identify journaling as "the data-gathering method that is most often used by teacher education researchers" (p. 122). They distinguish between fieldnotes and journals by pointing out that while fieldnotes are recorded according to the specifics of a study, journals are more 'free-flowing'. My journals are all from the same Japanese company, Apica – they are called C. D. Notebooks, and are 182x257mm. Most were 30 pages, lined, in multiple colours. There are 12 notebooks I am considering from between 2009 - 2016. While I started keeping the journals in 2009 as a sort of communications log to keep track of questions, events and presentations in the class, they quickly came to serve several other functions. In my first year of teaching, as I have mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, I taught eight sections of *EDUC 4416*—the journals provided a sort of life-raft in terms of keeping track of students' names, of

topics that I covered in class, and perhaps most importantly, they provided a ‘parking lot’ (a common outdoor/experiential education term for writing down questions for a later time instead of interrupting).

In my case, this ‘parking lot’ was for questions, comments and critiques of presentations and student interactions in class. The journals were also a very important way of documenting conflict in the classes, so that I could make sure to address the issues at hand, to follow up with affected students, and to provide a record just in case a situation in class escalated. *Chapter Four – Teaching the Class* is formed in large part based on observations that were noted in my journals. During the time I was teaching and reflecting on my teaching, I would re-read these journals as I changed my successive syllabi. While I have never attempted to formally code them, the patterns of reactions and of occurrences in the classroom that they contain, and the notes that I made to myself about changes to syllabi, to supporting resources, and reminders for future courses and classes have formed a foundation for this research. I read through these journals regularly while preparing for classes, while writing presentations and publications, and to check back in preparing this dissertation. While this personal documentation and reflection was, and remains, very important to my practice as a teacher educator, what helped me gain perspective and trouble my perceptions of what was happening in my classes was regular interactions with critical friends— with colleagues, with contributors to the courses, and with texts generated in the discourse.

Critical friends and dialogue. In a description of S-STEP as relational teacher development by Kitchen (2005a, b), he writes that it is a personal journey of discovery, and is significant primarily because it has the potential to improve teacher education practices and

teacher candidate learning. “Developing a pedagogy of teacher education entails an examination of the complex interplay among teacher educators, teacher education practices, teacher candidates and the educational context” (Kitchen & Russell, 2012, p. 4). As I develop my own professional identity, I have benefitted enormously from the perspectives and experiences of friends and mentors who are engaged in university teaching, in Indigenous education and in other critical education contexts.

In the S-STEP literature, these colleagues are called “critical friends” (Loughran, 2004) who contribute perspectives, challenges, and most importantly dialogue to critically reflect on the daily occurrences or trends in the classrooms. In particular, I would like to thank Ruth Beatty, Connie Russell, Paul Berger, Frances Helyar, Michael Hoechsmann, Blair Niblett, Kathy Kortes-Miller, and Bob Jickling for engaging in ongoing and critical conversations about my teaching practices and experiences. Dialogue in S-STEP is situated as an important part of the process of ‘coming-to-know’ that is research:

> The process…begins in the expression of an idea within a conversation. We recognize that such a conversation can be internal, occurring within the self, where through interior dialogue, we counter, shape, develop, define, and establish ideas. However, at some point in time in order for whatever is explored to be counted as research, it must enter the public arena and be put forward for critique. (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 88)

These conversations were much more frequent in the beginning of my teaching/learning journey. Ruth Beatty and Frances Helyar provided a great deal of perspective, and gentle and welcome criticism, in the first year of my teaching in Orillia. Blair Niblett and Paul Berger are kind and compassionate critical pedagogues from whom I learned a great deal about equitable teaching practices and approaches in response to some of the challenges that I faced in the classes – they gently encouraged me to see from the students’ perspectives. From Bob Jickling, I

learned about teaching outside the classroom in the university setting, and about apologizing for bending rules rather than asking for permission. Kathy Kortes-Miller and Michael Hoechsmann have been both directly supportive and have taught me about boundaries in compassion – both to maintain and to transgress – with students and with thought. The conversations about teaching were less frequent at my home institution as I became more confident, and more acclimated, to the challenges in the classroom. But as my practice progressed, I reached out more beyond my institution to learn from and compare notes with others engaged in this work from coast-to-coast-to-coast.

As I researched this field further and learned from the writings and conference presentations of practitioners across what is currently known as Canada, I gained more perspective and confidence in my perceptions and interpretations of the occurrences and themes in my classrooms. Although there are many people within the Indigenous education field that I am indebted to, I would like to acknowledge the warmth and support of Carmen Rodriguez de France, Jennifer Tupper, Nicholas Ng-a-Fook, Dwayne Donald, Frank Deer, John Hodson, Potawatomi/Ojibwe Anishinaabe scholar Mark Aquash, Brooke Madden, Marc Higgins, Sandra Wolf, Julian Kitchen and Paul Berger; all of these people have greatly contributed to my learning about this practice through conversations over time. These scholars shared patterns of challenges with me, and both affirmed and troubled my perceptions of what was happening in the classes. These patterns and challenges were further affirmed and troubled, in a more formalized research context, with the participants in the conversations stage of this research.

Citing many studies, Kitchen and Russell (2012) wrote that teacher educators in S-STEP have long recognized that the development of community amongst teacher educators makes for more effective teacher candidates' learning. The dialogues and sharing practices and reflection

that these communities support are of great benefit to the educators and to the candidates (see Kitchen & Ciuffetelli-Parker, 2009; Knowles & Cole, 1994; Russell & Bullock, 2010). From a methods perspective, this call for conversations and community is also addressed in the later stage of my research through my conversations with other practitioners in Indigenous education in teacher education. While the journals and dialogues provided the observations and reflections, and suggestions for change in practice, the successive course syllabi provide evidence of transformation, as did the valuation of assignments, explanations of assignments, criteria for assessment and evaluation, and expectations in terms of behaviour in class, written work and assignments.

Syllabi. Each semester, the syllabi that I wrote for the classes underwent changes. There were seven separate semesters where I taught *EDUC 4416*; there were seven iterations of the course. These changes provide evidence of the transformations in practice that I enacted as I was developing my professional identity, and as I was (and continue) learning how to teach teachers. For this research I considered the seven iterations, looking specifically for changes over time. “We engage in self-study to both orchestrate our own transformations and to monitor and understand our progress in facilitating the transformations of our student teachers” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 832). Much of this development is described in *Chapter Four*. In these syllabi, changes are most evident in the differences in explicit expectations for assignments and for student conduct, in the values of different assignments, and in the broadening scope, more explicitly defined, of the learning expectations for the course.

The syllabi, then, provide evidence of changing pedagogy, a key consideration in S-STEP: “The pedagogical practices employed by self-study researchers are an integral part of the

methodology of self-study because…they are the interventions in our research design" (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 834).

In January of 2010, I came to the realization that I wanted to conduct doctoral research into the teaching of *EDUC 4416*; I remember the moment I made this decision perfectly. It was a snowy day in Orillia, and I was teaching the second set of four classes that year in the winter term, having taught four sections in the fall term. I was listening to Elder Mark Douglas teach the class, and I suddenly knew that I wanted to formally engage in research to become a better teacher of this class. These syllabi exemplify my own evolving understanding of my ethical relationality to my students and to the subject matter. As I describe how my teaching changed in *Chapter Four*, the syllabi provide evidence of these changes. These transformations are more fully articulated in the many conference presentations that I gave and the journal articles that I wrote over the years that I was teaching this class.

Conference presentations and journal articles. A crucial element of self-study is to make public, and vulnerable, one's practice and interpretations (LaBoskey, 2004; Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015). While this is achieved in part by dialogue with critical friends, opening myself up to the broader field of teacher education practice has meant consistent conference presentations, three journal articles and two book chapters. I have presented twelve papers and one poster at 13 conferences, in particular at the American Education Research Association annual conference (2011-2016), and at the Canadian Society for Studies in Education annual conference (2011-2013, 2015, 2016) (see Appendix C).

> The purpose of self-study has thus always been to move beyond the particularities of practice by making public the developed understandings (through conference

> presentations, research reports, journal manuscripts) in order to make them informative for others and available for critical debate. (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015, p. 509)

I tend to try to bring humour into these presentations, and to do so by poking fun at myself and the :authority of my experience" as a way of knowing (Pinnegar, 1998). I tend to lean more towards what hooks (1994) identifies as the "passion of experience" (p. 90), where she is troubling the essentialism or generalizability inherent in claiming such authority. She writes:

> I am troubled by the term "authority of experience," acutely aware of the way it is used to silence and exclude. Yet I want to have a phrase that affirms the specialness of those ways of knowing rooted in experience. I know that experience can be a way to know and can inform how we know what we know. (hooks, 1994, p. 90)

In these presentations and journal articles, I try to write in to the challenges and the "living contradictions" (Whitehead, 1989) that are so instructive and generative in reflective practice. An important early example of this was when I realized in 2011 that I had not enacted my educational philosophy of community building and active learning…even though I had articulated this as a central concern in my practice in my essay in application to this PhD program. This "living contradiction" became the main topic in my first graduate student poster presentation, which I titled *Failure as Transformation: Critical Reflections as a White Teacher educator in Aboriginal Education* (2011). These successive conference proposals and presentations, and journal articles, forced me to think and respond much more deeply in my practice of teacher education, adding greatly to my self-study. While the crafting and presenting of these works was very important, so too were the responses to these public articulations of my practice by critical friends and colleagues. As I have gone back through the presentations and articles, I notice areas of development in my thinking, and have written about what I would do differently from this perspective.

As my practice developed, so too did my frustration with perennial structural challenges to conducting my classes in the way that I wanted to—centering Land and local Indigenous communities, and by learning from, and respectfully remunerating, local Indigenous peoples.

Administrative advocacy. Every year that I taught this course, I had to actively advocate for administrative support from the University in several ways. Some of these challenges were experience-based—I did not yet have the institutional knowledge or confidence to conduct my classes outside of the classroom, either out on the Land close to the university in Thunder Bay, or at local places of significance. Once I learned the administrative hoops to jump through, this became less tricky. Each year, though, I had to enter into negotiations with the Faculty of Education to ask for appropriate honoraria for Elders and community members. On a few occasions, I supplemented what the Faculty was willing to give with my own money in order to be in line with local practices. Recently, I was reminded that there are records of these perennial struggles and recommendations in email chains with administrators and department heads, which I read through after finding them by searching 'honoraria' in the 'contains' field of the email search engine.

In these emails, there is information regarding outdated department policies, unproductive Education committee meetings, insufficient amounts for honoraria, and evidence of the need for the University to update their structural and administrative support for Aboriginal education in the University setting. I contacted other local institutions to make sure what I was proposing was in line with what other institutions were offering, and found this challenge to be widespread. While Lakehead University was publicizing its commitment to supporting Indigenous education and students, the administrative structures of the University were slow to

catch up. I hope that this is better now. How this was usually resolved was by individual creative and supportive administrators—I sincerely thank them.

While these artifacts are a small contribution to the data I have collected for this study, they support an important finding of the study—namely, that these administrative challenges exist in many contexts across the country in the field of Indigenous education. In the S-STEP literature, this data is evidence of a reform agenda (Korthagen & Lunenberg, 2004; LaBoskey, 2004, p. 832), where institutional reform is an important part of participating in, and supporting, the professional community (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). As more and more institutions seek to 'Indigenize the Academy', structures and administrators are falling behind the publicity that surrounds these efforts. This finding came out in the literature and in the data generated through the conversations with other practitioners.

Conversations. In the later stage of the S-STEP process (May 2015 – June 2016), I conducted eight conversations in pursuit of the experiences of other practitioners in the field of Indigenous education in teacher education. Purposeful conversations are sometimes considered in the place of 'interviews' (Bogdan & Biklen, 2006) in qualitative research methods; this is particularly relevant to S-STEP as the researcher is both researcher and participant (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 117). These conversations were open-ended and informal, although the questions were given to the participants beforehand, and the conversations were recorded. This part of the study is very important. I wanted to be open to other perspectives and interpretations of what is happening in my classes; I wanted to learn from other teacher educators doing this work, and I wanted to honour the great work that is happening all over the country. Respect and humility are at the heart of good teaching, and of good research. This is a thread in S-STEP

literature (Kitchen, 2005a; Loughran, 2004; Samaras & Freese, 2006) and is also central in Indigenous research methodologies. There are many Indigenous scholars who are doing work in decolonizing and reframing some interpretations of ‘research’ (see Graveline, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Lowan-Trudeau, 2012; L. Smith, 1999, 2005; Wilson, 2001, 2008).

Each conversation was significantly different, as each participant has a personal set of relationships both to their community and to the Land that they teach on, to me, and to the location and mode of communication of our conversation. Tuck and Mackenzie’s (2015) *Place in Research; Theory, Methodology and Methods* takes on this crucial consideration deeply:

> The book before you seeks to draw attention to the multidimensional significance of place(s) in social science research, not just as ‘durable symbols or the distant past’ (Basso, 1996, p. 7), but as sites of presence, futurity, imagination, power, and knowing. This is an important time to write about place, not just because social science, in general practice, doesn’t give place its due, but because we write from and into the overlapping contexts of globalization and neoliberalism, settler colonialism, and environmental degradation. (p. xiv)

During this research, I have learned so much about, and from, the practices and experiences of practitioners with these different relationships, and I strove to do a good job of representing these contexts well. I wonder now how these interactions were affected by such factors as: Was our conversation in person (n=5)? Over Skype (n=3)? Outside (n=1)? In an office (n=1)? In a space stolen into during a busy conference (n=3)? In a classroom where we have both taught (n=1)?

It is very clear to me in reading and re-reading the conversations that we had different knowledge levels and comfort levels with one another. Each person’s articulation of how they see themselves and their work is so personal, and so diverse in emphasis. I was stuck for many

months, grappling with how to interpret or represent each person's perspective in a good way[17], and in a way that shows relationality, contradiction, and location, both personal and geographical.

I see that the common ground amongst these generous and hard-working humans lies in the deep passion that each has for caring for their students, and for shifting the perspectives of the pre-service teachers that they teach so that they are contributing to justice and wellbeing in their classrooms. Because of this orientation, settler colonialism is being interrupted by these teachers in these places. I am patently unable to be objective about this topic, and about these relations. Objectivity, as Hampton (1995) and Wilson (2008) write, is anathema to accountability. Most of all, I aspired to conduct research with a respectful understanding of myself-in-relation (Graveline, 1998). "Self-study points to a simple truth, that to study a practice is simultaneously to study self: a study of the self-in-relation to other" (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 14). My relational accountability includes learning from other practitioners in the field, and contributing to the community.

In this stage of the research, I conducted conversations as an element of the S-STEP to investigate the practices of other educators in the field—in my case, of those engaged in Indigenous education in teacher education. As stated earlier, Knowles and Cole (1994) assert that our studies of ourselves take place through dialogue, in different forms of conversation. I conducted and recorded conversations with eight teacher educators who teach mandatory or elective courses in Indigenous education, or who use a significant amount of Indigenous content in their teacher education courses, and who are using critical Place-based pedagogy in some way. Each conversation took approximately one hour, in person (n=5), or via video conferencing

---

[17] The phrase "a good way" is used frequently amongst my Indigenous (particularly Anishinaabe) colleagues, peers and mentors. The way I understand it is similarly to *right relation* (see footnote 6 on page 7).

software (n=3). I made digital audio recordings with the permission of the participants, and kept a journal to keep track of my own reflexive journey as I considered the content of the conversations shortly after they had taken place. The conversations were professionally transcribed.

I have studied the conversations and shared transcripts with the participants for member checking (Creswell & Miller, 2000)—that is, making sure that the participants consent to how they and their words are portrayed in the transcription. I also shared the use of their words with them in the final dissertation to ensure that their words are honoured and intact. All of the data are kept secure to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. While anonymity was offered and honoured, it was optional. As it turned out, there were two participants who wished to waive anonymity, but most did not. In the interest of consistency, I have maintained anonymity throughout the writing. This was explained to all, and everyone was comfortable with this.

Conversation questions (Appendix B) were generated out of three contexts. These were: My own teaching experience, literature on Indigenous and critical Place-based education in teacher education, and the interactions I had listening to presentations and speaking with colleagues teaching similar courses at Lakehead University, at the Canadian Society for Studies in Education (CSSE) meeting in Fredericton in 2011, in Waterloo in 2012, in Victoria in 2013, in Ottawa in 2015, and in Calgary in 2016.

I analysed the conversation data for emergent themes in what Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) refer to as a constant-comparative strategy, looking for patterns and relationships (p. 150); they turn to Mishler's (1990) call for exemplars as a way of making the study visible through connecting excerpts (from my own practice) with literature and with data (from the conversations) (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 150). In keeping with Indigenous research

methodology, it was important to keep the narratives as intact as possible, out of respect for the participants and their stories (Kovach, 2010; Lowan-Trudeau, 2012). Thus, I report findings using long passages of participants' words. This is in line with the S-STEP assertion that these colleagues are, as I am, "deeply invested in their studies, personally and profoundly" (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 13). I take the learnings of Basso (1996) from the Western Apache seriously:

> Western Apaches regard spoken conversation as a form of 'voluntary cooperation' (*lish'j 'odaach'idii*) in which all participants are entitled to displays of 'respect' (*yiñlsih*). Accordingly, whenever people speak in cordial and affable tones, considerations of 'kindness and politeness' (*bil goch'oba'*) come centrally into play. Such considerations may influence Apache speech in a multitude of ways, but none is more basic than the courtesy speakers display by refraining from 'speaking too much' (*laago yalti'*). Although the effects of this injunction are most clearly evident in the sparse verbal style employed by Apache storytellers, people from Cibecue insist that all forms of narration benefit from its application. And the reasons, they explain, are simple enough.
>
> A person who speaks too much – someone who describes too busily, who supplies too many details, who repeats and qualifies too many times—presumes without warrant on the right of the hearers to build freely and creatively on the speaker's own depictions. With too many words, such a speaker acts to 'smother' (*bikå' yinlkaad*) his or her audience by seeming to say, arrogantly and coercively, 'I *demand* that you see everything that happened, how it happened and why it happened, *exactly* as I do.' In other words, persons who speak too much insult the imaginative capabilities of other people, 'blocking their thinking,' as one of my consultants said in English, and 'holding down their minds'…. An effective narrator, people from Cibeque report, never speaks too much; an effective narrator takes steps to 'open up thinking,' thereby encouraging his or her listeners to 'travel in their minds'. (p. 85)

What I strived for was to listen, to share excitement, and to learn from each participant in the spirit described above by Basso. In the conversations, and in the representations/writings, I have

attempted to get out of the way as much as possible, but the more I read into these conversations, the more I come to understand that I am never really out of the way, as researcher and interpreter, and as listener/reader/writer.

Participants. Starting at CSSE in 2011, I met educators from across Canada who are engaged in this work of Indigenous education in teacher education. Several of these scholars expressed an interest in keeping in touch, given the similarities in the work we are doing, in the resistances that we have experienced, and in the potential for creating a supportive and generative community of practitioners. The conversation participants were selected from teacher educators who are engaged in Indigenous education in teacher education and, to some extent, who use critical Place-based pedagogy. Kovach (2009) wrote, "in choosing participants, it is suggested within qualitative studies that research participants be chosen for what they can bring to the study as opposed to random sampling" (p. 51). In the spirit of the 'ethical relationality' required of an S-STEP framework (Kitchen, 2005a, 2005b; LaBoskey, 2004), these participants were selected as they constitute part of the community of educators that I continue to learn from.

I approached prospective participants via a brief email to ask for their participation, or for recommendations of others who might be interested in participating (purposeful sampling, Kovach 2009; snowball sampling, Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). I attached the conversation questions (Appendix B) for early consideration, and after they indicated positive interest, they were sent a detailed letter outlining my intent, my location, and the details of the study. I made clear, in writing, that they could withdraw their participation and the data that arises from it at any time before the dissertation is completed. This work is complicated and contentious, and produces different power dynamics for different people doing it.

There are a few variables that I was conscious of in recruiting, and I aimed for balance in

considering these factors: Whether the instructors were teaching mandatory (n= 4) or elective (n= 3) classes of Indigenous education; whether the teacher educators were employing a great deal of Indigenous content, but were not conducting classes dedicated to, or named, Indigenous Education (n= 2); whether the instructors of these classes were Indigenous (n= 4) or non-Indigenous (n= 4)—these were all factors, but were not to be exclusionary, although a balance of Indigenous and non-Indigenous instructors was desirable. The age range was from late 20s to early 50s, and there was a mix of genders. I have learned from and am respectful of the potentially different experiences of instructors based on multiple positionalities.

Another consideration was the location of the instructors within their institutions: In my experience, tenured instructors are more likely to be more forthcoming about challenges, as they have less fear about job security. However, those who are administrators have different risks in terms of criticizing their contexts. The amount of institutional support for these practices and programs is very material to these practices; however, that was outside of the scope of this study. What I was interested in, in conducting these conversations across many positionalities, was the common factor of the Land.

As I mentioned earlier, I wonder how the mode of the interaction impacted the conversations. Skype (n=3), in person (n=5), on the Land (n=1), in a classroom (n=3), in a space in an unfamiliar institution (n=4); surely these factors play into what was discussed and how. In retrospect, I would have liked the contexts to be a bit more uniform and more generous (perhaps with food, tea/coffee). Context, and place, are considered highly relevant in S-STEP research (Beck & Kosnick, 2002; Loughran, 2004; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009).

Conversations in Place. The relationships described in the last section necessarily include relationships with Place—with the institutions, and most importantly in this dissertation,

with the Indigenous Lands that provide the situated context for the teaching, learning and research that ground this study. S-STEP takes context very seriously, both as agent and as constraint:

> Context is a usually silent but ever-present influential companion in S-STTEP research. Just as attention to context can lead to a reframing or transformation in our practice and our understanding of it, context can also constrain that understanding and limit our ability to act. (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 81)

I investigated Land as pedagogy within critical Place-based education (see Chambers, 2006; L. Simpson, 2014; Styres et al., 2013); that is, I was particularly interested in the way that the Land is being honoured as a central teacher and tool in Place-based Indigenous education in teacher education, in a way that disrupts colonialism. In these conversations, the participants were aware that this was my focus. We shared experiences, and reflected on our own learning journey and that of our students. This emphasis on Place is a central theme in this study, and is an important consideration in S-STEP, as part of ethical relationality.

Ethical Considerations

The emphasis in the S-STEP literature on accountability, respect, community, relationality, humility and location appeals to me both in its own right, and in the kinship that these emphases demonstrate to Indigenous research methodologies (see Kovach, 2009; Lowan-Trudeau, 2012; Scully, 2012; L. Smith, 1999; Steinhauer, 2002; Wilson, 2008). In addition to the attention I have paid to *right relation*, as explained in the introduction to this dissertation in footnote six, I have also carefully attended to Eurowestern research ethics. Participants in this study could choose to be anonymous or to have credit for their words and ideas by waiving their right to anonymity. As stated earlier, two participants wished to waive anonymity. As most did not, I maintained

anonymity for consistency's sake. This has posed some very tricky problems in contending with the positionality of the participants: In a dissertation that is centrally concerned with Place, having to anonymize places and some aspects of personal location seems counterproductive. There was also the challenge of figuring out what to omit. It is hard for me to see now what renders the participants identifiable, having worked so closely with the data. I realize that there is a potential for harm for participants of this study in two main ways: Professional harm, in the naming of resistances to Indigenous education or in naming racism that they have encountered in their practice from administration, institution, community and/or students; this might include concern about job security. There is also a potential for personal harm, as the work in this field is controversial, and both the material and the response to it can be emotionally violent. We are dealing with very challenging work, for Indigenous and for non-Indigenous instructors, in some different and similar ways (Schick & St. Denis, 2003).

Personal challenges may include experiences such as those of the Indigenous instructors who refused to continue teaching the *EDUC 4416* classes due to the racism and criticisms they were confronted with. For me, these classes have presented significant personal challenges relating to self-doubt in the face of the constant resistance to the subject matter, and worry about navigating my white privilege in a way that spends it rather than reifies it.

Any anecdotes relating to participants' own students are anonymized, and I have worked to make sure that students cannot be identified through signifiers. The interview transcripts are kept separate from the data analysis and from identifiers, all under lock and key or password protected.

I have completed the Tri-Council Policy Tutorial: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans course on Research Ethics (TCPS 2: CORE). The Lakehead REB, interpreting Chapter

9 of the TCPS (2014), required that I demonstrate support from the Indigenous Community at Lakehead to proceed with this work. The Department of Aboriginal Education at Lakehead Thunder Bay served as this community via a letter of support for the research. The Research Ethics did allow for my use of my evaluations as a data set in a limited capacity.

Instructor evaluations. Part of what I appreciate so much about this methodology is that there is no mention of objectivity. As Chickasaw scholar Eber Hampton (1995) states:

> Emotionless, passionless, abstract, intellectual, academic research is a goddamn lie, it does not exist. It is a lie to ourselves and a lie to other people. Humans—feeling, living, breathing, thinking humans—do research. When we try to cut ourselves off at the neck and pretend an objectivity that does not exist in the human world, we become dangerous, to ourselves first, and then to the people around us. (p. 52)

I have many artifacts as data that support this study, evidence of my own experience and transformation of practice—including successive syllabi, papers from past work, journal articles, images, texts, and papers and posters. I also have the instructor evaluations for all of my courses, which I had hoped would provide some evidence of what students found effective and ineffective.

As stated in the previous section, Lakehead University's Research Ethics Board ruled that I was not permitted to directly quote from these evaluations (this is not a widely-held view, as I have seen quotes in many conference presentations). However, this has not proven to be a great loss, as these evaluations are not widely respected as 'objective' or reliable estimations or reflections of instruction. In fact, they are sometimes used to express personal frustrations and even hate, especially in courses where material is 'challenging' (Flaherty, 2016). Still, these

evaluations have been instructive artifacts, in terms of patterns of feedback, both positive and negative.

For me, a more useful and generative method of feedback for my own teaching has been through informal and/or anonymous feedback both throughout the courses and in final classes. These have been well-documented in my journals. While no direct quotes from students have been collected, there are very strong patterns and recurring responses to the assignments, during in-class discussions, and in particular in responding to and processing the many experiences in the courses. The evidence of how this transformed my teaching can be most easily accessed through three sets of artifacts: The changes to my syllabi, my journal articles, and my conference presentations. This variety of methods and of reflection supports a triangulation of perception and analysis that creates trustworthiness of findings in S-STEP (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 853).

Trustworthiness. Trustworthiness is a word that comes up frequently in the S-STEP literature, and refers to “the degree to which other practitioners or researchers turn to, or rely on, and use the concepts, methods, and inferences of a practice as the basis for their own theorizing, research or practice” (Mishler, 1990, p. 419). Why should the exemplars from my own practice that I share in my articles and presentations be taken seriously? I situate my practice within the field and discourse of education and Indigenous education, and show how I have invited critique and challenged my own perceptions, and invite further challenges to my perceptions and practice.

> For self-study inquiries to be exemplars of scholarship and practice, they need to be intentional and reflective human actions, be socially and contextually situated, engaging the writer/researcher in interrogating aspects of teaching and learning by storing the

> experience, implicate the author's sense of self and involve the construction of meaning and knowledge. (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015, p. 518)

The reader will judge to what extent I have successfully done this.

Data Analysis

Data for the first part of this S-STEP research were generated through ongoing inquiry into personal history / critical reflection, journaling, dialogue with critical friends, designing successive syllabi, writing conference presentations and journal articles, emails showing administrative advocacy, and student evaluations and other feedback. Using a "constant-comparative strategy, data were examined and analyzed for patterns and categories, building a pattern of relationships" (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 150) that eventually, messily, resolved into coherent themes.

In the second stage of the research, the data from the conversations were used with the reflection data on my teaching experiences to describe the shared experiences, divergences, and emergent themes of teaching Indigenous education and especially the use of critical Place-based pedagogy in teacher education. Again: All of Canada is Indigenous territories; each instructor teaches in specific cultural and physical places. As critical Place-based education is the focus of the investigation of the practices of these educators, specific attention was paid to the physical location of the instruction in Indigenous education in teacher education. The ways this is taken up had a significant impact on the learning and the growing awareness of the relationality of the learners.

The themes or categories, and relationships, that emerged from spiraling through these data took shape as different forms of Land-based education in a critical pedagogy of Place. Late in the study, the themes that emerged from seeking to understand the conversations with relation

to the data generated from my practice are: going on the Land, a pedagogy of Land (both of these include visits to local places/sites that are teaching places), learning from local community members in and out of class, bringing the Land into the classroom, Language learning, and Treaty education.

Limitations

It is the early days of Indigenous education in faculties of education in Canada; that being the case, there will be great diversity in practice related to Land, some of which was certainly missed given the small sample of educators with whom I shared conversations. Trustworthiness, then, is sought through "the conversations" (see Bishop, 1996, 1997) which helped to co-construct a mutual understanding by means of sharing experiences and meaning (Bishop, 2005). While these understandings are necessarily limited due to the limited number of contexts that participants were drawn from, the findings provide insights from which to think about this work in faculties of Education across Canada. From informal observations and interactions with other practitioners in the field, critical Place-based education appears to be a very promising practice. This work, while not capturing all voices, helps describe how 'we' can support one another to do this work in a good way—in *right relation*— in support of the community of practice that is frequently invoked in the S-STEP literature (see Beck & Kosnick, 2002; Kitchen & Ciuffetelli-Parker, 2009).

Another limitation is my own bias as an Insider Academic, linked professionally to the participants (L. Smith, 2005). That being the case, I am professionally committed to supporting this work in the institutions I am studying, and I struggle with how this work supports my own futurity in this field. I may therefore underreport faults in the practice of cPBE. I am also, as I

have articulated many times in this piece, a white settler. As I wrote earlier, I will be learning for the rest of my life about how this position shapes how I see and act, and I am not aware of all of the ways that it does so. However hard I might work at acting/thinking in solidarity, this will always be a factor and an important consideration.

While none of these participants' first language is an Indigenous language, as many colleagues and friends recover their Nation's languages, I am conscious of what Berger (2008) articulated in his doctoral dissertation on Education in Nunavut:

> Along with style, language provided a challenge during this research. Dorais and Sammons (2002) wrote that 'English encounters problems when it tries to penetrate the Inuit way of thinking; anything connected with the expression of one's innermost self is usually uttered in Inuktitut' (p. 108)….That questions were framed by a Qallunaat [white person] in English, and that most participants responded in English, their second language, may have limited the findings to broader concepts that 'translated well.'

Does my own position mean that I misinterpret the meaning of Indigenous participants' words? It seems certain that I might highlight concepts or parts of the conversations that hold different emphasis for all the participants, Indigenous and non-Indigenous. However, this may pose an additional challenge with the Indigenous participants. While I strive to understand the ways that my perception and practice are shaped by my location, I continue to learn about what I have not seen before in terms of the implications of settler structures and privileges.

These limitations are significant, but they present fascinating opportunities for study beyond this dissertation. I am very excited about this study, and have done my best to approach it with respect, humility, and an open heart. While it is part of my work to report and interpret, I have done my utmost to "open up thinking"—both my own and that of the participants/communities, by presenting this work well.

Chapter 4: Teaching the Class

Teaching a required course in Indigenous Education in teacher education has meant engaging in mandatory anti-racist education. While teaching these classes, I have worked to be aware of, and learn ever more about, my own location as a person with unearned privilege. I continue to benefit from the colonialism I am teaching about, and teach in an institution founded in Eurocentrism, as part of a degree (a bachelor of education) that has been a violent tool of this colonial project in Canada. Doing education differently in all the classes I teach, that is, striving for ethical relationality (Donald, 2009; Kitchen, 2005a, 2005b; LaBoskey, 2004) and relational accountability (Wilson, 2008), means asking students to be accountable to one another, to spend time on the Land, and to centre Indigenous community members and Lands. It also means contending with whiteness and all the ways that whiteness seeks to re-centre itself; this is most evident in the overt and often energetic disavowal of whiteness as racialized privilege and all that it bestows and takes away.

Most importantly though, this work would not be possible for me to do in a way that is in right relation without the web of relationships that I continue to learn from, past, present, and hopefully, future. Accounting for these is what Chambers (2006) calls “an introduction to the relations of social and intellectual kinship that make generation of knowledge about a curriculum of place possible” (p. 114). In this chapter, I will relate my experience of teaching the class; my initial preparation, my discoveries, realizations and mistakes. Transformations from failure and from consistent dialogue and openness with critical friends, publications and presentations, and in advocacy have shaped my syllabi and my practice. Humour has played a very important role in these classes. I also recount the Land-based learning that was at the centre of the classes, and

the places, people, and more-than-human relations we learned from. How did my teaching attend to context, both my own and my students'? To Place? To Land? To settler colonialism? To Indigenous futurities?

EDUC 4416 Aboriginal Education

Context and preparation. At Lakehead University (LU), in 2007, a required course entitled *Aboriginal Education* (*EDUC 4416*) was split out from the existing *Multicultural and Aboriginal Education* course. Until the Indigenous content requirement was doubled for the new two-year Bachelor of Education course in 2015, this course was weighted as a .25 credit; that is, 18 contact hours. For the professional year program, this meant one two-hour class every week for nine weeks. For the concurrent education program, this meant one-and-a-half hours every week for 12 weeks.

The description of the course in the LU course calendar was short: *Theory and strategies of appropriate education for Aboriginal students*. There were no official shared course objectives over the many sections. (These have been developed for the new extended course; I was consulted for this development). Until 2009, there was an unofficial policy that these courses were to be taught by Indigenous faculty members. These courses have usually been taught by a couple of tenured faculty members, and by five or six sessional instructors.

I was hired at Lakehead Orillia to teach the course in 2009-2010. I was the first white instructor to be hired to do so. I have some very clear memories about preparing to teach those first classes. I was very excited, and very nervous. I contacted my former professor at York University, Dr. Joe Sheridan, to talk about approaches and concerns. The very first thing we discussed was that at least one-quarter to one-third of the classes should be led by local community members, and/or take place on the Land. He put me in touch with Vern Douglas,

who was then Elder-in-residence at Trent University, who put me in touch with Mark Douglas who lives in Mnjikaning Rama. Mark Douglas is a Chippewa Elder, officially designated as the "Keeper of the Fish Fence", the Mnjikaning Weirs described earlier and later in this work.

Mark Douglas has been a wonderful support, and led a class in each section that I taught at Lakehead Orillia, including *EDUC 4416*, but also *Foundations and Issues*, *Contemporary Educational Thought*, *Outdoor Education*, and the newer compulsory *Environmental Education* course, which also centres Indigenous Lands and community (at least when taught by me). I went to go see Mark at his home before the start of term to ask him to be a part of the classes.

Building and maintaining this relationship has been deeply important to the classes in Orillia; each semester, I built my schedule around Mark Douglas' class visits in the *EDUC 4416* class and in all of the other classes I taught. The Fish Fence site is twelve minutes from the Lakehead Orillia Education Campus, so holding classes there has been relatively simple. Now, the brand-new Rama Pow Wow grounds also make for a good learning place. That first year of teaching *EDUC 4416*, I crafted the syllabus while I was working as an assistant camp director in Algonquin Park at Camp Wapomeo; I had a beautiful tiny room looking north on Canoe Lake where I dreamed and schemed about what I would teach.

I was instructed to phone Elder and Associate Professor Dolores Wawia, or Muk-kee-Queh, of Gull Bay First Nation for some tips on teaching the class – she had been teaching the class in Thunder Bay for years. Professor Wawia taught using a blend of direct instruction and through a narrative style, recounting her own experiences as an Indigenous person and as a Residential School attendee. I had a sense that I would be teaching a general knowledge course; I already knew from my own experience before arriving at Trent, and from 14 years of trying to change the culture at the Taylor Statten Camps, that there might not be a lot of knowledge about

Indigenous peoples among the students in the B.Ed. classes. Professor Wawia's advice reinforced this view.

I remembered my own experience of learning at Trent, and figured that I would paint in broad strokes, so to speak. From my years of experience in outdoor education, and from my brief learning about constructivist education (Davis et al., 2000; Evernden, 1990) at York, I would start with common ground, and make sure to stick to my own strengths in experiential and outdoor education; to build community within the classroom (although I forgot to do this in the first semester!), to find out what the students already knew and wanted to learn, and to reinforce a minimal amount of direct instruction with learning from the local community directly. Generally speaking, this formula is the one I stuck with throughout the 17 sections, but there was a very steep learning curve at first, for I had woefully underestimated the resistance, and even the hate, that I would encounter in those first classes.

In 2009-2010, I taught eight sections of 40 students, commuting first from Algonquin Park where I was then working as a fall labourer at the summer camp, primarily in a canoe shop, and then from Toronto where I was working retail at MEC Toronto. While in Orillia, in the fall, I was staying at a local motel for one night per week, and teaching four classes over two days. I was completely overwhelmed by the size and structure of the classes (we were squished into very small rooms), and most of all by the profound lack of knowledge that the learners had about Canadian history, and about Indigenous peoples in general. What follows are generalizations of the common themes from comments and concerns in the classes – in doing this doctoral work, I have recognized each utterance as a part of the experience of generations of teachers and scholars doing this anti-racist work, and in particular those working with Indigenous peoples and for justice. These incidences were carefully recorded in my journals.

For the record: What the journals hold. In the first classes, there were several instances where the participants openly challenged the existence of the course. Some claimed (and this in front of the whole class of 40 adults) that Indigenous peoples “made it hard for themselves”; that the pre-service teachers should not be required to learn about them. There were many questions about this being a stand-alone class – that there should be a multicultural education class instead, as this would be more useful to the students, many of whom would be teaching in southern Ontario in classes with a large proportion of new Canadians. Over and over again, I have heard the *perfect stranger* stance (Dion, 2007, 2009) expressed: the assertion that the students had never seen, let alone met, any Indigenous peoples – this despite the presence of Indigenous peers in their classes. In several instances, students claimed that meeting the Elder was the first time they had ever met an Indigenous person, again, there were Indigenous students in their cohort, either openly self-identified or not.

I remember clearly the flush of shock and anger that arose in my chest the first few times I heard these perspectives. I found it both infuriating and embarrassing. I sometimes have a hard time not showing my reactions to peoples’ words in classrooms where I am the instructor, though I am much more practiced at it now. What made a huge difference to how I felt about these assertions was the realization that these violent ignorances were programmed by the education system and by the media. Most of the people in these classes had never learned differently, and their views were reinforced by the absence of these learnings in school and by the biased and stereotype-reinforcing information and perspectives that they consumed from major media outlets. These perspectives were created by systemic failure, and more egregiously, by systemic design (Battiste, 2018).

I learned some big lessons in that first semester. Tompkins (2002) describes affective work, intrapersonal and interpersonal work, as integral elements of these courses; things get emotional. Anger and tears happen, both on the part of the unsettled white students, and on the part of the Indigenous students whose experiences and relations are being opened up (or not). I learned the hard way to vet the student workshops before they presented to the classes, when students used outdated or discredited sources, and when some groups reinforced stereotypes, seeing them as positive. On a few occasions in the first year, class presentations provided a platform for deeply racist opinions and perspectives that presented a teaching challenge for me, having to correct them, and for the members of the class for whom these perspectives were personally violent.

I learned that there is a lot of misinformation and poor sources of information available through the internet, and that I would have to be very specific about what constitutes a good source. I learned to create very detailed rubrics regarding assignments. I learned that because I encouraged open discussion and feedback in the classes, these classes sometimes became a venting mechanism for the intense stress and frustration of the students about the B.Ed. year in general. I learned that part of teaching this course in a B.Ed. program meant contending with whole rooms full of people who thought that being a teacher means being an expert authority in all subjects…and that subsequently, their lack of knowledge about Indigenous peoples and about this part of Canadian history and citizenship was unfathomable, and inspired rage, frustration and fear in them. These early and raw experiences have stuck with me. Having documented many of them in the journals has provided me with important material to help me reflect upon and process these experiences so that I have been better prepared to contend with challenges in the classroom. In some cases, I have been able to re-design discussions and activities to avoid some

of the non-productive tensions that emerged in the classes. Also, I continue to share the challenges and patterns I encountered as more institutions and instructors across Canada share similar experiences.

I warn readers that elements of what I describe next are disturbing. I have had several students tell me that the subject matter of the Indian Act and Residential Schools was "too depressing". I have heard many people express fear about behaving or speaking in a way that was offensive. I have heard complaints about political correctness, and had people assert that their Indigenous friends have insisted that there is no problem of race, stereotype or terminology. I have had several (non-Indigenous) people assert that they could 'do' teachings because an Elder had told them they could. I have been told with absolute certainty that there is no treaty or comprehensive land claim where the student lives; that there are no Indigenous people left; that there are no reserves in Southern Ontario (settler zero point epistemology, Bang et al., 2014, *terra nullius*); that all the Indigenous languages are dead (Vanishing Indian [Francis, 1992]); that someone is not Indigenous (Inuit, First Nations, Métis) if they hunt with a gun, use a snowmachine, use the internet, have a tv (Vanishing Indian, authenticity [Francis, 1992; Raibmon, 2005]); that the Residential Schools were not so bad; that Indigenous sports mascots have nothing to do with *actual* Indigenous peoples; that Indigenous addicts should be sterilized; that Indigenous peoples are a conquered people (singular); that Indigenous peoples do not pay taxes. I would like to point out that the reason I can report all of this is that I heard these claims so many times that they constitute generalized comments/assertions; they are written in multiple places in my journals. These were the misconceptions – the absences of knowledge are equally, if not more, troubling.

The common ignorances that I encountered were as pervasive as the misconceptions. A vast majority of the students in these classes had never heard of Residential Schools, of the Indian Act, of Treaties, of the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, and had no inkling of the sheer diversity and numbers of Indigenous peoples and communities in Canada. A particular ignorance that I marked is the lack of awareness of the northern reserves in Ontario – of the water issues, the resource and housing concerns, and the education context there; that is, that there are so few secondary schools in the north. But just as concerning was the very common assertion that there are no Indigenous people in urban settings too.

Regularly encountering these ignorances attests to the need for effective disruption of settler colonialism. Early in my teaching—by the second semester—these experiences reinforced my motivation to use cPBE to help people, in the short span of time I had with them, to move from where they were (or thought they were) to a less colonizing, less dysconscious, more ethical, relationality. This work is not easy now, then it seemed impossibly difficult. I needed support, and I found it in some of my colleagues.

Critical friends to the rescue. The challenges that I encountered in these first classes were very overwhelming. Luckily, I had the support and mentorship of two critical friends, Ruth Beatty and Frances Helyar, to support me in learning administrative ropes, and to find the compassion to understand where I needed to be compassionate, and where I needed to set clearer boundaries, both in terms of expectations of behavior in classes, and in terms of responses to assignments. While neither had taught compulsory anti-racist education nor had deep knowledge of these topics, they helped me navigate expectations and structure to provide a better learning experience both for me and for the pre-service teachers; they gave me a sense of how much work

might be reasonable for assignments, and told me who to ask about honoraria. While they were not specifically mentors in using cPBE, the support they provided in adapting generally to university teaching was invaluable.

It became evident to me that the challenge of refining this class was going to be in finding a balance between addressing the profound and violent lack of information/knowledge about Indigenous peoples in Canada and fostering both a will and a skill set to encourage the pre-service teachers to teach differently than they were taught—to teach Indigenous students well and to bring Indigenous perspectives and peoples into their classes with respect and resurgence as foundations. Grappling with white privilege and with racism and oppression was a current running throughout all of the topics and sessions in the classes; in 2010, Gerald Walton provided me with excellent language and resources to understand these and other challenges better, including gendered violence. In the next section, I will specifically address some of the challenges I encountered, and how I changed my syllabi, pedagogy and resources to reflect this learning.

From experience, reflection and dialogue come change: The syllabi. There are many things that I learned in that first semester that were hard lessons in pedagogy, in instructional design, and in my own conduct. I also encountered some structural challenges that continue to plague me to this day. In this section, I detail changes I made both structurally and personally in response to ongoing challenges and feedback in the classes. These include more than the cPBE elements of my teaching.

As I look through my syllabi, the responses to the experiences of teaching this class are noticeable. On my first syllabus, the course objectives are:

> Aboriginal Education is an issue and an opportunity that is rising in profile daily. This course will examine the historical legacies and contemporary contexts of incredibly diverse Aboriginal communities and learners. With a better understanding of Aboriginal cultures, histories and perspectives, pre-service teachers can create more appropriate and effective strategies to meet the needs of Aboriginal students, and can more respectfully and accurately create space for Aboriginal history and contemporary realities in educational curricula for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students. Each and every student should complete this course with the tools to make proactive and respectful connections with their local First Nations in order to invite and promote a greater understanding about and learning from and with First Nations communities. (Scully, 4416 syllabus, 2009

Over the syllabi of the next five years, there are many incremental changes. In the course objectives, there is one change and one added sentence:

> Each and every student should complete this course with the tools to make proactive and respectful connections with their local Indigenous communities in order to invite and promote a greater understanding about and learning from and with Indigenous peoples. Authentic engagement and care are at the heart of good teaching practice for all learners. (Scully, 4416 syllabus, 2015)

Looking back, it is egregious to me that I only included First Nations in this paragraph in 2009. I became aware that I needed to be explicitly inclusive of Métis, Inuit and non-Status community members. I had planned that we would be connecting with Mnjikaning/Rama, and that we were on the territory of the Chippewa Tri-council, but I quickly realized that I needed to change this language. Despite that I had included learning about and from Métis, Inuit and non-Status peoples in the course, I had not modeled it in my objectives. Additionally, although I had been taught at Trent to privilege the word Indigenous, it was only when I became more comfortable in the institution that I felt comfortable doing so in the syllabus (although I always did so in class). The change in the final sentence reflects a theme that emerged in the 17 sections

of the course—that each learner, both in the pre-service teacher context and in the K-12 context, thrives through connection.

There were other changes in the syllabi over time too. I roughly halved the amount of written work required by 2015 as I came to understand this course in relation to the other coursework required in other classes, and also to provide students with an opportunity to go deeper, and to spend more time collaborating on assignments—to building their communities of practice. By 2014, I included very specific instructions about expected class conduct in terms of listening, respect, kindness, and generosity of perspective. Interestingly, the more time I spend in Indigenous learning contexts, the more I understand how positive and constructive it is to articulate these ethics and expectations of behaviour and attitude. This is especially evident in the successes over the last few years in the Mnjikaning Kendaaswin school (Principal Nicholas Howard, personal communication, September 2016); this will be explained further later.

There are some features of this course that stayed the same throughout the 17 sections. There were four such elements: 1) We began many classes with icebreakers/community builders, 2) At least one class is led by an Elder, and at least one by a local community member, 3) At least one class takes place on the Land and/or on reserve, and 4) There are three core assignments: the Local Assignment, a group project to gather resources for the class on a topic (Residential Schools, stereotypes, MMIWG, books/authors, art, hip hop, media), and a culminating short paper reflecting on an experience of learning or engagement with Indigenous community. The syllabi provide evidence of the commitment I have as an instructor in using cPBE—each of these objectives explicitly require students to attend to the people they are with, the Place they are in and to the Land they are on—to ethical relationality. Throughout this teaching work, I have been committed to two core principles: *Land as First Teacher*, and *All my*

relations. Although, with reflection and with writing this dissertation, I have come to see these practices, and my relationship to them, very differently.

Living Contradictions and Vulnerability

As I wrote about earlier, one of the first presentations that I made about teaching *EDUC 4416* and my doctoral work in studying my own practice was for the Graduate Student Conference at Lakehead in Thunder Bay. The title of the poster presentation was, *Failure as Transformation: Critical Reflections as a White Teacher educator in Aboriginal Education*. In particular, the failure that I was referring to was that despite my assertion in my *Statement of Purpose* in my application to the PhD program that *EDUC 4416* should be taught similarly to outdoor education, with great attentiveness to community building within the classroom, I realized, in the fall of 2010, that I had not in fact done this. I had not attended to the initial community building practices that are so central to outdoor education, and to some environmental and Place-based education (Woodhouse & Knapp, 2000), in my experience as a guide and an educator. This is a good example of the living contradictions theorized by Whitehead (1989), and this realization humbled me and gave me an opportunity to be vulnerable, in public and about my practice, as is required in S-STEP.

In part, I think I was very nervous about classroom teaching and teaching at the university, as all of my teaching until being hired by Lakehead was in outdoor and experiential education. I did the very thing I was trying to trouble – I taught how I have often been taught in that setting – through direct instruction with everyone in their seats in the classroom. It was not until I reflected on the teaching, and settled in a bit, that I realized that I had a couple of much

better models for such teaching: My time at Trent, learning from Elders, and most of my outdoor education (OE) and experiential education experience, including some classes at York.

In the years following this realization, I have started each and every course with some of the classic icebreaker and community building activities that are ubiquitous in OE, and uncommon in other disciplines. Tompkins (2002), who also has a background in OE, also writes of the importance of this practice. A great deal of grumbling happens at first. However, what these games contribute is a sense of play and relationship that seems to generate more goodwill in the classes. These games are great levelers; being silly together, and my own willingness to be silly or vulnerable, sets up a more respectful dynamic in the class for the hard, unsettling work that is to come. The building of community within these classrooms attends to cPBE as it honours ethical relationality between the learners as they come to see how they are positioned amongst themselves, as pre-service teachers, and to the communities and Land we are learning from.

When I was in Pangnirtung for the Bush School, we as a group spent a week out on Cumberland Sound in a hunting and fishing camp. In the morning, we sewed with the Elders. Once the tide was right, we would go out in the boats on the Arctic Sea and the hunters would hunt for *natsirq* (ringed seal). One day, we went fishing for *iqaluk* (char). Among the many highlights of this time was the almost-daily practice of playing games at night. The head of the camp was Joanisie Kaapik, and the head hunter was Jaco Ishulutaq, who is also a very famous carver. Each night, there would be prizes for the game winners, some made by Jaco. These games were such an important part of camp life; everyone tried, looked silly, demonstrated some perhaps hidden skill, and best of all, laughed and laughed. This was an incredibly important part of the community feeling on the land. These games dissolved some of the stress and tension

inherent in close cohabitation, and inherent in the miscommunications and tensions that come with interactions between cultures/worldviews. Laughing and playing together brought the group closer together, and contributed to a greater level of comfort in the group. This comfort can also be accessed through the use of humour.

Humour

"Comedy is too important not to be taken seriously."

Oneida comedian Charlie Hill

"If you want to tell people the truth, make them laugh, otherwise they'll kill you."

Oscar Wilde, or maybe George Bernard Shaw. An Irishman, anyway.

I have thought of the second quote every time I teach this class. It is widely reported by Indigenous peoples from all walks of life that humour is central to Indigenous cultures and to the resilience of Indigenous peoples in the face of the multiple and ongoing oppressions (Hayden Taylor, 2005). Anishinaabe comedian Ryan McMahon spoke seriously with me about the fallacy of underestimating the role of humour for Indigenous cultures: Far from being a simple coping mechanism, humour holds a central and complex function in transmitting Indigenous teachings, ethics and values through story, teasing, and role-modeling (personal communication, November 23rd, 2017). I try pretty hard to be funny sometimes, mostly at my own expense, and I do find that this tactic is an important balance to the gravity of some of the subject matter.

I think I took myself a bit too seriously at first – I did not have many funny professors in my own university experience, with the notable exception of Cayuga faithkeeper and Chief Jake Thomas, who was hilarious. I am very grateful for the many Indigenous humourists whose work

I use in the class, including Mohawk scholar Karen Froman (2005), Thomas King (2007, 2008) and Drew Hayden Taylor (2005). Additionally, the Elders who have been regulars in the class love to tease and joke around. This is true of both Elder Mark Douglas and of Elder Gerry Martin. Nancy Stevens is also very funny, and her use of humour in the classes she engages in exemplifies the importance of humour to teach and to lighten.

Again, over the years, I have come to recognize and be very grateful for humour as a way of opening people up to new perspectives. Another example of the importance of humour is in teasing. In a couple of circumstances, I have felt a new level of acceptance when I start to be teased by community members. This usually only comes after some time spent, and shows the importance of spending time, over time, in relationship building. The same is true in teaching; it is important to consider the long game, that is, the effect of the materials, relationships, and learnings over the long term. Humour, and teasing, in these contexts has supported the relationship building across power and location (keeping in mind the adage that *satire punches up*, that is, that satire and humour can trouble oppressions and privileges in a good way when directed against those with more power than the humourist has, but can be denigrating when directed at those with less).

What does humour have to do with Place? It can expose positionality, context, common experiences, and observations in-place. In this tricky work, laughing together might make it easier to experience other emotions together too. Some students have come back in touch with me years later to seek new materials or to let me know how a certain experience in the class affected them. While the effects might not always be evident during the class, the hope is that there is some lasting effect. One way that 'playing the long game' in these classes has been

structured is in building in requirements that the students create communities of practice (Kitchen & Ciuffetelli-Parker, 2009; Lave & Wenger, 1991) within the course.

Communities of Practice

Since 2009, it has been my practice to ask the students to anonymously submit questions, concerns and/or most wanted subjects at the end of the first class. These scraps of paper have become valuable records of the recurring themes that need to be addressed in the classes. These themes have been recorded in the journals, and have been taken into consideration in designing syllabi. By far the most prevalent request from the students has been a plea for resources. Teacher candidate requests for a “recipe card” or a blueprint—something that they can just take into the classroom with them and go—are ubiquitous in my experience and in the teacher education literature (St. Denis, 2007). This request may reflect the students’ perception of mastery, and their unease about the subject matter. This request is also often coupled with a concern about terminology and the fear of offending. At the beginning of teaching the classes, I did not attend to this request for resources as directly as I did later in my teaching practice.

In later classes, I introduced the group presentations as opportunities for resource collection for the class. This practice has been very successful on two fronts: It means that the students are accountable to their classmates in providing quality resources that align with the Ministry of Education requirements for lesson plans for classroom teachers, *and* they appreciate one another’s contributions to their teaching toolkits. I have found that giving them an opportunity to teach in class and to learn from one another is appreciated, and takes some of the focus off my particular style, shortcomings or perceived bias. We are creating communities of practice (Kitchen & Ciuffetelli-Parker 2009; Lave & Wenger, 1991) in our classes.

This contributes greatly to what I call the long game in the class: I will not be able to reach every student, but part of learning from their classmates means that I can hope that they learn better/differently from another person, so the odds are greater that they will be shifted in some way. Additionally, I hope that they will see the benefit of collective collaboration and learning—that the group learning that they were required to do in these classes proves valuable to them as they craft their own teaching practices. Collaboration and relationship building is crucial to cPBE, both within and beyond institutions. One of the important messages that I hope to communicate in these classes is that they need not be experts—that there are great resources available, and that their job is in relationship building more than in developing mastery. Building relationships with knowledge keepers and local communities is necessary to right relation/ethical relationality on Indigenous Lands. One tool that I have used that has helped immeasurably in developing these group projects, and in emphasizing the importance of relationships, is the use of contracts.

Contracts. In Bachelor of Education programs, there tends to be a lot of group work. For some, this is a huge source of frustration; these required communities of practice sometimes backfire. In the early classes, there was a great deal of frustration and inequitable division of labour and praise in these groups. In my second year of teaching, I started to ask the groups to develop group contracts, detailing the division of tasks, preferred methods and frequency of communication, and timelines. The groups were asked to hand these in at the end of the second class. An additional requirement was to make sure to honour each participant's strengths and preferences, and to share praise/credit where that was due. In this way, not all members of the group would have to be a vocal presenter/facilitator, as long as their contribution was of equal

value and this was communicated to their peers. This clarified expectations and tasks in a way that I found alleviated a great deal of stress and worry in the groups. Now, reflecting on this pedagogy in the context of S-STEP (Kitchen, 2005a), I see contracts as an important way of attending to the relational accountability in the class. Contracts are documents that resist mainstream education's emphasis on individual work, achievement and competition. In this way, we have concretized collaboration and the understanding that your evaluation depends on your interactions and support of one another.

As I look back over the years of teaching this class, I have come to realize that all three of these changes, that is, the community building, the communal resources gathering, and the contracts, are specifically concerned with relationships. These practices are about respect, reciprocity and accountability. In developing practices that support respectful relationships in the classroom, these classroom communities seem to be more positive, and more open to the unsettling that is a necessary part of this work. The icebreakers contribute humility, the communal work highlights interrelationship and collaboration, and the contracts contribute accountability. Being open about what these cPBE practices contribute to the classes has opened up discussions about accountability and respect – relationality – on the next scale, that is, interrelationship with Indigenous peoples and Lands.

Land-based learning

In making sense of my own practice, and in linking my practice to the practices of the participants in the conversations, I arrived at several categories of Land-based learning. These are: going on the Land, a pedagogy of Land (both of these include visits to local places/sites that are teaching places), learning from local community members in and out of class, bringing the

Land into the classroom, Language learning, and Treaty education**.** In this section, I will describe how these have been enacted in my own practice.

On the Land. One of the central tenets of this dissertation is the importance of learning about/with/from Indigenous peoples by learning on the Land. There is no substitute or alternative to being out of the classroom, with feet on the ground, learning from a particular place. Land is the root of Indigenous lifeways, languages, epistemologies and ontologies; learning in a good way means learning from the Land. It is insufficient to merely leave the classroom; in some way, attention must be directed to the Land itself, and this attention must be followed by reflection for the pre-service teachers regarding the feeling, value, and understanding that has taken place. These learnings can start small: an Indigenous place name, a plant, a story. For Indigenous education, these learnings are connected to / led by local community members, and in this way, the pre-service teachers begin to see, or reaffirm, that they are always already in relation (Scully, 2012).

Learning the Indigenous name for, story of, or teaching about, a place or a plant that is already a part of the daily life of the pre-service teacher shifts the 'knowledge' that the learner has arrived with. They already have a relationship with that place/plant (or if they didn't really notice before, they will now), and the relationship expands to include new information. The places, plants, even people that form the materiality of the daily lives of the pre-service teachers are 'known' by Indigenous people too; this is common ground, the context.

In many different places and contexts, I have heard over and over again how good the pre-service teachers feel and/or how inspired they are when we spend time outside. Over and over again, I hear: "I never knew this was here" or "I never saw it that way before". The dynamic

in the classroom community changes for the better each time we spend time outside. It is my hope that this is part of what the pre-service teachers leave my classroom with: A will to learn from the Land where they are. I also recognize that obstacles arise to being consistent in this practice, just as they did for me.

When I began teaching at the LU Orillia campus, I was chagrined to discover that it would prove very difficult to take the classes outside from the Heritage Place building. In the first year, I did not do so at all. The classrooms that I taught in were in downtown Orillia, at a major crossroad in the town, and there was little nearby greenspace. As a new faculty member, I was a bit hesitant to push on the policies regarding meeting outside the classroom; this reluctance is reported in the conversations (Toby, Heron) and in the teacher education literature as being common in new teachers (Tompkins, 2002). As an outdoor educator, I had not encountered this problem before; all of my work had assumed that most of the instruction and experience would happen outside.

At York, during my master's in Environmental Studies, many of my classes took place outside at least some of the time. From my master's work, I was committed to the concept that wherever we are is "nature"; however, I had never taught in a place where going outside of the school building was a challenge from both a logistical and structural perspective. At Lakehead University in Orillia, which is frequently characterized as a commuter campus, part of the campus is downtown and the newer building Simcoe Hall, which is located right off the 400 series highway, is adjacent to some farmers' fields. One can walk on the edges of these to reach a wooded lot that is public land, but the fields are privately owned.

At the Heritage Place building, it would take too much class time to take the class to walk together to the closest park, and leaving the classroom meant registering with the security office

and filing risk management forms and release forms for each student. While this is still the case, thanks to experience and to the support and direction of critical friends like Frances Helyar and Bob Jickling, I am much more at ease with these procedures now, and do not hesitate to ask the students to meet at alternate locations. Time in the class is still lost, as we must be mindful of travel time, but I am committed to these practices. Convening my classes in local sites (Mnjikaning Fish Fence, the Mnjikaning Kendaaswin school on Rama First Nation, and now the new Pow Wow grounds on Rama First Nation) proved to be the most pedagogically rewarding choices in Orillia. They all connect people to places and all disrupt white teacher candidates' common notions, opening space for different futures. For these reasons, I consider them to be good cPBE practices. More than this, too, these practices enact *Land as First Teacher*.

I have heard these concerns about policy echoed in the worries of teachers regarding outdoor education; teachers, especially new teachers, are loath to resist common practices or to innovate, as they are concerned about job security and fearful of censure. Lack of familiarity with policies also contributes to this institutional barrier.

At the Lakehead campus in Thunder Bay, taking the class outside is easy and encouraged; there are extensive and beautiful grounds surrounding the education building. The walk to the Sweat Lodge Site and Medicine Garden is achievable in class time, although it might take up all of the class time! In my teaching to date, there have been no issues of accessibility reported to me. This is a very important consideration, though—mobility and preparedness to spend time outside may mean that different options must be considered. Some of my classes took place in what is now the Law building, downtown, which used to be the Port Arthur Collegiate Institute building. These classes all took place in winter; while we did not spend time outside, there was an incredible view of the iconic Sibley Peninsula—the Sleeping Giant. Sharing the

story of this icon meant that we were connected to Thunder Bay as an Indigenous place in each class.

A big difference that I found in teaching at the two campuses—Thunder Bay and Orillia—is that the Indigenous population of Thunder Bay is so large (around 12.6 % of the population according to the census [Statistics Canada, 2016], although 'common knowledge' places it much higher now) that the 'need' for a dedicated class in Indigenous Education was more evident to the students. Additionally, Lakehead Thunder Bay has a more active and visible commitment to Indigenous services, events and supports. The Fall Harvest that takes place in the first few weekends of the fall term is a great introduction for the students to spending time outside and learning from local Indigenous peoples. It includes many activities such as wild rice processing, drumming and singing, Elder plant walks, a market, and some ceremony. There is always lots of food! This event is one that I implored students to participate in or at least attend as a great introduction to local Indigenous community in Thunder Bay.

While my practice in Thunder Bay was better supported by the institution on-campus in terms of time spent outside and connecting with community members to come in to my classes, I notice that my practice in Orillia was different, and perhaps richer, due to the time we spent on Rama First Nation and at sites like the Mnjikaaning Fish Fence. Perhaps leaving the institution (the university) is important for a better representation of cPBE. After all, as I continuously argue, it is particular places, and specific Land, that must be attended to – that we must enact our relational accountability to.

Land as First Teacher. *Land as First Teacher* is a principle that I was taught by Anishinaabe-kwe Elder Edna Manitowabi at Trent University in the early 1990s. Recently, I have seen echoes of this teaching in the education discourse articulated as *a pedagogy of Land*

(Haig-Brown & Dannemann, 2002), and as L. Simpsons' *Land as pedagogy* (2014). Both the Local Assignment and the classes that take place on the Land honour this teaching: The Land is the source of the knowledges, languages, economies and epistemologies of Indigenous peoples, and must be respected as a teacher in this context. The Local Assignment accomplishes this by honouring the place-knowledge of the learners (they must choose a place that they feel connected to, or somewhere they would like to teach), and then extends their knowledge of place by seeking Treaties, comprehensive land claims, Indigenous communities, place names, resources, and languages that grew in that place. However, nothing can replace actually being on the Land; a Land-based learning requires this action and communion. "If you want to learn something, you need to take your body onto the land and do it. Get a practice" (L. Simpson, 2014, pp. 17-18).

Taking the classes outside and/or to a local Indigenous community place, and doing so in a way that is specific and critical, further connects the learners to the place that we are learning in/on. These pedagogies bring us to *All my relations;* one interpretation of this teaching, also imparted by Elder Manitowabi, describes that we are all connected, and that it is simply a matter of uncovering these connections. For this is the work of compulsory Indigenous Education in teacher education—supporting the sometimes very uncomfortable understanding that all Canadians are implicated in a just future for Indigenous peoples and lands…we are always already in relation. Land and community relationships are at the heart of Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education. In these classes, there were core experiences that provided the best connections between the pre-service teachers and the local territories and communities. The following section outlines the contributions of the particular experiences in the classes.

The Mnjikaning Fish Weirs. I have mentioned the Fish Weirs several times in this work, and I would like to write a bit about the experience of going there for class. Orillia is located at

the place where Lake Couchiching and Lake Simcoe meet. Couchiching is a much smaller lake. Originally, the community that is now Rama lived on the spot that is now the Metro grocery store on the west side of the lake in Orillia (Vicki Snache, personal communication, September 21st, 2016). The Rama First Nation is now on the east side of Lake Couchiching. In order to travel from Orillia to Rama First Nation, it is necessary to take Hwy 12 for about 15 minutes, and to travel over where Lake Couchiching meets Lake Simcoe. This confluence, in settler terms, is named the Atherley Narrows.

The Narrows is an important passage on the Trent-Severn Waterway; there is a great deal of boat traffic. So, it is a 'highway' for large motorized boat traffic, as well as being traversed by a four-lane highway bridge. Hwy 12 is a major thoroughfare for the region. Zhooniyaang-zaaga'igan (Of the Silver Lake) is Lake Simcoe. It flows into Lake Couchiching. These lakes connect to Waaseyaagami-wiikwed (Shining Waters Bay), also called Georgian Bay, on Gichi-aazhoogami-gichigami (Great Crosswaters Sea), also called Lake Huron (The Decolonial Atlas, 2015). Georgian Bay is reached through the Severn River to the west, and the Talbot River can be taken to the Kawarthas and to Lake Ontario (Niigani-gichigami [Leading Sea]) to the east (The Decolonial Atlas, 2015). This Trent-Severn waterway has been a major transportation route in this territory since time immemorial, connecting Anishinaabe, Wyandot, and Haudenosaunee peoples from various territories.

For at least 5,000 years, this place, where Lake Simcoe flows into Lake Couchiching, has been a sacred and significant gathering place for Indigenous communities[18]. At this site, there is a Fishing Weir – a mnjikaning – that has been carbon-dated to at least 4,000 years ago. This weir

---

[18] The following information regarding the Fish Fence is all attributed to learning from Elder Mark Douglas of Rama First Nation. Personal communication, 2009 – 2016.

is a magnificent technology: a harvesting tool where the communities would come together to harvest and process large quantities of fish for the coming winter. The weir consists of young trees, stripped and trimmed, held in place from canoes, being driven into the muck on the floor of the Narrows by using large flat rocks. These trees were placed at regular intervals to form paddocks to gather fish of a certain size and maturity. The pregnant fish were released, and the young fish swam through the weir. Each family grouping would have their own paddock, and would take turns helping one another to harvest and process the fish for their family for the winter.

These gatherings held great significance for the communities: These were opportunities for council, for news, for relationship-building and maintaining, for trade, for romance. Elder Mark is careful to describe the importance of the *good mind* in the work of these gatherings – that animosity and grievances were left away from the site, in service of the importance of harmonious work and relationships. For my most recent class here, Mark described the site as a major power centre for Land and Indigenous peoples in this territory. As mentioned earlier, Mark has been designated as the Keeper of the Fish Fence, and it is part of his responsibility as a community Elder to advocate for and teach about the site. While not all of my Orillia classes have learned at the site, all have learned from Mark about the site. Those classes that learn at the site experience something extra, in that the very context is so illustrative of both the power of the Land, and of the processes of colonization and the impact they have had on Land and on communities. These practices are examples of centring Land-bassed learning in cPBE.

The participants in the class travel to the site via car, on Hwy 12. My directions are not super clear, I will admit:

> Tomorrow, we are meeting at 11am at the Fish Fence. Turn hard right immediately after crossing the Atherley Narrows Bridge, as if you were headed to the Blue Beacon Marina.

> Park on the side of the laneway, and proceed to the path indicated by the National Historic Site sign to the right of the road.
>
> Here is a google map to the site from Heritage Place… (4374 Syllabus, FA 2016)

It has been designated as a National Historic Site – and all of the signage refers to the settlers, the explorers, and the Huron (Wyandot). Once there, you proceed down a small path, bordered on one side by a large chain-link fence (to prevent intrusion into the Blue Beacon Marina, one presumes), and on the other side by a slightly murky but overgrown marsh to a pair of signs, described above. There, you make a right-hand turn, over a pretty herringbone-patterned wooden bridge (single file), and proceed to the large area covered in paving stones, directly under the highway overpass. There is a large piece of granite—a grandfather—in the middle of the area, obviously carefully placed there, as the paving stone pattern has been set to highlight the stone.

While the Fish Fence itself is under water, and off several hundred feet to the left of the site as you face the water, there is gravity in this place. It is a very curious juxtaposition of reverence and modernity, listening to the Elder, the geese, swans and pigeons, with the traffic thundering overhead. We unlearn the information from the signs while we lean forward and back to negotiate the noise levels, depending on the weight (and noise) of the cars and trucks overhead. This experience is powerful in ways that are hard to explain. The students are rapt for the entire time, and always comment that they had "no idea this was here" afterwards. I learn something new every time I go, and feel a bit more deeply connected to this territory where I am a visitor and a teacher in troubling times.

This is a good place to learn about the Four Sacred Medicines, and Mark frequently offers a smudge[19] at the end of his talk. Classes at and about the Fish Fence are particularly powerful in the Orillia context; this experience does a great job of linking past and present, natural and built environment, and human and more-than-human. For me and for the other settlers in the classes, this experience disrupts colonialism by showing that particular places hold relationships and meanings despite what is laid overtop of them; in this case, here is site of meeting, travel, technology, and economy for both ancient and current communities.

Indigenous futurities require settlers to understand the knowledge and dynamism of Indigenous economies, technologies and relationships to places; the sustainable harvesting practices demonstrated at a major confluence of land- and water-travel show how settlers learned from Indigenous knowledges and usages of places, and might continue to do so. Respecting and acknowledging this debt is part of paving the way towards restitution and right relation.[20] The experience here shows the power, ingenuity and sophistication of Indigenous peoples through time in this place. Another very powerful experience that shows the potential for healthy Indigenous futurity is the visit to Mnjikaning Kendaaswin.

Mnjikaning Kendaaswin Elementary School. Mnjikaning Kendaaswin Elementary School (MKES) is the elementary school on Rama First Nation. Since I started teaching in Orillia in 2009, all of my classes have had the opportunity to go to MKES, to see what

---

[19] Smudge – Nookweziganoon The smudging ceremony is a purification ceremony. Any one of the four sacred medicines can be used. Sometimes all of the sacred medicines are used. The most common one is mashkodewashk, otherwise known as sage in English. Some pipe carriers and Elders recommend that when people refer to these medicines, it should be in Anishinaabemowin. These medicines are picked from Mother Earth just for the purpose of purification. The four sacred medicines are asemaa (tobacco), wiingashk (sweetgrass), mashkodewashk (sage) and giishkaandag (cedar). (from Swan, M. (n.d.) - as collected by Little River Band of Ottawa Indians, Anishinaabemowin Program - Kenny Pheasant, Director)

[20] The Williams Treaty and the Coldwater-Narrows Specific Land Claim are very important and ongoing questions in this territory.

Indigenous education can look like. Since 2013, my classes have benefitted enormously from the leadership and generosity of Principal Nicholas Howard. He took over the principal role at MKES the year that I moved to Thunder Bay to learn and teach; he has now been there for seven years, and the school has thrived enormously under his leadership.

Traveling to the school is pretty straightforward from the LU Orillia Education campus. We travel along the same Hwy 12 that we took to the Fish Weir. We travel past the Narrows to Rama Rd, turn left, and proceed along the main road into Rama First Nation. For many, this is their first time on a reserve. We pass the formidable Casino Rama, and arrive at MKES 14 minutes after leaving LU. I use the Mjnikaning Arena Sports Ki as a landmark; it is conjoined with the school, and is better signed from the road than MKES is.

The first view of the school is already beautiful: there are gardens, paintings, sculptures, and the building itself looks like a lodge instead of an institution. When you walk in, after being admitted through the locked doors and signing in, you are in a large foyer with skylights and a beautiful collection of art, some by students, but dominated by a huge painting by famous Anishinaabe artist Norman Knott, from Curve Lake First Nation. Even the foyer feels great, and is a wonderful introduction to the school. Principal Howard greets us here or in the large music room, and we are given instructions to roam freely, to ask questions, and to take in all of the beautiful wall adornments, and not to take pictures of the children. We agree to reconvene after about 40 minutes so that Principal Howard can give us a chat, and answer the questions that inevitably arise.

I bring the pre-service teachers to the school for several reasons. First and foremost, the school and its programs are shining examples of student- and Anishinaabe-centred learning. From the amazing art on the walls, to the scent of sage in the air, there is a general sense of well-

being and attention to Anishinaabe culture and language throughout the building that is incredibly inspiring and grounding. The announcements and the Canadian national anthem happen in Anishinaabemowin, the Seven Grandfather Teachings[21] form the code of behaviour for the school, and there are images of the more-than-human co-inhabitants of the territory with their Anishinaabemowin names throughout the school. The language program is strong, and everywhere you look there is a deep commitment to hands-on learning, and Land-based programming, music education, and wholistic education.

The Seven Grandfather teachings are a strong cultural leitmotif throughout the school – they are repeated in posters and in artworks lining the hallways and the classrooms. *The Mishomis Book*, produced by Anishinaabe Elder Edward Benton Banai (1988), is used as a foundational text in the school; the Grandfather teachings story is within. The Grandfather ethics are also repeated throughout the year as weekly themes, and are used as tools in restorative justice and consequence actions for behavioural issues. This reinforcement of Anishinaabe story and ethic has proven to be a most powerful tool in supporting the agency, self-concept and self-esteem of the students. L. Simpson (2014) contextualizes the theory behind this practice in this way:

> A 'theory' in its simplest form is an explanation of a phenomenon, and Nishnaabeg stories in this way form the theoretical basis of our intelligence. But theory also works a little differently within Nishnaabeg thought. 'Theory' is generated and regenerated

---

[21] Chapter 8 – The Seven Grandfathers and the Little Boy
There were seven grandfathers who were given the responsibility to watch over the people of the earth by the Creator. They realized life was hard for the people of earth, so they sent their helper to earth to find a human they could teach in their ways. The boy grew and he was instructed very young and taken to all four corners of the earth. As he grew up the boy was given seven gifts and was sent home with Otter as a chaperone in order to bring his people these gifts. These gifts were wisdom, love, respect, bravery, honesty, humility and truth, as well as the knowledge of the four directions.

https://mishomisbook.wordpress.com/chapter-summaries/

> continually through embodied practice and within each family, community and generation of people. 'Theory' isn't just an intellectual pursuit – it is woven within kinetics, spiritual presence and emotion, it is contextual and relational. It is intimate and personal, with individuals themselves holding the responsibilities for finding and generating meaning within their own lives. (p. 7)

Weaving the Seven Grandfather teachings throughout the school in imagery, behavioural expectations, and valuing Anishinaabe stories and teachings in practice has had a wonderful and positive effect on the school community. Principal Howard speaks with great pride about the plummeting incidences of behavioural issues and about the exceptional EQAO (standardized test) results from the last couple of years. While there is deep irony here in achieving a Eurocentric measure of 'success' in education—might this be furthering colonization through Indigenous means?—it also demonstrates that academic achievement on Eurocentric terms *and* greater wellbeing is possible for Indigenous students, using Indigenous tools, in an Indigenous context. The pre-service teachers report seeing kindergarten students leading smudges, and a general feeling of warmth and pride in the school.

We are welcomed in; all of the students and teachers are aware that we are there, and we wander throughout the school with classes in process. The teachers are excited to tell us about their programs and projects, and the pre-service teachers are inspired by the language classes, the drum groups, the catapult projects, and Rocky the Tortoise. When we reconvene after a period of wandering, there are many, many questions, mainly about future employment possibilities and if a student or teacher must be Anishinaabe to come to / work at the school. Principal Howard is very clear with the LU students that this is an exception in the context of federally-funded First Nations schools: That the reason that the school is able to do the amazing programming and community support that it does is due in a large part to money from the Rama First Nation chief

and council that is far above and beyond what is provided by the Canadian government. Without this money, he would have 1/3 fewer teachers, and no Educational Assistants, in a school where 25% of their student population has registered exceptionalities. He is also quick to point out that the EQAO numbers are great – that they have tested at or above provincial levels consistently for six years.

Bringing the pre-service teachers to the reserve, to a wonderful school, filled with successful students and exemplary teaching and a fabulous learning environment, facilitates Land and place-based learning, in this case in an Anishinaabe context, that provokes the most positive responses from the participants in the classes. These responses were recorded in my journals, in the instructor evaluations, and were repeated over and over again in the group debriefs in the final classes. The pre-service teachers flock to Principal Howard after the excursion to inquire about job applications, and I regularly heard that this school, and Principal Howard himself, gave them hope and vision about what they want their teaching practice to look like. Many participants have articulated that being at the school completely changed their perspective on what 'good' Indigenous education might look like. These thriving students, and this beautiful school, completely disrupt the negative images and perceptions that many of the teacher candidates have about Indigenous students and schools; this is a very powerful support for Indigenous futurities.

In particular, hearing Principal Howard, who is an energetic white British man in the later stages of his career, speak about his work with passion, and with a deep commitment to serving the local Anishinaabe community in a respectful way, is very impactful. He jokes about his attempts to learn Anishinaabemowin, but is clear about the importance of his doing so. He articulates that he sees culturally-situated education as being effective in terms of educational

outcomes and in terms of the wellbeing of his school community. I am so deeply thankful to Principal Howard and to the students and teachers at MKES for welcoming us term after term. While I am glad that this experience is one that I can facilitate, it also underscores how much more powerful my classes might be if all were conducted in community sites and/or with a community knowledge holder who could weave these understandings, and this knowledge, throughout the class. I feel very fortunate that I have built relationships with knowledge holders to lead a few of my classes: One such knowledge holder is Mark Douglas, another is Gerry Martin. While Principal Howard is not an Indigenous community knowledge holder, his position and experience make him an important community-based teacher for the students in my classes.

Elder Gerry Martin's Medicines. In Thunder Bay, I had the honour of forging a good relationship with Elder Gerry Martin from Mattagami First Nation. What connected us, or rather, what galvanized our connection, was when Elder Gerry realized that I had spent a great deal of time living in and canoe tripping in the territory where his people are from – Temagami and Biscotasing, further south and east in Ontario from Thunder Bay. Like Elder Mark Douglas did in Orillia, Elder Gerry led classes in each course that I taught in Thunder Bay, including *EDUC 4416*, but also in the Outdoor Experiential Ecological Education program. For some students, the introduction to Elder Gerry began at the annual Fall Harvest held on the Sweatlodge site at the LU campus. He would lead his 'famous' medicines walk during that event.

I always encouraged students to attend and to participate in that event for an opportunity to learn, possibly to collect service hours for one class I taught, and/or to have an 'experience' for one of the assignments for the *EDUC 4416* class. Elder Gerry is trained as a registered nurse, sits on the Elders' Council at LU Thunder Bay, and is an Elder-in-residence for Aboriginal and

Cultural Support Services there. For my classes, we would have one of two experiences: We would go on a medicines walk, or he would bring medicines to the classroom (likely in winter).

For the medicines walk, we would meet about a seven minute walk from the Education building, well on our way to the river and to the Sweatlodge site. Once there, we would greet him, give him our *semaa* (tobacco) and honorarium, and he would tell us a bit about himself and about what he would like to teach us. We would then embark on a stroll through the woods on a path, and he would stop at spots where most could hear him, as he found plant medicines that he wanted to tell us about – their names, and their healing properties. This was a good eye-opener for many of the students, some of whom had never considered the plant relations they walk with every day on their way through campus. The end of the walk would lead us to the Sweatlodge site, where Elder Gerry would offer a smudge if we wanted, and the students would shyly ask remaining questions before heading back for their next classes. As cPBE dictates, it is very powerful when the learning you do is repeatable (Davis et al., 2000; Dewey, 1907; Orr, 1992). These students, while they would not retain all of the teachings, would gather up a small bit, enough to open a window into the relations all around us on campus; a different way of understanding their environment and the people who have lived here for millennia, still do, and will do.

When Elder Gerry brought the plant relations into the classroom, we would pass the plants around, and students would share their own understanding of these plants, or would exclaim about having noticed this or that plant before. I always remember Elder Gerry talking about mint, and about how mint is a diuretic that makes you pee, so to be careful! Additionally, I remember Elder Gerry explaining that cedar tea is a very powerful medicine, and to not make it too strong. Elder Gerry would also weave the Seven Grandfather teachings and medicine wheel

teachings into his time with the students. Having Elders Douglas and Martin has been foundational to the classes that I have taught. I could not be more grateful to them for their time, knowledge and wisdom. It is also of great importance to me that the students learn from women as well as from men, and that they learn from knowledge-holders of different ages and stages: In this way, I hope to contribute to the pre-service teachers' understanding of the diversity and richness of different Indigenous peoples and knowledges.

Suzanne Morrissette and the Thunder Bay Art Gallery. In 2012, the Thunder Bay Art Gallery was fortunate enough to have Suzanne Morrissette (Cree-Métis), an accomplished artist, curator and scholar, as the curator-in-residence. Suzanne has since become a doctoral student at York in the Department of Social and Political Thought. She describes her work in this way:

> Morrissette's research looks to bridge conversations in critical race theory and anti-colonial thought by examining the works of Indigenous artists who challenge the characterization of Indigenous political presence as antagonistic and anti-state through their strategic engagement with the logics of liberal colonial values. (personal communication, October 1st, 2016)

With one class, we travelled to the Thunder Bay Art Gallery to learn from her about the Carl Beam exhibition which travelled to the Thunder Bay Art Gallery from the National Gallery of Canada, curated by Greg Hill. In another class, Suzanne gave an artist talk focused on her own research-creation work. In her own words:

> This included some early pieces where I was exploring a sense of home, and sites of memory for cultural knowledge. I then talked about my Master's work which critically examined two exhibitions with works by Indigenous artists - who were re-envisioning their home reserves within the space of the gallery. I concluded with a description of an artwork called *solve, for some* – which was a visual mapping of experience and location. (personal communication, Feb. 8th, 2017)

Learning about art, resistance and scholarship from Suzanne was a wonderful cPBE experience for the classes in Thunder Bay who were fortunate enough to do so; positive feedback was recorded in my journals and in the instructor evaluations. Both at the Art Gallery and in her artist talk in one of my classes, Suzanne brought Land and resurgence to life in a new way for the pre-service teachers. Learning from Suzanne is a part of my commitment to bringing diverse Indigenous community members into the learning in the classes; as a very accomplished young female Indigenous artist and scholar, Suzanne shows what Indigenous futurities can look like. Learning at the gallery, and about Indigenous art and artists, also broadens and complexifies perceptions of Indigenous lives and knowledges.

Nancy Stevens. Nancy (Haudenosaunee and European) is a doctoral student at Queen's University who also worked as an instructor in the Social Work program at LU Orillia. In 2009-2010 and in 2016, Nancy gave talks in my Orillia classes regarding her own experience and that of her children as Indigenous peoples. She also facilitated circles to check in with the often-stressed pre-service teachers. Nancy is an incredibly powerful person who has spent much of her life advocating for Indigenous children and families. She is a gifted singer; she sang and drummed in the classes too, and talked about how important her drum and her singing community has been to her as she navigates the tricky and conflict-ridden world of social work.

The classes she led were also ones that were mentioned by students in the debriefs in final classes as particularly powerful (this is noted in my journals); her own and her children's lived experiences demonstrate the continuing impacts and structures of colonization. This felt knowledge may help teacher candidates to become committed to change, helping open possibilities for the future. With her skill, grace, humour, scholarship, empathy and her excellent voice, she shares her own resilience and generously builds that of the teacher-candidates in the

class. Again, this is an example of how important it is for the students in the classes to feel connected, and to be affected in person, by an Indigenous community member with lived experience of the material we cover in the classes. This, again, is an important practice of relational cPBE. The students meet Nancy, they laugh with her, and are greatly affected by her experiences. They begin to understand themselves-in-relation.

Bruce Beardy. Bruce (Fort Severn First Nation) was the director of the Indigenous Language Instructor's Program at LU Thunder Bay. I frequently spent time in the Aboriginal Lounge, where his office was, to both chat and learn bits and pieces of Anishinaabemowin and Anishiniinimowin. Bruce also took the time (once with his very funny brother Larry, too) to deliver a few short language workshops in the classes. Language and Land are so intimately connected; this is another way to bring Land into the classroom. (This will be futher addressed later in this dissertation.) Additionally, as mentioned earlier, it is connective in that it gives another point of reference for the students in terms of the place-names that they may not have considered as denoting the first inhabitants of these places. For example, Kakabeka Falls is a beautiful 40 m high waterfall on the Kaministiquia River. Located just outside Thunder Bay, it is popular with tourists and, according to local signage, the word Kakabeka is Anishinaabe, and means something like 'waterfall over a cliff'. Bruce told me one day, with a twinkle in his eye, that it really meant "a really good place to get out of your canoe and walk around".

Bruce spent time with the students doing some basic syllabics – this was wonderful, as it gave them some connection to the syllabics on much of the signage on the LU campus. He also taught some words like *biindegan* (welcome) and *miigwetch* (thank you) which again figure prominently on signage around Thunder Bay. All of these learnings help connect students to the

understanding that they are on Anishinaabe land, and that Anishinaabemowin and Anishininimowin are Indigenous languages that are alive and well.

~

I am so deeply grateful to each of these people for their leadership and friendship in helping to facilitate the learning in these classes. This work would not work without these relationships and without their knowledge. They broaden and deepen my own community of practice, and keep me accountable beyond the classroom to the Land and communities we are learning about. These are important practices of cPBE, and Land-based learning, that are central to my work.

Bringing the Land into the Classroom

One of the main things I have learned through doing this study has been this: Land education is many things. I wrote earlier that there is no substitute for spending time with "feet on the ground" on the land, with community members. This is a fundamental truth of Land education. Additionally, there are ways of *doing* Land education in the classroom. As I stated earlier, I am committed to the fundamental truth that we are never apart from nature. Kulchyski (2005) rejects any suggestion that Indigenous people are closer to the Land:

> It is a commonplace assumption, and one I reject, that Aboriginal peoples are or have been 'closer to nature.' In my own view, the metaphor of proximity to nature is wholly suspect since nature retains its power within each of our bodies. One cannot be closer to or further away from that which is within us. (p. 18).

While this may be true, the impacts of the Eurocentric beliefs about human proximity to nature (and how this intersects with gender, race, class and ability, not to mention the more-than-human) are literally earth-shattering. It is a shared epistemological stance of Indigenous cultures the world over that all humans are closely interrelated with, and dependent upon, Land (Cajete,

2009; Deloria Jr., 1994; Donald, 2009). For the Haudenosaunee culture and community class that I took at Trent in 1995 from Chief Thomas and Dan Roronhiakewen Longboat, in one assignment we were invited to investigate the epistemological differences between Haudenosaunee and Western cultures as illustrated through the respective creation stories, featuring Skywoman and Eve. Kimmerer (2013) writes of this too (her people, the Potawatami, are neighbours of the Haudenosaunee):

> On one side of the world were people whose relationship with the living world was shaped by Skywoman, who created a garden for the well-being of all. On the other side was another woman with a garden and a tree. But for tasting its fruit, she was banished from the garden and the gates clanged shut behind her. That mother of men was made to wander in the wilderness and earn her bread by the sweat of her brow, not by filling her mouth with the sweet juicy fruits that bend the branches low. In order to eat, she was instructed to subdue the wilderness into which she was cast….And then they meet—the offspring of Skywoman and the children of Eve—and the land around us bears the scars of that meeting, the echoes of our stories. (pp. 6-7)

Kimmerer (2013) shares this story in her book in the context of realizing that her third-year *General Ecology* students had largely responded to a survey question that there were no beneficial interactions between humans and nature; they rated their knowledge of negative interactions highly, and the median answer in rating their knowledge of positive interactions was none (p. 6). Western binaries separating humans and nature have done their epistemological work thoroughly: In my experience also, it is difficult to shift this binary in learners to a deeper understanding of interrelationship past nature appreciation that is aesthetic or perhaps has a caring perspective on valued species. These epistemological schisms are investigated in Chapter Two in the concepts of *Landscape, wilderness, frontier, the commons*, and *terra nullius.*

This Eurocentric binary presents a huge epistemological obstacle in this work. In Indigenous education in teacher education, because Indigenous communities and Land are interrelated in many ways, Land is central to learning about the power and resurgence of Indigenous peoples, cultures and communities and about the oppressions that are enacted through Land. All Canadians are implicated in these oppressions as treaty partners and as beneficiaries of extractive economies (but importantly, communities do not benefit equally, and some are violently affected by these industries. Some might argue all are.)

In those initial classes in Orillia, one opportunity was to figure out how to expose the ways that the Land was already present in the classrooms. The Local Assignment, described earlier, was the first step in this process; it highlights the emplaced connections that each student brings to the class, and makes apparent the relationships to those places, and therefore to people, that the students already have with Indigenous peoples and Lands. Many, if not most, students struggled greatly with this assignment, as I did when I was required to do a similar assignment at Trent University. I found that I needed to provide very detailed instructions on how to access the information to support them in this work. My successive syllabi show that I changed the grade weight of the assignment significantly between the first and third iteration of the course, from being worth 10% to being worth 5%, in response to how challenging the students found it. Perhaps more than any other assignment, this helps to unsettle settler teacher candidates' unexamined assumed trajectory of settler futurities, opening space for them to join in creating different futures that might benefit all residents of what is currently known as Canada, and Land, more equitably. The next step was Treaty education.

Treaty Education. As I have articulated before, and as shown by many educators doing this work (e.g., Tupper & Capello, 2008; Tupper, 2012, 2013), few pre-service teachers arrive in these classes with a cursory, let alone a comprehensive, understanding of the Treaties or of the comprehensive and specific land claims in Canada. While Treaty education can be seen to centre the Canadian government and the carving up of a nationalist map of Canada from coast-to-coast-to-coast, it is also an important relational practice of showing how all Canadian citizens are already implicated with relation to Indigenous peoples in Canada. These Treaties are the nation-to-nation agreements that have supported the economic foundations of this country through primary resource extraction; the failure of the Canadian government to honour these Treaties, and the specific and comprehensive land-claim agreements as they were negotiated and understood on both sides of the nations with relation to economic proceeds, education, and health, is responsible for many of the inequities experienced by Indigenous communities today. Some of Canada, including the nation's capital city, Ottawa (unceded and unsurrendered Algonquin Territory) remains unceded Indigenous territory. Many argue that the fundamental difference in understanding of what was agreed to in the Treaties means that all of Canada is unceded. The failure of Canada to deal justly with Indigenous peoples affects all of the inhabitants of these Indigenous lands.

The Treaties are living contracts. Just as the classroom contracts foster respect and reciprocity, so were these Treaties meant to support peaceful and mutually beneficial co-existence – at least as understood from some Indigenous perspectives (Henderson, 1995; Richardson, 1991). An in-depth exploration of Treaty education is beyond the scope of this dissertation; for wonderful work in this field, Dr. Jennifer Tupper (2012, 2013) has written

extensively (see also Tupper & Capello, 2008), and knowledge holder Chippewa *oshkabaewiss*[22] Brian Charles and others talk about the living agreements. Charles gives talks on Wampum Diplomacy all over southern Ontario, complete with replicas of the wampum belts from the Guswenta to the 1800s; this is Treaty history and contemporary implications from the perspective of the Anishinaabe people. Since 2007, Treaty Education has been mandatory in the province of Saskatchewan. From Barnhardt's Throne Speech:

> In 2007, mandatory Treaty Education was introduced: Treaty education is an important part of forging new ties. There must be an appreciation in the minds of the general public that Treaties are living, breathing documents that continue to bind us to promises made generations ago. This is why my government is committed to making mandatory instruction in history and content of the Treaties in the K-12 curriculum. (2007, p. 3)

In *EDUC 4416*, it has been my practice to read the active Treaty that relates to the territory where the class is: The Robinson-Superior Treaty for Thunder Bay, and the Williams Treaty, and the Dish with One Spoon Treaty, for Orillia. The Crown Treaties are not long reads, and reading them is a way of demonstrating to the classes what they are participants in. Learning the Indigenous Treaties from local knowledge holders is very powerful. This pedagogy is possible in all Canadian classrooms: There are parts of Canada that are 'officially' unceded in terms of Crown Treaties, and that are covered instead by the land-claims mentioned above. This too is Treaty education and should be part of learning for teacher candidates.

There is some Indigenous resistance to the claim "We are all treaty people", and indeed, this claim is not true for some whose ancestors did not sign, and for those who reside on officially unceded territory, or for those who do not recognize the authority of the Crown. For settlers, however, wherever you live in Canada, you are a treaty person: These living agreements

---

[22] *Oshkabaewiss* is an Anishinaabemowin term that means 'helper' (Edna Manitowabi, personal communication, Oct. 1993).

are entered into in your name as citizens or residents of Canada. All settler Canadians have benefitted, albeit unevenly, through these agreements; we are therefore implicated and obligated to hold the Crown accountable to the promises made to Indigenous peoples through these agreements. Treaty education is part of good critical Place-based education, and education with Land at the centre. This is another way of bringing Land into teacher education in support of healthy Indigenous futurities.

Ceremony. Another important way that Land is present in *EDUC 4416* occurs when ceremony and teachings are conducted in class. In each class I taught, we were honoured by the presence and teachings of Anishinaabe Elders and knowledge keepers. There are a few ways that the Elders and knowledge keepers bring the Land into the class: These ways include smudging ceremonies, medicine and plant talks, songs, drumming, storytelling and doing teachings such as the Seven Grandfather teachings. These Elders and knowledge holders bring their bundles; these bundles contain plants, rocks, pipes, cloth, feathers… all of which contain spirit to support the work of the Elders in communicating their teachings.

Wilson (2008) writes powerfully about the way that Ceremony connects us to Land, including some words shared by a research participant, Peter:

> After he reiterated that being Indigenous is a community and relational thing, he went on to say:
>
> > I started with tribal, and it's relational, but it's more than human relationships. And maybe the basis of that relationship I know with Indigenous people is the land. But it's our relationship to the land that's a spiritual connection to the land.
> >
> > So I think that we can take people to those places, and they can experience them for themselves. So it's [pause] like Oscar [Kawagley] and Ray [Barnhardt], they write about the pedagogy of place, that the environment is the knowledge.
> >
> > So place is important, and how we describe it, I don't know how we go about doing that. I have another friend, he is Tongan, but grew up in New Zealand, and space for him is that distance or relationship between people. So the Maori, when they

> do ceremonies, it's to eliminate the space between people. So the space between people is Kapu, is sacred, and you go through a ceremony and respect each other's space, but the ceremony brings us together so that we occupy the same space. So that's the Mauri concept of space, or the Tongan concept of space. And I think that Indigenous concept of place is that there is that same kind of relation between humans and our environment. So the distance or relationship between ourselves the environment is sacred, and so you do ceremonies to bridge that space or that distance.

> This quote contains several important points that I can see…I can see the importance of relationships to the land when he mentions the environment being the knowledge or the pedagogy of place….Second is the concept of the linking of the space between people with the relationship that they share….The space and therefore the relationship between people or between people and their environment is seen as sacred a key concept within many Indigenous peoples' spirituality. By reducing the space between things, we are strengthening the relationship that they share. And this bringing things together so that they share the same space is what ceremony is about….The third point that I can draw on from my friend made is that there is no distinction made between relationships that are made with other people and those that are made with our environment. Both are equally sacred. (Wilson, 2008, pp. 86-87)

It is not my place to describe or explain the sacred bundles or the elements of ceremony, although I have added a couple of community-sourced explanations in this dissertation. They do a very good job of bringing the Land into the classroom, though; they did so in my first classes in Orillia when I was inexperienced at bringing the students out of the classroom, and they also did so in Thunder Bay in the deep winter months. As explained earlier, Elder Gerry Martin, trained as a nurse and as an Elder, brought bundles of medicines (plants) into the class, and named and explained each one. Elder Mark Douglas brings his bundle and teaches with the Four Sacred Medicines, carefully telling the stories and explaining each one. As stated in the section on structural obstacles, it is not always possible or appropriate to do smudges in class. For people with severe scent allergies, this practice can be exclusive. However, making sure that a smudge happens either outside or with lots of warning has been important to the classes I have

conducted. These smudges have been led by the Elders. Similarly, and increasingly, I see the importance of language in learning well in particular places. In Thunder Bay, I had support in this area through the expertise of Bruce Beardy.

Language. I am currently writing up this dissertation in Inuit territory, in Inukjuak, Nunavik, Northern Quebec. Inuttitut is the first language for most of the community members here. Even here, there is a great deal of concern about language retention. In particular, the Elders are worried that the Inuttitut of the young people is not rich and fluent; it is described as 'children's Inuttitut'. The reason for this is given that as fewer young people grow up learning on the Land from Elders and older community members, performing the daily tasks of life on the Land, the language is shrinking. This was also reported by Berger (2008) as a concern in Nunavut. This concern clearly illustrates the fundamental link between Land and language.

In future teaching of these classes, I would spend even more time emphasizing the importance of Indigenous language learning for youth, and for teachers. In my practice, I did make a point of bringing the language into the classes; students told me frequently that they became more aware of the Anishinaabemowin words around them (street names, lake names, signs). In Orillia, learning the Fish Fence – Mnjikaning – from Elder Mark Douglas is a practice both in place and Land. Most students at that campus are familiar with the Atherley Narrows as a nearby lock in the Trent-Severn Waterway, and as a highway marker that they pass frequently if not daily. Elder Mark shows them this is a 5000 year-old gathering place with an Anishinaabe name and an ancient technology for economic sustainability.

As I described earlier, in Thunder Bay, Bruce Beardy taught Anishnaabemowin/Anishininimowin workshops in my classes, and gave an overview of

syllabics, the written language system for Anishinaabemowin and Anishiniinimowin, and of some of the words that are seen daily in Thunder Bay. (An example used earlier is Nanabijou [The Sleeping Giant, or Sibley Peninsula]). In our class visit to MKES in 2015, we were treated to an impromptu Anishinaabemowin lesson from their language teacher, Kory Snache (Chippewas of Rama First Nation). Kory, along with his sister Vicki, are two young and dynamic leaders in Anishinaabemowin learning and retention in their territory. There are very few young fluent speakers of Anishinaabemowin in their community; it is fabulous to see it being taught by a young person.

After learning bits and pieces of Anishinaabemowin over the years, I am always delighted to discover an Anishinaabe word embedded in a place-name, or to discover the Anishinaabe name for a place. As is demonstrated by my experience in learning about Kakabeka from Bruce Beardy, these names are often instructive in some way about the place itself. For example, Spadina Rd. in Toronto, where my grandfather grew up, is a version of the Anishinaabe word *Ishpadinaa*, meaning “it is a high hill or ridge” (Ojibwe Library, n. d.). Recovering Indigenous place names is an effort being engaged in all over Canada; this is a powerful and important reclaiming of Indigenous Lands and relations. Learning these names supports Indigenous futurities, and supports ethical relationality as a practice of cPBE.

Language learning is yet another way of bringing the Land into the classroom in teacher education classes. Additionally, it is a powerful concept to understand that for Anishinaabe people, the Land is the source of the language; Anishinaabe territory is where we are. Kory Snache is passionate about the need for young Anishinaabe people to learn the language through time on the Land. For Anishinaabe people to learn the language, the Land is here. The language keepers have usually grown up on the Land; this is also evident here in Inuit territory. The

relationships of the language keepers to the Land is primary; as the language is learned, the Land is learned. *All my relations*.

Relationships. Relationships—with places, with people— are central to doing this work well. For LU to do a good job of providing support for these courses, one key element must be in providing stable platforms to support the relationships necessary to do this work well. Good cPBE, with ethical relationality, takes time. In Orillia and in Thunder Bay, I spent a great deal of time building and affirming the relationships with community members in order to be respectful in the territories I was teaching in. In writing this dissertation, I have both struggled and delighted in figuring out how to respect and celebrate the people I have learned from – scholars, teachers, colleagues, critical friends, knowledge keepers, Elders, administrators. In teaching this class, it has become very apparent that there is a great deal of value in spending time in a particular place, and that there is enormous importance in building, fostering and forging relationships.

A large part of the work of this teaching is in time spent on the Land, or with people in their homes, or in common space in the community, or at the university, drinking coffee, learning the web of relations that we are implicated in. The communities of practice that support this work extend far beyond the university. I have stated repeatedly that I would never have been able to do this work without the support of the Elders and knowledge keepers. Additionally, repeating the classes, learning the administrative processes, visiting the Land sites, and spending time and care with the people who enable me to be a part of this work is ultimately important.

In other words; Universities that hire sessionals or contract lecturers to do this work where those people are precariously employed is contradictory to doing this work well. This

work depends on respectful and reciprocal relationships with people and places. Hiring sessionals with no job security to teach these classes fundamentally undermines and disrespects good practice in this work. Even where there are institutional structures like Aboriginal Cultural Support Services, personal relationships are built slowly over time. Turnover in those offices, and emphasis on sessional instructors, shows the communities that the relationships are not respected. Dedicated space for Elders on campus, stable and competitive honorarium rates, consistent programming and diversity in terms of age, gender and area of expertise in the community members learned from are all important ways that the university can show that it values the relationships necessary to do this work well.

Indigenization: Obstacles and Resistance

Since beginning this dissertation, there has been a drastic change in the attention that universities are paying to all things/people/subjects Indigenous. Where academia (and many other institutions and organizations) seems to be situated, right now, is in a lag between the promises and press surrounding efforts to 'Indigenize the Academy', and the supports and structures needed to actually do so in a good way. Scholars such as optipemisiw/Michif/Métis scholar Zoe Todd (2017, 2018) and Eve Tuck (2017) have written about the perils of the practice of hiring sometimes multiple Indigenous faculty without putting in place structural and communal supports for those hires, and of ongoing and multiple oppressions that they experience as Indigenous faculty, and as female Indigenous faculty. Todd (2017) points toward the recent publication by Henry et al. (2017) which addresses racism, racialization and Indigeneity in Canadian universities. This research emerged out of the "need for a national study [of Canadian universities], because of the scarcity of data on the number of racialized and Indigenous faculty

in universities, pay equity structures, curriculum, climate, or incidents of discrimination, harassment, and bullying" (p.viii). The results are grim, and show deep and ongoing inequities and violences that continue to be disproportionately directed at racialized and Indigenous faculty. Todd (2017) also challenges the 'Pan-Indian' measures being taken by some universities as counterproductive, but is careful to single out the University of Alberta and the University of British Columbia as doing good, community-led work. M. Giroux (2017) reminds us that many of the necessary changes to support Indigenous faculty and practices have been called for already, for decades, by Marie Battiste. She also posits:

> It should be clear by now that I don't think "indigenizing" is the right approach to addressing Canada's colonialism within universities. But if not indigenizing, what should we be doing as academics, as university administrators, as Canadians?
>
> The question we need to consider is: In what ways have the university system and academic traditions harmed Indigenous nations, and how can we begin the process of reparation?
>
> The first step is to start listening, listening to Indigenous scholars and to Indigenous nations on whose lands our universities stand. As such, I don't have answers. I can't tell you, or tell academic institutions across Canada, what needs to happen because knowing will require long-term, on-going engagement with Indigenous communities. (M. Giroux, 2017)

I continue to read, and to deeply consider, challenges to white academics participating in this work (see Todd, 2017). What is very clear from my own frustrations in trying to do this work in a good way, in the way that I was taught, with patience, care, and time spent building relationships and in respectful remuneration in dollars and in actions, is that these practices are not recognized or supported by the academy.

Structural obstacles and advocacy. Each year, my commitment to centering the Land in *EDUC 4416* has been challenged by the institution through regulations about risk management (the large amount of administrative work necessary to leave the classroom), scent policies (two-week advance notices for smudging), and most consistently, annual fights about Elder honoraria. While I understand the basis of the first two, the annual fights over appropriate honoraria are frustrating; these are documented in a series of emails. Risk management is a fluid context, still, and is new to some institutions. Both risk management practices and scent policies are about civil liberties / human rights; they are really about keeping people safe and providing equitable access to learning and experiences.

How LU needs to support this work better is threefold: Firstly, by ensuring that the Faculty of Education has an honoraria policy that is consistent with the going rates for Elder honoraria in the regions and in other faculties within LU and that the method of payment takes in to account complications with Elders' taxes and pensions; secondly, by providing a better structure or support to the instructors for ensuring that there is a stable relational framework for working with Elders and community members; and thirdly, by accounting for the need for these classes to take place both on- and off-campus. The silver lining to all of this frustration has been the reward for my pedagogical and personal commitment to this work: What I have experienced, and gathered evidence of, in these classes supports my early conviction that Land and Indigenous knowledge are the First Teachers, and are what constitute 'good' Indigenous education for Indigenous and non-Indigenous learners alike. While it is very hard to measure the learning of the students in my classes by the end of the programs, what I have seen makes me proud and galvanizes my will to do this work in a good way, especially in these times when this work is gaining so quickly in profile and in support at the provincial and federal levels.

~

Centering the Land in Indigenous education in teacher education is at the heart of best practice for this work, in the experience I have documented here and in the literature (Cajete, 1994; Chambers, 2006; Donald, 2009; L. Simpson, 2014; Styres, 2011). It opens the possibility of relating justly to Land and to Indigenous peoples and communities for better futures for all. In this section, I have outlined that Land education can be comprised of a few practices, including Treaty education, ceremony, and language learning – in these ways, the Land can be brought into the classroom. While these are practices of Land-based education, these practices are not to decentre or be in-place-of the most powerful practice, that is, taking the learners onto the Land, and fostering and respecting relationships with the Land and with local communities through direct contact with the Land and with communities.

In the next chapter, I discuss what I have learned from the educators who participated in conversations with me about their own practices; about the ways in which the Land participates in their work as teacher educators focusing on Indigenous education, and the ways that this challenges and confirms what I have described here.

Chapter 5: The Conversations

In this chapter, I relate what I learned from the conversations that I had with colleagues, who are also critical friends, from the community of practice engaged in Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education, seeking to explore their use of critical Place-based pedagogy (cPBE) in their classes. The research question is: *How is critical Place-based education in Canadian teacher education supporting Indigenous futurities in Canada by interrupting settler colonialism?* These conversations were crucial to this research. They contribute trustworthiness to the observations and reflections I gathered over years of teaching the course in three ways: they reduce subjective bias by providing different perspectives, the conversations are data collected through an additional method, and they formalize the contribution of critical friends to this research (Mena & Russell, 2017). To repeat a statement from Chapter Three of this dissertation: Respect and humility are at the heart of good teaching, and of good research. This is a thread in S-STEP literature (Kitchen, 2005a; Loughran, 2004; Samaras & Freese, 2006) and is also central in Indigenous research methodologies (see Graveline, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Lowan-Trudeau, 2012; L.T. Smith, 1999, 2005; Wilson, 2001, 2008). Again: All of Canada is Indigenous territories; each instructor is teaching in specific cultural and physical places, where they enact relationships both to their community and to the Land that they teach on. Those who agreed to participate in my research are my teachers: They are peers and colleagues to whom I must make my research open to critique and dialogue—to whom I am accountable to enact ethical relationality as an S-STEP researcher.

In this chapter, I have a responsibility both to show what I learned from these colleagues, especially in relation to the first stages of my self-study in terms of confirmation, affirmation,

and resistance, and to represent their words faithfully and respectfully. By *far* the hardest part of this research work has been to figure out how to do this in a good way. Each conversation seemed wildly different…ever more so the more I worked with the transcripts. This is only natural, as it expresses the diversity and complexity of, well, *people*, and is in and of itself very interesting. However, it has made for some significant challenges in terms of representation and coherence.

Each of our paths to, and practices of, this work are incredibly varied. In particular, this has been difficult to navigate with respect to anonymity. Some participants chose to be anonymous until the final draft, and some waived anonymity throughout. I have chosen to maintain anonymity for all participants, and all participants are have authorized how they are represented. The implication of anonymity in a dissertation that is primarily concerned with *Place* is complicated, as I am unable to disclose most of the geographic, social and political locations shared by the participants with the specificity that I call for in the classrooms, and from my teacher candidates. In this chapter, I will introduce each participant through their own words as they explain their personal journeys to this work, and then progress to the emergent themes in the conversations.

The Participants

Over the last two years, I have been fortunate that eight teacher educators have taken the time to talk with me about their practices in Indigenous education in teacher education. As I have described earlier, I contacted the participants through snowball sampling: Each is someone I know or who knows someone I know. Each participant has very recently taught, or is teaching, in a Canadian Faculty of Education. Each one taught classes specifically addressing Indigenous

education; four of the eight teach compulsory courses, three teach elective courses, and one taught a foundations course where these topics were centered. Seven out of the eight participants taught predominantly white students. One is an early career scholar, one is a graduate student, neither of whom have tenure. Six are well into their careers. Four are lead administrators in their faculties. Three out of the eight self-identify as Indigenous, and one is on a learning journey in relation to their identity as they research back through their recent family history. One of the Indigenous scholars is teaching in his home territory. All but one were initially contacted via email. Despite the many differences between the participants, each expressed a passion for this work, and excitement about sharing their work. As I have gone over the transcripts of the participants, some similarities have emerged, as well as some important and generative differences.

In the next section, we learn a great deal about each participant through their stories of how they came to teach Indigenous education. I crafted the loosely structured guide for the conversations seeking to draw parallels with my own practice of Indigenous education in teacher education (see Appendix B); in particular, I was looking for the ways in which Land was considered or incorporated into their practices. What I found in addition to the Land-based practices were similarities between the participants' trajectories, and my own, in terms of personal and professional experiences that were also echoed in some of the literature surrounding Indigenous education in teacher education.

These include: The settler-educators' early ignorance regarding Indigenous peoples in Canada (Dion's [2007, 2009] *perfect stranger*), and Indigenous educators' awareness of the need to 'do education differently' for Indigenous peoples; encountering widespread ignorance of Indigenous peoples in Canada among the pre-service teachers they teach; challenges around

bringing classes outside; and finally, universally, the profound importance of contending with the personal socio-political locations of the students, and of longitudinal relationship-building with community members and with Land. All are explicitly committed to disrupting settler colonialism in support of Indigenous futurities, although their approaches vary.

While Land is present in all of the conversations, and in all of the practices, it emerges in varied ways. Using Eisner's (1985) "three curricula" is useful here: For some, Land is central and *explicit*; that is, it is repeatedly named and engaged with. For some, it is *implicit* – more evident perhaps in hindsight, and not openly emphasized as part of the classes. For a few, they discovered Land in the *null* curricula; that is, they had not considered it at all, and discovered the absence of particular Land-based practices as a telling part of their pedagogies.

Each of the categories of Land education that I elicited from my own practice as important in disrupting colonialism are echoed to some degree in the practices of the participants; some have all categories, some have one or two. To quickly review, these categories are: Treaty education, language, ceremony, bringing the Land into the classroom, bringing community members into the classroom, and going out onto the Land – to communities, to teaching places outside of the classroom, to learn from local community members. I have edited the conversations lightly for flow, and taken out expressions such as "um," "uh," "so" and "like." Each participant has authorized this version of their words in these contexts. After discussing participants' personal locations in the next section, I then move to the practices of place and Land that each participant employs.

Personal Histories and Ethical Relationality

The first questions in the conversation guide asked the participants to tell me a bit about how they came to teach Indigenous education in teacher education. Each story is different, and there are also some similarities in terms of educational trajectory. Each participant shares some information about personal location both historical and current, about their educational trajectory and about how they came to be in the field of Indigenous education. Pseudonyms, most chosen by the participants, have been used to maintain anonymity.

Stella and Ma'iingan, both Indigenous scholars, each introduced themselves and their journeys in relation to the Land they were from and the Land they were teaching on. Stella is an Indigenous person who is teaching and living in a territory that is thousands of kilometers from her heritage communities in Monterrey, Mexico. She said:

> And, I have been a grateful visitor in the land, in the land of the (*****,******, ******), more specifically the *****-speaking peoples for almost 20 years when I arrived at the [Canadian] university as an international student with my baffled dreams to pursue a master's degree. I went back 'home' to finish my master's degree, and I taught for two years in grade five, and then I had fallen in love with the place, with the town, with the university, with the programs. And my ultimate dream was to do a doctoral degree, so I applied, and I came here again, for three years to work on my doctoral degree, but, during those three years, I just continued to fall in love with everything around me. And so, I'm one of those stories of a person who came as an international student and has transitioned to now being a faculty member in the same place in the Faculty of Education, the place that embraced me where people gave me a chance to start my studies.

Stella speaks very warmly about her schooling and about her professional trajectory at her current institution and the strong Indigenous scholars who supported her. She also stated that "my first participation in anything that had to do with Indigenous perspectives or worldviews was back in 2003, after I had graduated" [with her doctorate]. So, while Stella was clear in centering Land and Indigeneity in her upbringing and current location, she also made it very

clear that it did not figure in her schooling at all, either in her home territory or in her Canadian schooling.

Ma'iingan, another Indigenous educator and scholar, also made explicit his own upbringing with relation to Land:

> I grew up in Northern Ontario—Northwestern Ontario. Most of my childhood I spent on the land, so I used to trap and hunt and fish and do things like that. So, the Aboriginal side of myself that's very meaningful to me really came out of that. Grew out of the connection that, mostly my uncle who was the person who brought me out on the Land and fished with me and everything. Taught me about who I am with respect to my clan.

Ma'iingan went on to share his very circuitous route through the education system: From 'flunking out', to CEGEP[23], to a BEd and running an Aboriginal training program for the federal government, to an MA, and finally to a PhD.

For the federal government, Ma'iingan ran Aboriginal training programs, was advisor for Diversity and Employment Equity, and a manager for Aboriginal Relations. After his master's, he worked for the Public Service Commission, running "the Aboriginal Center of Excellence, and it was designed to help Aboriginal people get employment within various departments in government". He mentioned hockey frequently as a constant; an avenue for work and for structure. He spoke of the commonalities in his work trajectory, and emphasized the importance that Land and ceremony had in his PhD studies; in particular:

> It's always the same. I work in Aboriginal relations. My thesis is titled (**********). It translates as (**********). So, actually, my thesis work looks at research. I critically look at research in (my field) from an Indigenous worldview and how that would work in

---

[23] CEGEP stands for Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel, and is the publicly funded pre-university college system in the province of Quebec.

> Indigenous worldview. For me, Land is a critical component of that. So, it really is Land is the instigator of everything that I do.

Bear, an Indigenous educator and scholar, spoke more about Land in terms of her practice of education. The story that she told about coming to be in this work was about absence, or the null curricula (Eisner, 1985). As an Indigenous learner, Bear had an experience of education where she realized that there were serious deficits in mainstream education for Indigenous peoples.

> I've always had an interest in education—always wanted to be a teacher for as long as I can remember. The problem was when I was doing my Bachelor of Education and getting my teaching certificate, it was in that moment that I realized that I couldn't be the teacher that the system wanted me to be. It was kind of a crisis moment for me because I'd always wanted to be a teacher....It was in my BEd that I came to realize that education needs to be done differently for our [Indigenous] kids. Then my mission became, well, how would we do it then? That's why I stayed and did my master's and then continued on to my PhD because I wanted to create education that worked for our kids.

Bear's experience of the null curricula regarding Indigenous peoples and processes is echoed in the journeys of many of the participants, although they experienced and reported this absence differently. Part of what she is recounting here is her personal coming-to-know. For some of the settler participants, this coming-to-know was about being shown by Indigenous communities and learners that they needed to reconsider their practice.

Toby is in a coming-to-know of their own: Through studies, research, and teaching in Indigenous learning they are now tracing their own ancestry relative to their identity. This journey has led to Aotearoa. Toby's educational trajectory is a bit different than that of the other participants'; their master's studies are in Indigenous Studies and Education. For two years, their graduate assistantship was with a long-time Indigenous faculty member, teaching a compulsory

course in Indigenous education. Upon the completion of their MEd, they were hired to teach the course themself. In their case, a deep personal connection to land-based learning and reflexive pathways through decolonization developed a foundational respect for Indigenous Knowledge; though learning about Indigenous history and Treaties was very limited in the MEd, they developed an understanding of Indigeneity through relationships, ceremony, and experiential learning through mentorship as a student. As a teacher, Toby mentioned that it was a struggle to find that mentorship and to know how to consistently engage with their students in land-based learning. Again – as Toby is on a personal learning journey – they are committed to consistently re-situating themself in relation to place and to Land with Indigenous Knowledge informing that practice. They continue that process as a student in Indigenous learning seeking that grounding.

In the conversations, I found that the way that the settler participants positioned themselves was quite different. Lark, Jasperdaniels, Florence and Heron, all settlers, all talked about how they grew up *not* learning about themselves in relation to Indigenous people. This certainly echoes my own experience both as a learner and in listening to the pre-service teachers in my classrooms, and is well-documented as being common among non-Indigenous pre-service teachers in Canada (Dion, 2007; Schick, 2000). These four educators grew up in different parts of Canada: northern Ontario, the Maritimes, the Prairies, and downtown Toronto, and yet each reported the absence of learning about and from Indigenous community.

Lark started her story by describing herself as the child of immigrants with their own stories of colonial displacement from their homes and countries as Irish and Scottish people. She went on to describe her own 'coming to know' about Indigenous peoples in Canada:

> I grew up in Toronto where there wasn't really an Indigenous voice that hit my ears…and in the school curriculum where it was all placed in the past. So, in that way, it was coming to BC as a young adult, and learning here what it meant to be a settler who has no

> idea about their obligations and their responsibilities and their privilege and that they've come to Indigenous land. So, I was very fortunate to make friends who cleared it up for me. (Laughter). Yeah, good solid friends, from Nisga'a Nation, right? Very political.

Jasperdaniels, in talking about his early life, spoke about a close relationship with the Land, but segregated from the Indigenous peoples and knowledges of his community.

> I had grown up, you know, hunting and fishing and had a, at least for the lakes and the land that I did that on, a kind of deep sense of knowledge, of, you know, the fishes' habitat and when we went partridge hunting, the seasons and their habits, and the cycles. But not necessarily, and that was just through observation experience, and not necessarily being taught by the local Indigenous people that were there. They were always invisible and not necessarily there. It was more the generations of settlers that had been there and learned from the landscape themselves. And some of them were mixed as well. They might have been part Cree, but there was certainly a denial of that identity at the time that I was growing up. It wasn't, you know, you would have experienced extreme racism if you had acknowledged your Indigenous history living in [place] at the time.

Florence spoke about her upbringing in the east; she, too, despite a great deal of time spent on the land when she was young and in her young professional life as an outdoor educator, felt that she spent no time with or learning about/from the local Indigenous community:

> My background is a settler person from Nova Scotia. Grew up in Cape Breton. East Coast—West Coast of Cape Breton and Mi'kmaq territory but Scottish-French-Acadian and Irish roots. Very small, rural community. My father, mother are from the very same community, so, both sides of the family go back probably 250 years in that place, so very place-based. Cape Bretoners tend to be very attached to their corner of the world. And did 17 years of school in Nova Scotia. Very Eurocentric schooling.

Florence, too, spoke of the absence of learning about/with/from Indigenous peoples in her own upbringing. Her experience as a kid in the summer outdoor camp system echoed mine in outdoor

education where Indigenous peoples and territories are completely elided (except, in my case, for Taylor Statten Camp's use of Seton's problematic Indian Council Ring). Florence said:

> I did a project in Grade 12 on Aboriginal education, and I'd never in all of the camps I had worked in, and you know, I was around the province doing all kinds of—I'd never had a conversation with a Mi'kmaq person. I had never run into them, because they weren't—they just weren't where I was. And so, as Carl James would say, we've managed to create, you know, despite all the diversity that's right around us, we managed to really stay in our boxes.

Heron, a settler, chose to answer this question solely in relation to her journey in Education; As reported by Stella and Lark, Heron encountered the absence of learning about Indigenous peoples in Canada throughout much of her education.

> **Alexa**: Well, I wonder if you wouldn't mind telling me a bit about how you came to be in this work.
>
> **Heron**: Well, it's been an interesting journey, and it's certainly not one that I had anticipated many years ago. And so, I'm going to back right up to my own undergraduate teacher ed program which I completed in the late 80s, early 90s. And, I was a social studies major at the University of Alberta, and . . . through that degree program, just by having had numerous required courses in Canadian history and courses in education, social studies, methods, pedagogy, and curriculum, I didn't ever have conversations about anything about the dominant narrative of Canadian history. We might have talked a little bit about the, the absence of women in that narrative, but there was not discussion of Aboriginal peoples and our shared relationship—in Treaty 6 at the time.

All of these non-Indigenous scholars are aware of the erasure of Indigenous peoples and Lands from their experiences growing up. This expression of *terra nullius* (Coulthard, 2014) and the Vanishing (Vanished) Indian (Francis, 1992) resonates with the literature, and with the reported experiences of pre-service teachers as they learn in Indigenous education contexts in

teacher education (Dion, 2007; Schick, 2000). Florence's invocation of the 'boxes', which she attributes to James (2001), is also an articulation of Dion's (2007, 2009) *perfect stranger* stance; that is, the dysconscious (J. King, 1991) settler standpoint vis-à-vis Indigenous peoples. This awareness, which I share with the non-Indigenous participants, situates us well to contend empathetically with some of the resistance that the pre-service teachers we teach express as they begin or continue their learning journeys with relation to Indigenous peoples and topics in unsettling teacher education. All of the participants, myself included, experience resistances and ignorances that we had not anticipated.

Coming to Know, Resistance, and Anger

Many of the participants reported a specific realization, a coming to know, that they wanted or needed to 'do' education differently, in service of Indigenous peoples and territories. I describe these here. As they enacted their practices in relation to Indigenous futurities, most also faced the resistance on the part of the pre-service teachers that has been articulated in the literature, and that was also my experience (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014a, b; Schick, 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2003; Tompkins, 2002). Seeking to overcome these resistances, and supporting the learning of the ethical relationality of the pre-service teachers, is a central practice of cPBE.

Heron, in talking about her journey to Indigenous education, spoke specifically about her own education, and about the absence of learning about Indigenous peoples right up to and including in her PhD work. She described being called out by an Indigenous learner for replicating the dominant narrative despite the situated contexts of her students as learning on Indigenous lands, and how this propelled her to move forward to learn differently:

Well, Edmonton is in Treaty 6, so that's where I was at the time, and I really believed, Alexa, at that time that I was well-equipped to teach well in a classroom, and, indeed, I had the technical skills to do so. But, I didn't have, I think, a comprehensive understanding of the lived experiences of the learners in my classroom when I first began teaching, the majority of whom were adult, Aboriginal learners who had not had success in a regular school system for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is it's a colonial system that has structured itself in ways that do not support the success of Aboriginal learners, certainly not at that time. And, they were in my social studies classes, and I was teaching social studies from a dominant lens, not considering anything but a two-founding nations narrative, and it was the courage of one young Aboriginal student, to call me out. That was a, you know those moments that we have as teachers? We're like...oh my goodness. The veil was lifted, and I realized, that I had a lot to learn and that I, in my own practice, as a well-intentioned teacher, was doing a great deal of damage and perpetuating that narrative. So, I left my classroom and I pursued graduate work, and was very interested, I think, more specifically in, social justice education, anti-racist education. And, so in my master's, that was certainly a focus. It was more so the focus of my doctorate. But I would say, also in my doctorate that there wasn't a lot of exposure to the really critical theories of education, so at the time, there was a tradition in the department that I was studying in, a hermeneutic tradition, so that was a very dominant, interpretive, theoretical, methodological approach to research. There were not conversations about critical race theory. There were not conversations about decolonization or anti-colonial theory, so I had glimpses of it, I think, through feminist theory, through post-structural theory, through anti-racist thinking, but it wasn't until I arrived in [place] and was invited into a research project exploring best practices in Treaty education that I began to do that kind of theoretical work that I needed to do to understand not only the context that I found myself in, but my own lack of knowledge even though I'd been through an undergraduate degree, a master's degree, and a doctoral program. And I needed to understand, I needed to understand that for myself, so that I could, then, change my own practices as a teacher educator.

For Heron, the initial disruption was not enough. She made a choice to keep pursuing the learning she needed.

Lark learned early on about White privilege in her own negative experiences of school, which were in contradistinction to her parents', as grateful immigrants, celebration of the earlier Trudeau era valuing of multiculturalism. In this excerpt, Lark describes her developing understanding of Canadian colonialism under the tutelage of her Nisga'a friends:

> *Trudeau? Trudeau's a hero*. Right? And it's like, *he was inviting everybody.* And it's like, to whose party, right? And so, (laughter), you know, that was a real thing, and then at that Dancing Around the Table, I was able to see a few years later as well. It really clarified for me the disrespect that has been shown to Indigenous people and how I've had a life of privilege because I've been able to have certain choices and definitely growing up in an area where it was—in an area where there's a lot of immigration. It was very unusual to be white where I was living. So, I kind of knew about my Whiteness very early, and that most of my friends weren't white. And, that I could see in the school system that they weren't given the same options. So, I had much more understanding of racialization and Whiteness and, you know, we used to talk about that in high school, right? Like, *oh I bet you they're gonna, you know, you should go to the, enrichment class. Or, you're going to go to the basic class,* you know?

Lark spoke about her own coming to accountability later in her educational trajectory, that she had taught in inner-city Vancouver, and was 'schooled' by her students before coming into her PhD studies:

> I started by teaching Philosophy of Education, but I had been a long-term teacher in inner-city of Vancouver. I worked with a lot of Indigenous students and families, and had been corrected many a time (laughter) on what it would mean to be, teaching in a very good way with their children, and, took a lot of time to make relationships at the community centre locally and with the families.

Later in this same response, Lark talks about being invited to teach a course at the university in xxxx, despite being a settler, about the racism that was made explicit in her first year of teaching, and also the resistance to the spiritual practices in her course.

> And then the mandated course came up, and I never applied because in my mind I was thinking there are all these Indigenous PhD students around, and this is the perfect opportunity. And I had envisioned in my mind that the courses would be about Indigenous knowledge which I don't see as my role to teach, but my role is more to teach about settler complications and how settlers can learn and open ourselves to learning. Anyways, I was approached to teach it, and I thought, okay. And so I consulted with a very respected Indigenous academic mentor, and she said, *Why wouldn't you be teaching that? Of course you should be teaching that*. And then, so, and she had also—I had also been her teaching assistant, and she had mentioned before that, being a long-term teacher, understanding the complications and the things I had learned about the complications made me valuable in her class with her master's students. So, she thought that definitely I could take this on and do it. So, that's how it started, and there was a lot of racism in it the first year. And, there was one day where there was just like a bit of a mutiny. I wrote an article where there is a big section about the anger and the violence, and dominating epistemologies and space in this course. Especially as it goes to spirituality and, you know, what should and shouldn't be allowed in public educational spaces. How the borders of what we can discuss in schools are enforced by settlers. Who feel that power and authority in them even though they're teacher candidates and they're dealing with professors. They're still enforcing it on them. And, or trying to.

I have shared my own hesitance to teach these classes, initially, and the literature supports the experiences that both I and Lark report regarding racism and anger in the classes (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014a, b; Schick, 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2003; Tompkins, 2002). Although I have not included these experiences in my recounting of teaching the course, I have also had specific resistance to smudging ceremonies (outside) on religious grounds: For some, it was because of their Christian faith, and for some, because of their devotion to secularism—that

spirituality has no place in the classroom. This could likely make for a dissertation in and of itself.

Anger is a response I have encountered more frequently in response to discussions around stereotypes in film and in sports mascots, as discussed in Chapter Four. I believe anger and resistance are becoming more widely reported as these compulsory courses roll out at universities across Canada; however, these conversations are, as of yet, most likely held in the corridors and at meal times of the education conferences, or in response to questions about presentations. I expect to see work related to these matters in the literature soon. DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014b) write about resistance, including anger, as a response to taking a critical stance in courses where "you will be studying key concepts such as socialization, oppression, privilege, and ideology and doing coursework that challenges your worldview by suggesting that you may not be as 'open-minded' as you may have thought" (p. 1; see also Santoro, 2009; Schick, 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2003). This is echoed in the S-STEP literature on diversity and positionality (e.g., Berry, 2007; Brown, 2004; Kitchen, 2004, 2005a,b). Florence reports her experiences with these resistances in a different way.

Florence described her own practice of anti-oppression education in the context of how her practice has changed in answer to these resistances. She spoke about the ongoing need to democratize the classrooms; she and her colleagues have made a decision to attend to issues of power, race and gender in setting up the groups and learning communities in their classrooms:

> We have three sections. We get our program manager to divide up the power, so that we all have the same number of male phys ed students. We all have the same number of French Immersion grads. We very carefully try to balance the power, and then within the classes themselves, we use cooperative base groups. And within the base groups, we set the base groups up really carefully. First of all, we'll divide up so there's a male in each group. And then we'll try and say okay, that's a male from [university], let's try to

> balance that with, perhaps, an elementary woman who has not been at [same university]. And, we try, you know, let's put an Indigenous student in this group. So we really try and balance the room, which is a strategy that I always thought in grade 3 was useful. You know, really trying to engineer-in success. When I taught Indigenous women in the master's, we carefully engineered the group because you had the director of an organization as one of the really strong women, and you couldn't just put a primary teacher from a local school in the same group because the voice, you know, it was all Indigenous women who'd be drowned out. So, that's one of the biggest learnings I think we've had is that if you're doing this work, you're gonna get resistance, and so you can walk in and you can walk into traps. And, so now, for example, [name] really pays attention to setting up her base groups as a way of trying to rebalance the power.

Florence also spoke of the need to attend to these critical issues for, and with, the instructors:

> The students read power. So, if I watch settler faculty women who are untenured, they will have a harder time teaching that course than I will as somebody who's, you know, already a bit long in the tooth, and I've got tenure. One year, the dean, an African Canadian colleague, and myself taught the same course. We team-teach it. We team-plan it. We have three concurrent sections. Sometimes we'd come together, we really worked a lot together. When we looked at gender, I got challenged because that must be something I was bringing as a woman. [Name] and [name] didn't get challenged. When we did race, [name] got challenged because, *who's he, bringing all that African stuff*? The dean never got challenged. The person with the most white male privilege was not challenged by the students. So, what I've learned, the practice is to anticipate that this is going to be teaching against the grain, and—and structurally try and build in some support so that you're working with it. And I would say that what's happened over the years is that the culture—we have become stronger with this. It's now kind of culture that this is what you're doing, but in the early days, it was really—it was really tough.

There are a great many resonances here with the literature on Place and with my own experience of teaching anti-racist education, and certainly outdoor education. In situating community-building within the classroom as a part of cPBE practice, attending to these power

dynamics is an important consideration. Respectful right relation is so important to these practices, and intersectional oppressions are discussed and are enacted within the classroom in multiple ways, as described here. While I strive to be accountable, humble and transparent in terms of my teaching ability and methods, as I recounted in Chapter Four, I have encountered some resistances through comments in my teacher evaluations and comments to the class that I have since understood to be more common to women who teach. DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014b) describe resistance to evidence of inequality in classes that take a critical stance:

> Forms that resistance takes include silence, withdrawal, immobilizing guilt, feeling overly hopeless or overly hopeful, rejection, anger, sarcasm, and argumentation…. Further complicating the challenges of facilitating social justice content, many instructors who teach these courses occupy marginalized identities, which add more layers. (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014b, p. 1)

Indeed, resistances expressed in this way may have been part of the reason I was hired—my settler location nullified the extreme accusations of bias directed at some Indigenous faculty who taught the class before I did.

This sort of violent and racialized resistance was directly reported in the conversation with Stella:

> **Alexa:** I wonder, I've been writing a little bit about the sort of recurring patterns of resistance. I wonder if you notice, like, for me, teaching that class so many times, I heard the same things over and over and over and over again, right? And I wonder, I wonder if that has also been your experience—and what you see shifting that a little bit?
>
> **Stella:** Yes, I think that's a good point because my experience in teaching this course in 2008 was heartbreaking. Although it was offered as an elective, at the end of the day, at the end of the term, the comments were very personal. In terms of, you know, how biased I was or how I only favor the person who was an Indigenous person in the class.

> **Alexa:** Wow.
>
> **Stella:** All of those comments from the students. And that was a pattern. And I have seen it. You know that I'm doing this research. Now, I'm ready to do it like maybe a longitudinal comparison or study in terms of the reactions of the students and their experiences. So, I'm still collecting data until April, and then I'm ready to just do this one year, but also do the study since 2009. So, the comments are still bad. The resistance is still there.

Stella goes on to describe her hopes for the future of the course: she explains that she is hopeful that in a few years, the students coming into the courses will have worked with/learned from teachers that have a better grounding in these topics from their Faculty of Education experience in the compulsory classes—that there will be less ignorance, and less resistance. In the future:

> we are able to offer the required course in a different format. I don't know what shape that will take, but that's my hope, that there will be less resistance. We will always have the odd person, right, who likes to complain about the world. But that will be the exception as opposed to the rule. Because, we—we have those crossed arms, *why Aboriginal, why multicultural? I'm not planning to work with Aboriginal students.* They will go and, you know, work in whatever context except with Aboriginal. And I think those attitudes—being the optimistic (laughter), I'm hoping that in three years' time or five years' time, we will have less of those attitudes and more towards, okay, what's my job? What do I do?

In my own case, as well as not being seen as biased due to being white, I was also very lucky to have an administrator who supported me through his understanding that my teacher evaluations might be affected by resistance; that they might be lower based on the material and subjects I was teaching. I like to think this is true, but am also committed to being open to the possibility that my unsettling strategies need a lot of work, as a few of my negative instructor evaluations suggested. There were fewer negative evaluations in later iterations of the course; there are many factors that may have affected this. Some of these factors may include more

emphasis on community building in the initial classes, more regular Land-based classes, less course-work, and my own growing facility in the role. Understanding that these courses may illicit negative responses in instructor evaluations may be a very important way that faculties can support instructors of these courses; more importantly, supporting the instructors in building relationships and practices over time may be the best way for universities to administer these courses.

The resistances that are being expressed in our classrooms are well documented in the literature. Respect, awareness of our relative positions, and accountability are evident in the stories of each participant. Sharing experiences and pedagogies is of great value here: Florence addresses these experiences and thinks ahead in crafting her base groups while attending to gender, power, and race. This practice utilizes the understanding that lived perspectives and behavioural norms will be differently expressed by people from different material and structural locations, as the critical and intersectional work on Place tells us (see Malpas, 1999, 2009; Massey, 1994). All of the participants spoke about their practices as being importantly about anti-oppression education, where they are asking the participants to learn about intersectional oppressions and multiple perspectives—about their ethical relationality. These practices varied from participant to participant, but one element that all reported was the lack of knowledge performed by the Canadian pre-service teachers regarding Indigenous peoples in Canada.

Dysconsciousness

As part of the loosely structured guide to the conversations, I posed a particular question related to what the pre-service teachers 'know' coming into the class. All eight participants reported a sense of dismay at what the students did not know about Indigenous peoples, Lands

and Treaties coming into the classes they taught. This resonates with my experience, as documented in my journals, and descriptions in the literature (Godlewska et al. 2010; Higgins et al., 2013; Tompkins, 2002; Tupper, 2013), and in particular affirms Dion's (2007, 2009) *perfect stranger*. This reaffirms the urgency of the need for critical pedagogies that foster movement away from colonial mindsets, in support of Indigenous futurities. I discuss participants' thoughts and strategies in this section.

Dysconsciousness is the term used by J. King (1991) to theorize "the limited and distorted understandings my students have about inequity and cultural diversity—understandings that make it difficult for them to act in favor of truly equitable education" (p. 133).

> Dysconsciousness is an uncritical habit of mind (including perceptions, attitudes, assumptions and beliefs) that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given….Dysconscious racism is a form of racism that tacitly accepts dominant White norms and privileges. It is not the absence of consciousness (that is, not unconsciousness) but an impaired consciousness or distorted way of thinking about race as compared to, for example, critical consciousness. (J. King, 1991, p. 135)

The racism and inequity that King is referencing here is in the context of Blackness in America; for over one hundred years, scholars have researched and written about white privilege and the stratification of education and opportunity relating to Black people (see DuBois, 1935; Ellis, 1917; Ladson-Billings, 1991). The dysconsciousness expressed by Canadian pre-service teachers is attributable to both miseducation and to profound discomfort with the implications of benefitting from racist structures and perspectives, especially for those who strongly disavow racism themselves, just as King wrote about American educators (J. King, 1991, p. 138). It is hard to claim, in 2018, that the pre-service teachers in these classes have had no exposure to the

topics that are included in these Indigenous education classes, including Residential Schools, MMIWG, and Treaties.

Additionally, it is well documented that most education systems in Canada have perpetuated stereotypes and ignorances regarding Indigenous peoples, histories and territories in Canada (Carson et al., 2009; Godlewska et al., 2010; Schick, 2000). This is evident in that it is widely reported in the literature indicated above, and is unilaterally reported by the participants in this research. The distorted ways of thinking indicated by J. King (1991) are a result of this miseducation; the work of teacher education, and really of education in general, is to foster and support a *critical* habit of mind that understands personal location and structural inequity, and how these are intertwined—this is the aim of critical Place-based education (Gruenewald, 2003).

As mentioned in Chapter Two, a major feature of the oppression of Indigenous peoples and territories, that is, of settler colonialism, that distinguishes this oppression from colonial oppressions, is the emphasis on Land (Coulthard, 2014; Tuck, Mackenzie & McCoy, 2014; Veracini, 2011; Wolfe, 2006). Addressing uncritical habits of mind through teacher education, then, means employing anti-racist and anti-oppression education and with Land-based education.

In Heron's program, they have an application requirement related to anti-oppression education:

> We don't pretend that we're not about anti-oppressive education. It's in our mission statement. It's in our values and our goals. It's part of our strategic planning process. We are looking for students in their application profiles that. . . seem to have thought a little bit about social justice education, who have had some experiences that could support them in becoming anti-oppressive educators.

Despite this application requirement, Heron reported that few students are aware of the Treaties or of Indigenous peoples and communities in Canada.

Jasperdaniels' response to this question was an unqualified negative, followed by a statement about his own knowledge, and what other professors might know as contributing factors to student ignorance:

> **Alexa**: When your students come into the program, do you find that they have a sense of themselves? Like, you know, would they be familiar with the comprehensive land claim.
>
> **Jasperdaniels**: No!
>
> **Alexa**: And do they know much about, like, what do they?
>
> **Jasperdaniels**: I would say more and more students know about the Indian Residential Schooling system because it's been on the media quite a bit, but in terms of Indigenous approaches to governance or education, or ways of knowing, like that's not, I mean, like, I know, for me, I only know not even a sliver of a sliver. And most profs don't know that either. And then, so the students really, for the most part, would not have understanding of that.

Another aspect of the ignorance that Jasperdaniels reports lies in the conceptual framework of *authenticity* described earlier in this dissertation. He said:

> Some students go there, where they expect to see *authentic* First Nations culture and get very disappointed when they see the teacher teaching math and who has decided, like, you know, it's not always going to be our local culture integrated or within what they're doing. Or, yeah, I'll use the term integrated. In the lesson that they're teaching, and they're like, *you know I thought I was going to see.* I'm like, as if it's stuck in history somewhere. And so, I find that interesting. I'm like, but you're in it! This is it! Right? This is it. So, I find that interesting, but most of them, I don't want to generalize, but many of the students say it's changed the way they think that they might teach history. It's made things more complicated for them. It's not the simple narrative that they're gonna teach.

This conscientization (Freire, 1990), or transformation, to use the S-STEP terminology, that Jasperdaniels reports is, for me, the goal of this work: To complicate and humanize the 'Indian' that the students had in mind (T. King, 2007).

Florence's program is strongly critical in its stance: When I asked Florence whether there was an assessment criterion like the one Heron described for their application process, her answer was that there was not, and that they also know that this will be new information for most students:

> But we don't expect, nor do we get people who are all that sharp coming in about this stuff. They don't seem—considering the four years they've had in undergrad—this is big news. It continues to be big news about power and privilege. The ones that come in from Women's Studies will have it. The ones that come in from Sociology will have some sense of it, but most of them are not—not being exposed to this kind of thinking when they come in. But we have a confidence that, you know, many of them will say, you know, I want to treat all children the same. And, most of them have almost no understanding of settler-Indigenous relations or that they're in an Indigenous place at all. Very disappointing. That's slowly shifting, but we trust the program will take them there.

This assessment of the students' lack of knowledge about Indigenous peoples and their own implication in Indigenous issues as Canadian citizens, as reported in the literature by Dion (2007, 2009), Higgins et al. (2013), Schick (2000) and Schick and St. Denis, (2003), was also reported by Bear.

> **Alexa**: One of the things that I'm pretty focused on and that has come up with some of the other folks that I've been talking to is…do you have a sense that people understand themselves as, citizens in a particular territory or Treaty territory or whatever else?
>
> **Bear**: No! No, they don't get it. There's so much that they don't know about, you know, things like Treaties and, with watching The Eighth Fire video series, they get a little bit of insight into that, right? 'Cuz they do their—I think they do a pretty good job of introducing all of these issues. So, they get a little bit of insight there. It will be interesting to see when

we do this Indigenous Environmental Sustainability course next year. Where they really are at and then how far—how far they come. But they have the Eighth Fire as a foundation. So, we'll kind of see where that goes, but for the most part, they really don't have any idea about that stuff.

Alexa: Do you have candidates that come that are taken aback by—that Indigenous peoples and knowledges are—have such a strong presence at [University]? Like, I suppose you might not hear about that? (Laughter)

Bear: Well, no. I do—I mean, I've heard both sides. I've heard people say it's wonderful that [University] does this. And then I've heard other people say *Why?* You know, why is there such an Indigenous thing—like they, some of them don't get it, you know? And even with me going into classes and, you know, talking about the policy framework and what is the policy framework here? Why it's so important? I do—a big part of my work is to—is to present a rationale for it because if they don't—they don't understand why it's important, they're not going to do anything with it, right? I'm always trying to, you know, I'm always pitching a campaign as to why this is important to do. And I don't always—I don't always get them all. Some of them still don't get it.

Alexa: I feel like all is—that's a high—the hard part. I feel like some is good—(some overlapping speech)

Bear: I know, and I-I just keep thinking, you know, you know, I—all I do is I put the seed there, and if it's not going to germinate now, it's there and maybe sometime down the road, they'll go, *Oh! Okay! I get it now!* You know what I mean?

Alexa: I do! (Laughter)

This last part resonated with me strongly. As I described in Chapter Four regarding 'the long game', we really cannot know what effect we have on the learners. We can 'plant the seed', and hope. I frequently think about the incredibly heated and contentious arguments that erupted in my classes regarding the sports mascot topic, and wonder if those who were there shifted their thinking at all in light of the increasingly public calls to change mascot and team names such as

the Cleveland Indians' Chief Wahoo, or the Washington Redskins, or the Edmonton Eskimos. I think about the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG); in 2009-2010, this was not a very well-known issue amongst settlers. Now, with the original numbers quadrupled from what they were then, and with the (albeit imperfect) National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, do the participants in those classes who heard the presentations by their classmates see the issue differently than they would have? Are they more invested in it because of what they learned? I hope so. Over the years, the classes that have been the most challenging for me have been the Residential Schools classes. My profound hope is that the increasing profile of this issue, thanks to the work of the TRC, has magnified the learning from those classes for all who were there. Still, there is a very long way to go, and it is both encouraging and awful that each participant in these conversations has encountered the deep ignorance around Indigenous peoples that is widely reported in the literature, and that I and many in my community of practice have encountered.

The lack of knowledge was reported in this way by Ma'iingan:

> **Alexa**: Do your students see themselves as territorially or culturally situated? So, you've talked a lot about your use of perspectivism, and so, what I'm trying to get at with this question is, is this new information for people? That they have a perspective? Or that they are already in Indigenous territory? Or that they are already Treaty partners? Is that something? How much knowledge do you encounter that people already have about that stuff?
>
> **Ma'iingan**: Very little. You know, unless students take a Native Studies class or Indigenous Studies or something, they will have very little knowledge of that. I've been really shocked, actually, because I thought the school system had tried to integrate that a little more. It's been kind of sad. I mean, there's not a lot of knowledge about those kinds of things. They might've heard the term Treaty, but they don't really understand what it is and the real, real importance of it. And why it's so important that people know that.

Earlier in this chapter, Toby's objective to teach more about Treaty education was noted briefly. Part of that same thread was regarding the lack of knowledge on the part of their students, in the same vein as their own lack of knowledge:

> **Alexa**: But did you find that your students were aware of the territory or the Treaty territory?
>
> **Toby** : No, no. Absolutely not. So, I did make a purpose, not in the first lecture. I believe I did it in the second lecture of just recognizing that we were on [name] First Nation, because we were speaking about identity and that gave me an opportunity to be able to talk about that. I did very little discussion of Treaties, actually, based—because I didn't have a lot of knowledge and didn't feel, to be able to. That's something I'd like to learn more—a lot more about. But definitely recognizing what the traditional territory was.

Stella was very gentle and compassionate about this ignorance in her students, but still reported it unequivocally.

> **Alexa**: Now, do you have a sense that they [pre-service teachers] see themselves as territorially or culturally situated? For example, I ask them to identify a place that's important to them and to investigate, you know, Treaty territories or — So what I'm curious to know is, in your experience of teaching those classes, do you have a sense that the students have a sense of themselves in that way? Or—or, do you think that that's something you really see develop over the course of that class?
>
> **Stella**: So, with that, I think it's the latter….If their degree is in the humanities, then, we see a little bit more of that exposure and that understanding. They don't come as raw or as, ignorant, for lack of a better word. Or not having been exposed. So, some of them, but it's the exception. Still is the exception. And the number of students who have an awareness or who are in their heart, you know, activists and who are involved and engaged. So those are the students who have an understanding and an appreciation about what we're trying to do.

Like Florence did, Stella indicates that the humanities students might have a bit more experience with the topics. She adds that mature students, or students with more life-experience, help in the difficult work of shifting the perspectives in the class. Stella also spoke eloquently about the violence that is inherent in these ignorances for Indigenous peoples:

> But the majority of the students, I have to say, have a very difficult time acknowledging that they are occupying a land that, yes, they have good hearts and good intentions, but it's, it takes some kind of working on, reframing one's position in the world when one has to acknowledge that this is not your land. That this is somebody's land, and there are traditions. And if we do believe, like, when we go to the graveyard that our ancestors are there, it's very similar. Because here our ancestors are here. And a lot of these places, which are very sacred, like [place, place] are burial grounds, and we don't know—we know that that soil on which we are stepping has been, fortified and fed and nurtured by the bones of those ancestors, but the spirits and the life. So, it is—for some of them it's just a lot of, blah blah blah, and I think that when students are in the mindset or heartset, it's very difficult to challenge or to change those perspectives. And I never want to be a converter. I never want to be a person who says you have to think this way because that counters the work that we want to do. But I think there's nothing wrong with exposing them and saying this is what it is. It's different if you don't accept it, but this —this is what exists here. So, there are variations. I think it has to do with life experience. We also have a number of mature students who have been now and then. Maybe not all together, but in a year we can have three or four. And those sometimes are the students who also help the younger minds who are the less experienced minds to appreciate…

I share Stella's hope that one way that the pre-service teachers will arrive at these programs with a bit more awareness of both their positionality and of their implication in, and occupation of, Indigenous communities and Lands is through the growing emphasis on this cPBE and Land-based schooling in faculties of education.

So far, the dysconsciousness is widespread. The fact of this dysconsciousness creates the need for cPBE. cPBE cuts through dysconsciousness by connecting people to truths about places they know, opening space for different relations in the future.

As more faculties of education require this learning in programs to meet the Calls to Action of the TRC (2015), the frameworks for this learning are being negotiated differently in different places. Compulsory courses, electives, immersive programs and placements, large lectures and small seminars—many programs are reporting on their practices in this new context. In the next section, I describe some differences reported in compulsory versus elective contexts.

Compulsory vs. Elective Courses

At CSSE in 2015 in Calgary, I came to realize how many institutions are now requiring Indigenous Education or Indigenous content classes (Indigenous studies, classes on Treaties, pedagogies for Indigenous learners) in their education programs. I went to presentations from scholars from the University of Calgary, the University of British Columbia, the University of Alberta, and the University of Winnipeg, who were presenting on the new compulsory programs they were instituting. The results were mixed, to say the least. Some reported glowing successes, and some reported walkouts, boycotts, and deep and combative arguments. In particular, the compulsory courses seemed to be encountering the greatest resistances; this aligns with the experiences of a few of the participants in the conversations. When topics of privilege, race, class and gender are introduced in the compulsory classes, the reactions from the students can be emotional, even violent, as DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014a,b) warn.

Stella and Lark both reported violent resistances of varying degrees in their classes; I was very overwhelmed by the emotion and anger that I encountered in the early classes I taught.

While I am more accustomed to it now, I think frequently about how to take it up in a way that is productive and useful in the classes, instead of leaving people feeling shut down or violated. Part of this work, then, is anticipating this, and finding pedagogies and approaches to contend with these reactions. Florence has reported her success in doing just this by attending to power in the groups she forms in the classes themselves. Ma'iingan reports little resistance in his classes; he is a kind, patient and skilled facilitator with years of cross-cultural relationship building in his background in a variety of contexts. He was clear that it does not *never* happen, it is just infrequent. I tend to exaggerate the negative reactions or responses, but they still happen, as frequently documented in my journals, and as bemoaned in my dialogues with my critical friends. Ma'iingan is an Indigenous male scholar who is older than I am; I wonder about what significance this has in how his words and work are received by students. And, I would like to learn more from him.

I share some colleagues' apprehension about requiring these courses. Some of my concerns include: Who is teaching the courses; how they are taught; do other courses in the programs support the information and pedagogies in these classes; and, are the universities and colleges that are requiring these classes going to support this work by shifting the many other ways that the institutions continue to oppress and to perpetuate settler colonialism? These increasingly widespread concerns are mentioned in Chapter Four, and have been written about recently by such noted scholars as M. Giroux (2017), Todd (2017, 2018) and many recent posts on Twitter from Eve Tuck (2018). From the literature:

> Will mandatory courses teach Indigenous issues through Western epistemic conventions or through Indigenous intellectual traditions and systems of knowing? In short, it is the old question of whether we are teaching Indigenous content in an otherwise hegemonic institution where business goes on as usual, or whether universities are ready to engage

> more profoundly with Indigenous concepts of the world, the human being, and the relationship between the two. Can that be accomplished in a single mandatory survey course? (Kuokkanen, 2016)

In my own teaching, the course was compulsory, and there was some effort to have common goals and information across sections, but this was not attended to consistently. Because of the different personal locations and approaches of the different instructors, students had very different experiences of the course in different sections. While this can produce great strengths in programming, I worried a lot about consistency in the honoraria offered, or not offered, to Elders and to other community members and in the relationships with the community members that could be invited into the classes. The institutional advocacy that I wrote about in Chapter Four was carried through to being invited by the Lakehead Faculty of Education administration, in 2016, to contribute to a re-visioning of the requirements of the *EDUC 4416* course going forward as they prepared for the new 36-hour course.

Stella, Lark, Ma'iingan, Heron and Toby all taught compulsory classes specifically dedicated to Indigenous peoples and learning. Stella reported that the course she teaches started off as an elective but became compulsory. Stella also spoke a bit about the work that she is mainly engaged with now:

> Most of the work that I do now relates the required course in Indigenous education, and I basically coordinate; we have five or six sessional instructors depending on the term, who teach that course. So, part of my job is as mentor and is also facilitating teaching circles. We meet every two weeks to just make sure we're on the same track. We talk about how is this going, how are you feeling, are there any challenges, share resources, coordinate site visits, or coordinate guest speakers. So, that's also very exciting in terms of beyond the teaching, it's also talking to my colleagues and just making sure that we're all being taken care of. Taking care of one another.

This practice of checking in with one another and caring for one another as instructors, that is, constructing a community of practice as S-STEP encourages teacher educators to do (Kitchen, & Ciuffetelli-Parker, 2009), is something I argue should be adopted in faculties across the country that are engaged in these required courses. As has been reported by the participants and in the literature (e.g., DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014a, 2014b; Schick, 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2003; Tompkins, 2002), this work is difficult, emotional and can be violent[24]. Support and sharing of resources and practices in communities of practice should be a fundamental part of this work, particularly for the programs where the classes are compulsory.

Some courses are neither fully compulsory nor truly electives. Although Florence's program does not have a compulsory class in Indigenous education, the Indigenous content is woven throughout the compulsory classes, and then they have dedicated elective classes also:

> The *Sociology of Education* really starts with the anti-racist perspective and really works on looking at Eurocentrism and then power and privilege and white privilege and settler privilege. And then we do take up the themes in the sociology; we take up the themes of looking at race, class, gender and do go into the Residential School. The Treaties less, but I think we'll probably do more of that, and that's a course that everyone takes. As well as that, we do have an elective in First Nations and Métis and Inuit education with other students—which other students will choose to follow. We wanted to make sure everybody got that foundation, and then we follow that with inclusion too, which continues those themes....They've got a pretty good rounding in the language and vocabulary of social justice. And then this other elective will do that.

Little to no resistance was reported by the participants where the classes were elective; quite the opposite. Jasperdaniels and Bear's programs are elective, and entirely Land and community-

[24] Here I am using the term violence in the way Spivak (1988) does, to mean epistemic violence. Spivak invokes Foucault's (1980) concept of *subjugated knowledges*: that is, to actively devalue and demean non-Western forms of knowledge.

based, and they report unilaterally positive feedback from their students. Their programs are immersive and experiential, and are examples of wonderful practices in this field. This positive report is a dramatic contrast to both my own experiences of resistance and to the findings of scholars such as Schick (2000) and Schick and St. Denis (2003). There are many possible explanations, including the starting places of the participants (background knowledge, experience, relationality), the group dynamics, the level of support and encouragement available both from peers and from instructors, and even a performance of 'allyship' being the norm rather than the exception. That these courses are wholly Land- and community- based may also be the reason for the positive feedback; this supports the overwhelming evidence from my own courses that these practices are the best received. Whatever the reasons, this is encouraging, and supports the turn towards centering Land-based learning for ethical relationality as best practice in cPBE in Indigenous education in teacher education. I turn now to these programs and other Land-based experiences.

Learning from the Land

The most immersive example of Land-based learning amongst the participants was a course that Bear offers. For 10 years, Bear has been running a program at her home as an alternative placement for the pre-service teachers. The group is small, and carefully selected; they live, work, eat and learn together for 12 days on Bear's property near the university. This course reminded me of the Pangnirtung program that I participated in in 2008. She described it like this:

> Okay, so our alternative settings placement is 75 hours, so they spend 12 full days with me. I run a 9-3 day, and it's done all at my home. It's done all outside. What I'm trying to do is, I want them to learn about Indigenous peoples. And I know the quickest and

> deepest way that I can do that is to do it on the Land. And so we learn about Indigenous people through the Land because, as you know, our worldview is a direct reflection of the natural world. So, if you understand our relationship to the natural world, you understand who we are. And so, that's what it's about. And so they come and we do a variety of things. We start the day off every day with ceremony and a morning circle which is like a mimic of a sunrise ceremony. We engage with the Land in a variety of ways….we go canoeing. We do a trip down to the end of the lake, and they love that. And…they get some ideas and some things they could actually do with their kids. We go out on the land, and we engage with what it has to offer in the moment. So, because we're doing it in the spring, we often go picking edibles, you know, like fiddleheads and leaks, and cattails. So I show them, this is *food*, you know. There's food out here. And, we talk about, you know, our teachings about that. We talk about our processes by which we do that respectfully, by offering tobacco, and we pick food and we eat it. I show them what's available. Like, I identify the plants right around us. This is what we got. This is how we can use it, right? We explore things like storytelling. We kind of unpack the creation story.

This Land-based learning is an example of the schooling that supports the shift Kimmerer (2016) calls for: Embodied practice of experiencing a positive interaction between humans and 'nature'. Tying this to story, to Anishinaabe epistemology and ontology, shows a different way of being in the world and of learning from Indigenous peoples and territories. I see this practice as particularly powerful: It certainly has been for me both in my own personal learning journeys at Trent, and in my teaching. However, this is not available to everyone, or to all pre-service teacher programs, yet. This would be a difficult fit for a compulsory program, as financial and accessibility considerations would be tricky, but certainly not insurmountable. Bear's program and Jasperdaniels' program have similarities in that they are both elective and completely community-based.

Jasperdaniels explains the model for his program, which is a combination of compulsory and elective immersive experiences. The program is tied to a local Indigenous community; it is 90 kilometres away from the university, and it is this community's territory that the university is on.

> I wanted to do what I don't think we had ever done, was to ask an Elder to come welcome us to the territory. So at the orientation, we had an Elder, and we had a principal from the school we work with. We had an Elder who is a Residential School survivor. So, each said the prayer, blessed everyone and welcomed them. Gave them a little bit about what they should think about. The Elder who was an Indian Residential School survivor spoke to that experience. Said why it's important to remember that. The principal talked about the importance of First Nations' education, not just for First Nations' students but all students, right? As Canadians and First Nations, Métis, Inuit communities, we need to have a better sense of our shared history or histories. And the relation—the way in which the relationships have been historically told or not told. That happened for all the students. We always try to set up a couple of kind of talks during the year which students are invited to. Not all students have to be there, but they're invited to do that. And then, myself and [name] who's the assistant director, we work the global cohort, and for those 90 students, we ask them to come with us to an orientation as part of the course, up to the community. So, 90 students travelled up and did an orientation with [name] and [name], so the director at the cultural centre and also the principal of the school about their history and their challenges and the way in which they'd like to see things move forward. They also get to do a tour around the school, and the school really works to disrupt the students' prior conceptions of what schools on reserves might look like and then the communities on reserve because often media is about the poverty which exists. About, there's stories about mismanagement, and so you get these little tidbits that get extrapolated, like, oh, the students are like*, this how it must be on all reserves.* And that school the students go [to], *this is better than the schools that I've, you know, been in. Or better than the schools I've done my teaching placement at…*it's the funding per student which is still 1/3 less. And they do some amazing stuff. 99% of the teachers are from the community….And then, after that, some of the students, then in the second semester, will

> go up one day every two weeks. So a smaller group. And it's all in preparation for those who want to do, at the end of their practicum do two weeks, a two-week additional teaching practicum up there where they're assigned to a teacher, and they work out what they're going to teach that week. And then they teach for two weeks with the students in the school.

I asked Jasperdaniels what he felt is valuable about the program that he facilitates with the community that he has carefully built a relationship with:

> **Alexa:** My evident orientation is towards land and place, and I think that this is the thing that is shifting, pre-service teacher perspectives or whatever. But I don't want to go out and be 'inceptioning' people when you know that is what I think. But what do you think about it? What do you see happening when the students are engaged in that way?
>
> **Jasperdaniels:** Well, one, well two different things. One, they focus on, which I try to encourage, which is on the relationship. So, for many students, they've never had a relationship. Period. With a First Nations person. Let alone visited a reserve. Or spent that much time, right? So, just doing that and having a relationship shifts the way, I think, for those students, about what's possible. I don't know what's possible for them because I don't know what they're going to do in the future, but the fact that they have a relationship, or had a relationship, or, you know, they're in the process of maintaining that relationship changes things.

For Jasperdaniels, the experience and the relationship is at the centre of what is happening. While I argue that both experience and relationship have everything to do with Land and place, Jasperdaniels is not quite so explicit in his articulation. Like when I took my students to Chippewas of Rama First Nation, the community that Jasperdaniels takes his students to is far enough away to not be part of the everyday life of most students, although some of my students drive through the reserve on their way to school. Another similarity between Jasperdaniels' program and mine lies in the disrupting of the students' expectations of what a reserve school might look like; the school and the students are thriving. While my students experience a

snapshot, the ongoing and immersive nature of Jasperdaniels program is wonderful in that it supports deeper relationships and learning: The teacher-candidates can better understand themselves-in-relation after weeks in the community, and will bring these understandings back to their homes and practices.

It may be very important to relate these experiences explicitly to the daily life of the learners, as is called for in Place-based education (Davis et al., 2000, Evernden, 1985); there is a criticism of outdoor education when the learning takes place away from the daily life of the learners, that this lets the learners see nature, or in this case Land, as separate or not part of regular life. It is this very separation that we are attempting to disrupt through Land-based cPBE in teacher education; that is, that Indigenous peoples and Lands are throughout Canada. It is not clear from my conversation with Jasperdaniels how much of this work centres Land. However, as Jasperdaniels points out, these immersive and critical Place-based practices are very powerful both in building relationship and in shifting understandings of the interrelationships between settler and Indigenous peoples. The students articulate how their prior conceptions of Indigenous peoples, and reserve schools, are disrupted, and many of his students express a wish to continue to work in Indigenous contexts, just as mine did.

To a much greater degree, Land is centred in Ma'iingan's work, in his thinking and in his worldview. Ma'iingan's teaching is of a compulsory class in a BEd program. In this quote, he describes his academic and work trajectory, and places Land firmly at the centre of both:

> It really is Land is the instigator of everything that I do. So, in the methodology that I developed, it's really talking about Land and gathering stories about Land and talking about the meaning of Land to the people that ends up facilitating peace, facilitating connection, facilitating culture development, identity development, and all those kinds of things….But I think in an Indigenous context, the depth of that discussion doesn't really grasp the meaning Land holds for people. I think within our cultures, it's just it's so

> profound. And I really think most of the literature doesn't do it justice. It mentions it, of course, and it does talk about it in terms of identity, but I really think it's even more profound than most theorists have even talked about. Because for us, Land is everything, you know. The symbols contained within the Land, our cultural ceremonies, everything connects us to the Land. So it's just a huge part of who we are, and not—I worked lots in politics. People throw around things like sacredness and terms, and in Aboriginal circles, I think we've become pretty skilled at using the politics of Aboriginal stuff in order to further our issues. So, but I think with Land, and the meaning Land holds, I really think people don't really grasp that full connection. And I hope—I hope that's what my thesis really emphasized. The idea that Land is just—I don't know how to describe it. It has—it's everything to do with our culture. And that connection—that's why when people say things like you know, the Land is sick, the people are sick, things like that. Actually, you know sometimes that's kind of mystical when people say that, but actually there's very concrete—you can make a very concrete tangent between those two things.

Ma'iingan sees the Land throughout his life, and in his practice, explicitly and implicitly.

While Jasperdaniels is less explicit, where he does explicitly centre Land is in talking about his personal history during his doctoral work. Here, Jasperdaniels' conversation was saturated with his learnings and experiences in the marshes of Louisiana, learning from the Homa. It was there that he learned deeply about the damage that was done to the ecosystem when the Mississippi was channelized, pushing sediment off of the continental shelf instead of being deposited throughout the marsh:

> We went fishing in Golden Meadow in the marsh behind there, and when the sun would come up and you look across the marsh, you could see why they call it Golden Meadow. Just the marsh grass would light up like a golden meadow. And then you would see the red fish in that hue. It was beautiful, right. And one of the reason they're losing it is that in 1927 when they had a huge flood in the United States. It was like over 1000 people died. The Mississippi flooded right out. They called the army corps engineers in to build the levee system to create the Mississippi River to go, to dump the water and the

> sediment off the continental shelf. That was one of the repercussions of it. So, you don't, you don't have the Mississippi river's natural meandering back and forth that it's done for thousands and millions of years to replenish the marsh grass and build it back up. Instead, it all gets dumped off the continental shelf, and they didn't build, like, in some places culverts for the fresh water to go back out and provide the balance between the salt water and the fresh water to create that brackish environment for the marsh grass to grow. So that, like, for me, that four years of experiencing that gave me, kind of, a more, a deep appreciation for kind of looking at Place differently.

While Jasperdaniels was researching Indigenous peoples in a particular place, he came to see place differently. One of the connections that Jasperdaniels made was between this Land-based oppression and the structures of schooling:

> When I learned in Louisiana, you learn, look…we engineered a river. That's having consequences. Like, we try to engineer everything, and so, I mean, if somebody has been doing something for, like, thousands of years because it maintains a certain kind of balance in the world, there's something to learn from that. And then you come and engineer something that completely alters the balance of the ecosystem that you're within, like the marsh grass, it, you know, it has massive impacts. And so, I think, you know, last night, I was listening to one of the publication awards, I think it's Jackie Siddel's work, talking about how it's pretty unnatural to put 30 kids in a tight room to help them learn when, historically, it's been the world itself that's been our, you know, our curriculum. And, so maybe that's kind of a representation of the imbalance. Like, taking kids and putting them, so you take a river and put it in a box, and this is what happens.

For Jasperdaniels, the connection between the systemic oppressions that led to the channelization of the river and to rigid structures of schooling of children in a classroom is easy to make, and each has serious negative consequences.

While Ma'iingan was asked to address Land in schooling, and in particular when prompted to speak about the ways that Land enters into his practice of Indigenous education, he spoke passionately about Land in education, or perhaps more accurately *Land as education*:

> And *Gakinoomangwin* —learning in Ojibway, teaching and learning is the same term, so if you really think about that, it's so profound, eh? So, Land means Earth. Everything in the Earth. Teaching and learning is the same….So I said earlier about process. Research is a process. Learning is a process. The process of gathering medicines is a teaching process and learning process. So, if you think about teaching and learning the same, all those processes are equally teaching—equally learning, right? So, when they were blueberry picking, the Elders talk about it as a time, well, we got together and my grandmother would be there. And we'd find out what did everybody do over the winter. And how their families were. And so, that—that process of gathering becomes a process of enculturation, okay? So, everything that we do as Aboriginal people, traditionally, that's what it was, right? It's a way to learn the culture. We didn't have—we didn't have classrooms, so where did we go? Now, if I lived with my grandmother and the family members all had different roles in that, so for me, my uncle filled that role. He would take me out on the Land, and then we'd walk along a trail, and he would point things out to me, and we'd talk about it. Now, the other part about it, too, that I think is really interesting—so you said earlier that, for you—when you were young, you had a piece of property in your family since the late 1800s. So if you think about it for us, the European history of this area starts in, you know, 1600s. If you think about it in terms of us as a people being here for thousands of years, what happens is over time, we travel a piece of land and then my father tells me the story about this particular piece of land that his grandfather told him that his grandfather told him. So the Land itself acts as almost a memory queues as you're walking, as you're participating and travelling on the Land….But, you don't understand is that when we say the Land is sacred, we say that because when you say we're gonna go fishing, immediately a process of learning and teaching happens. You know, my uncle would call me the night before. Tell me to get ready. Say these are things you're gonna need. We'll be going to this spot. You know, it's in the winter, so you gotta make sure you dress warm. We're gonna have a fire, so make

> sure you bring this kind of food. And then when he picks me up, we start talking, and we start sharing all the way there and all the way back. He tells me, here's where I shot a moose with your grandfather when we were young. Here's where we did this. And so, all of the Land—it's the story and the travel on the Land. All that has—is our way of teaching and learning, right? I use my medicine bundle for that, so like when we're given medicine bundles or we carry different gifts, all those gifts come from the Land. They come from the natural environment, and then those gifts those bundle symbols become stories. And they become the stories of how I became an Aboriginal person. So when I was young, I didn't know anything about culture. Then, I was given a drum, and when I was given my drum, I was given teachings. And so, now when I talk about that drum, that drum becomes the story of how I learned about my culture. A Siksika Elder that I worked with—his name is Alan Wolfleg from the Blackfoot people—he explained it to me like, for them, they used medicine bundles as part of their clan system. Or their system of governance. And so, he told me that a medicine bundle is like an icon on the computer. You click on an icon, you get a story. Well that's what medicine bundles were. You—you have a symbol in there. That symbol is an icon and it has a representation. So, I think that's purposeful how they do that. It's to, you know, transfer history and things, but also on a more day to day living. Also, that's very applicable in an Indigenous context. To me, that's everything.

While Ma'iingan does not take his classes out on the Land (yet), he brings his bundle into class, to teach Land-based learning and process to the class. In this way, he connects the students to the Land.

Bear and Ma'iingan, both Indigenous educators, were the most explicit in talking about the central role that Land plays in their practices. In terms of immersive Land-centered critical Place-based experiences, Bear and settler educator Jasperdaniels each offer elective courses where the pre-service teachers are learning daily from and with Indigenous educators and community members. Ma'iingan speaks about his daily life, and about his scholarship and his

educative practice: Land is at the heart of everything he does. He is showing the pre-service teachers what Land-centered Indigenous life looks like for him—for a Land-connected Indigenous university professor. In these experiences, in Bear, Jasperdaniels and Ma'iingan's programs, pre-service teachers are learning what Indigenous futurities look like, and how to support them…in these experiences with Land, place and people, the future is now.

Instructors Becoming Connected to Place

In two of the conversations, notably with settler educators, one topic that resonated was the recounting of forging relationships with particular places. Both Jasperdaniels and Lark talk about their own process of becoming connected to place—specifically to the place that they are teaching in—as an ongoing process of developing relationships to people and to the places. They are attending to their ethical relationality. They describe that these are processes that take a great deal of time, and how complex the layers are of understanding that they are uncovering as they spend time in their places.

> **Alexa**: I wonder, so I've heard you talk about a couple of different places. I wonder if there's a particular place or land that really occupies a part of your make up?
>
> **Lark**: Yeah. Definitely, I live on Musqueam. Well, overlapping Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh to the unceded territories. I've been corrected before. So, I said I'm on unceded Musqueam traditional territory, ancestral. And somebody said, *it's not just Musqueam right?* And so, I actually asked a lot of people, and then I did research. I went down to archives, and I found archives of Musqueam and Squamish Elders, that were recorded saying exactly where everything was. So I learned, and I've made it a continual habit of learning the history of the land that I live on, and what the, different views are on that land. And it's not my place to put myself between Musqueam and Squamish but there's one amazing tape with two of those Elders saying, *Oh, no, no, no*. So, I just feel as a settler in my place, I can acknowledge that these are overlapping territories, but

> everybody, does agree on the other side. And this is my special place, right? It's the other Fraser side, so it's not on the inlet side. It's on the other side. That is Musqeaum. That is that piece there. The inlet is very different on the mountain side. Like, that's all overlapping. I probably go to this place four times a week.
>
> **Alexa**: Wow!
>
> **Lark** Yeah, and that's my center. That's-that's where I go. That's what I do, and it's a couple of kilometers, and I walk, and I know every season. I know when the grass is coming up, and I know where the beavers are. Like, I know a lot just because I just go there, and it's a very quiet spot. And, yeah. I go walk, and I go with my dogs. So, I think that's-that's definitely how I keep my balance for sure.

Earlier in this chapter, I related Jasperdaniels' story of coming to understand place differently as he conducted his PhD research in Louisiana. In response to my question about how he came to teach Indigenous education, Jasperdaniels told a story about how a great deal of time was spent in his PhD work fishing with an Indigenous community in the southern US. In his recounting, we can see the importance of the development of relationships with people and with Place that have come to characterize his program of Indigenous education in teacher education:

> I was in my late 20s, early 30s and doing my PhD. And, the joke was that, 'cuz I would always go down and go fishing with J* or J#. And so, *you're coming to do your PhD right*? And I was going fishing…
>
> I wasn't doing research; I was just hanging out. You know, if they had an Elder's festival, I went and helped. If they had elections going on for band council, I helped. If they had a big cookout for a function, I'd help. And then, they had summer camps for the kids, I'd helped out. I'd do the newsletter and stuff. So, it was really spending, like, of the four years, a lot of time in that place.
>
> And then, through fishing, I learned about the landscapes and the importance of the tides. And the importance of brackish water in relation to the marsh…

Jasperdaniels went on to describe some of what he learned about the landscape while he was there, 'hanging out'. He said:

> So that was kind of, like learning that. And then the other concept of place that I learned in terms of that is the concept of time. And so, when you fish in a pirogue and you're going through the marsh, you travel across the landscape at a pace where you're able to observe things at a different pace….So that, for me, that four years of experiencing that gave me, kind of, a more, a deep appreciation for kind of looking at place differently. And I still feel here in [place] I'm still trying to understand.

This story of Jasperdaniels developing his ethical relationality is deeply familiar to me: It is an expression of one of the core activities of coming to know Indigenous peoples and Lands—relationship building. I had to learn the Land both in Orillia and in Thunder Bay. Those relationships are built over time both with people and with place, with Land (Cajete, 2009; Donald, 2009). There are no shortcuts. What is required is presence, service, and attention over time. After all, Indigenous presence in Place is all about relationships over time—often time immemorial. Respecting those relationships going forward means acknowledging those relationships going back. A sense of humour helps too. When I asked Jasperdaniels about his connection to his current place/Land, he lamented that he had not had the time to build that relationship yet, but that he saw it as very important:

> For me, that four years of experiencing that gave me a deep appreciation for kind of looking at Place differently. And I still feel here in [place], I'm still trying to understand. I'm so busy with the busyness of working, it's like your head is in the sand.

Building these relationships with Land and with Place over time is of central importance in enacting ethical relationality as a person in a particular territory, and especially as an instructor of Indigenous education in teacher education. Critical Place-based education requires relationships, respect, and reciprocity for deep connections and understandings of self-in-relation, both within and beyond the classroom.

Positionality and Anti-Racist Education

Many of the students in my pre-service teacher education classes balk, initially, at an exercise where they are asked to attend to personal location—where I ask them to identify their cultural heritage, a particular place they feel connected to, or in particular when we address issues of privilege and whiteness. Just as I did, many students have a hard time finding and processing the information that where they live and learn is Indigenous territory. And yet, these are foundational understandings for a class that seeks to use critical Place-based education (cPBE); this is the materiality and the meaning-making of the understanding of Place from a critical stance of right relation. This stance is explained by DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014b):

> By critical stance we mean those academic fields (including social justice, critical pedagogy, multicultural education, anti-racist, postcolonial, and feminist approaches) that operate from the perspective that knowledge is socially constructed and that education is a political project embedded within a network of social institutions that reproduce inequality. (p. 1)

LaBoskey (2009), a central scholar in S-STEP, conducted a self-study predicated on the question, "What does it take to prepare teachers to teach each child well in a racist nation?" In the article describing the study, she describes "great compatibility between self-study teacher education and social justice education," but goes on to underline the need to be explicit about race and racism for this work to be transformational (p. 81). While the educators that I spoke with are not formally engaged in S-STEP, to my knowledge, each educator that I spoke with mentioned both their own positionality, the personal history of their own awareness of their ethical relationality, and how they engage with this necessary critical reflection and dialogue, a crucial element of accountability in teaching and in the methodology of S-STEP, in their work. Each indicated that they start their classes with some work to support the students, some of

whom would never have done this work, in understanding their own positionality and what the implications of these locations might be in the context of race and racism.

Florence emphasized that a real focus and strength of her program lies in exploring intersectional oppressions:

> My role has been working with the sociology inclusion team. The foundation courses in the first year. So right from day one everybody is required to take a mandatory class, which looks largely—before we even start looking at Indigenous knowledge, it really is an anti-racist class which looks at our privilege, their own location. We do some race-class-gender, but really using their autobiographies as a way of understanding how schooling privileges some and marginalizes others. And I think that's been a real strength of our program. We do have some electives here and there and other ****** education, First Nation, Metis, Inuit education. But that foundation course, and it's always taught by a team, and we've written about it several places because we really feel it's given us that sense of starting as Marie Battiste has often suggested, start—starting in the west with the anti-racist and Verna St. Denis….And by doing that, it also has allowed us to then centre the—the six Indigenous students that are in your class because suddenly the space has been made more equal. Their voices can come in much more readily, so even though they're only—they're a minority of students, because of the space that's made, their voices are able to inform that of their classmates. It's been a really wonderful kind of solid signature of our program that we are going to have a strong social justice, anti-racist, and then from there, we can learn about others once we've interrupted our own Eurocentric thinking.

As Toby and I were speaking about personal location, and I was asking about the students' self-awareness not only in relation to Indigenous peoples and territories, but with their own cultural and structural histories and contexts (their personal histories), Toby spoke about the importance of contending with these situations:

> I think it's very important to self-position because we don't think about what has influenced us and what has influenced our thinking and how that affects our identity and who we are and who we've become. So, I want them to be able to think about who they

> are in relation to what's around them and how they got there. And who's influenced them. So, to self-position, and hand-in-hand thinking critically with those really foundations that I had at the base of the courses. I wanted them to think about who they were, and, ultimately, at a deeper level, that—that involves, you know, like walking through a process of decolonization, you can only do a certain amount in a short class. But to begin to—those are the foundational kinds of things to begin to look at. Identity and self-positioning.

Ma'iingan's final assignment asks students to attend to positionality and to context/territory:

> I have them think about their teaching place. If there are people who want to do international teaching, I have them think about Indigenous people in those countries too. So, I try to tell them, you know, what were Aboriginal, what were Indigenous? So, we talk about definitions and things like that too. And then everything is wrapped up with—they have two assignments in the last third of the course. One is they have to—the one assignment is done over the whole course where they actually have to identify resources. They have to identify the resource, identify the perspective it came from, where the Treaty area is, where it would come from, and then how they would consider that. Then the final assignment is kind of a culmination. So, what I do in all my courses is they are allowed to use previous assignments, and I have them build to the final assignment. So that final assignment, they actually write a letter like an application, and they have to explain to the—to their school board. So what they do is they have to identify where they're going to teach, who the person is they have to contact, if it's a principal of a certain school or whatever. They have to identify the Aboriginal group, the Treaty area. Where do you get resources? And then what they do is they have to write a letter to that principal explaining why they're appropriate for the position, and related to Aboriginal education. So they have to reflect on, you know, where their perspective came from, the theory and how they understand things now, and how it changed from when they started to the end. And then they have to attach, as an example, a lesson plan and how they took all the things they learned and rope that into a lesson.

In this way, the students must be able to articulate their self-in-relation with their prospective work placements—their contexts. As Chambers, (2008), Dion, (2007), Donald (2009) Hare (2011), Madden (2014) and Scully (2012, 2015) have all argued, pre-service teachers must come to understand themselves as being on Indigenous territories, and in relation with Indigenous peoples and communities both personally and structurally. Five of the eight conversations described this explicitly as a goal, as it is in my local assignment.

Where positionality became evident in another way in these conversations was when a few of the participants shared challenges that they or their students face, or fear facing, in 'doing education differently'; that is, in taking schooling outside the classroom, or in bringing community members or ceremony into the classroom—that is, a pedagogy of Land.

Land and Place: Explicit, Implicit and Null Appearances

In talking with the eight colleagues, I was surprised at the range of inclusion of Land-based activities in their pedagogies. Some named and enacted Land-based practices explicitly, some realized how Land is implicit in their practices. For a few, the absence of Land-based practices, the null, was telling. For some colleagues, in particular Bear and Stella, Land is at the very heart of their learning practices, and they are on the Land and in community a great deal with their classes. Stella describes her classes as being very focused on Land and place:

> [The class] is an introduction to the land, to the local territories. It includes language and languages in the province. It includes history, Residential students and 60s Scoop as centre. And that's probably core. And then, we can branch out to, for example, Treaties and what is the situation with Treaties here and what is the implication [for] the situation within education. We could also touch on working with families and schools. We can also touch on how to make connections to the communities. We have, for example, sometimes the district directors. We work closely with three school districts which are our most

> immediate districts here. And, we have sometimes guest speakers, or we take our students to their office to get a sense of what is happening, what is new, how teachers contribute in other ways. They're a real piece in education.

For Stella, it was easy to articulate and name the many ways that her courses both explicitly and implicitly engage with Land and Place. Just in this brief chunk, she names Land/territory, Language, Treaty, communities, bringing in community members, and going into community. Her practice resonates with and supports my own.

Bear's whole pedagogy in her elective course centres around being on the Land, and learning medicines, plants, ceremony, story, and water. Conversely, and very interestingly to me, Florence talked at length about how, despite being a self-described and passionate outdoor educator, she realized that explicitly naming and recognizing Indigenous Land had not been part of the pedagogy that she participated in or supported at the school:

> **Alexa**: …do you spend time—do you spend time in your classes outside the class—outside the classroom? So, actually on the Land?
>
> **Florence**: Yeah, well that's what I was getting really sheepish about because I was thinking, wow; no. We have a very intense outdoor ed-focus. We have a colleague who's got people doing an outdoor ed elective. He's got them out. He's doing outdoor ed certificates, and he's got—he's got lots of people out in canoes and kayaks, and, on campus we go outside, quite a bit in the fall. In the summer, we're outside using the outside as a learning space. But, no. We aren't using the land explicitly. That was a really big revelation to me as I was thinking about— (laughter)
>
> **Alexa**: Let me put it to you like this. So, when I say going on the Land, I don't necessarily mean go to an Indigenous community. I also mean conducting your classes outside even if it's out on campus. That's one part of it. There's also, okay, so we're outside. What's happening here, and, connecting with the actual Land that you're on and framing it from an Indigenous perspective. That kind of stuff. But actually going outside counts. (Laughter)

Florence: I myself am an outdoor person. I believe that taking people outside is—I just think it's a wonderful thing to do, and we do a lot of, you know, community circles and reflections. Sometimes we're right beside the teepee. You know, we have a teepee on campus. Often it's set up, and, but I—I've never explicitly made the connection. I also wonder, too, if because we have quite a, you know, 10% [Indigenous student population] is a significant amount; you can feel 10% in our program. I wonder if because we—because we have those folks with us, I'm not justifying or defending myself. Wow, I don't,—I don't think about that. But I do do it a lot, like every—every class in the fall, which fall here is beautiful. We'll go out and start with a circle, and then sometimes we'll do learning centers, and then, part of their learning centres is we go to find a space where they can reflect on this question. Sometimes we'll do a smudge. We have learning centres that we do around poverty and race and how they intersect, and often when we do missing and murdered women, we'll finish that with an outside circle—outside smudge. But we won't explicitly name the Land.

Alexa: So that's interesting to me, but I wonder—I wonder if you could talk about, 'cuz—'cuz you've characterized yourself as somebody, for whom outdoor education is really important and is your background. So, I wonder if you could just think for a minute about, you know, when you take—you do your circle outside, why do you do your circle outside? Or if you're sending them outside to do their reflection, then, it seems—it's evident to me that that is of value to you. And, I wonder, I wonder if there's a—maybe a different way of framing that than just, you know, we haven't explicitly connected them, but it's still clear to me that Land plays a—plays a part in those practices, right?

Florence: Yeah, but what I'm interested in and my own observation is we don't—we don't name it as as Indigenous land. You know, we don't talk about who the Land, you know—We do—we do try on a regular basis. Somebody yesterday made a great comment that I used today in a presentation with faculty. She just said, you know, let's try and keep talking about the Land all the time. So, kind of starting with hey, it's a great sunny day here on Indigenous territory. You know, as your first slide. Why I take it outside is as I said, initially, you know, I avoided becoming a teacher because I didn't want to work with kids in school. I found school itself to be a problem of a box. So, for me, there—there is

> something. I'm a walker, and I know I've read research that says where you do your walk matters. That you can walk around a mall, and you can get all the physiological effects that you want, but your walking is enhanced if you take it into a place where you're not seeing concrete structures and where you're actually smelling the scents of the woods and stuff like that. So, there's an unarticulated but profound belief that being in outside space does something for the soul, and probably does all kinds of physiological stuff that we just haven't measured yet.

As I read through and listen to this part of this interview with Florence, I hear myself working hard to reframe her practice as one that does know Land—searching for the implicit inclusion of Land in her pedagogy. But her own observation of the absence (the null) curricula of Land is such an important one, and one that I have encountered repeatedly, especially in the Outdoor education community; while there are frequent avowals of love for land, it is really in the sense of land as *terra nullius*, *frontier* and *wilderness*, that is, absent of people.[25] This is such a profound part of the Canadian consciousness, and that of (white) outdoor enthusiasts, that the field of Outdoor and of Environmental education is a very uncomfortable one for people who see and experience the intersections linking the oppressions of Land and of people.

Florence described the consciousness of the absence of her acknowledgement of Indigenous territory as sheepish, and I know she will proceed differently. Florence, in her conversation, spoke about future hopes and actions for her courses:

> More and more, we're trying to get a protocol down where—we open ceremonies with the acknowledgement of the Land, so it's slow-coming. And it's most in our faculty because we have—we have the largest concentration of-Indigenous students, on campus. In some areas, we're—we're moving along, and other areas, we still have a long way to go.

---

[25] For more on decolonizing Outdoor education, see: Lowan, 2010, 2011; Lowan-Trudeau, 2012; Root, 2010; Scully, 2012.

Ma'iingan, despite having carefully and clearly articulated his personal and academic focus on Land, identified the absence of Land-based activities as a weakness in the courses that he teaches. While his description of his bundle shown earlier in this chapter makes it clear that bringing his bundle into the class is a Land-based pedagogy, he had not yet included going out onto the Land as a part of his classes. As an Indigenous educator just returning to his home territory, this was a different perspective from Florence's, and one that speaks to the commonly-articulated importance of relationships built and reaffirmed over time:

> I've recognized that as kind of a weakness in the course. I want to start putting, you know, doing a little more hands-on things. Going on the Land. The difficulty is the environment. It's difficult to do here. Last year, I didn't know very many people coming in new—back. So, it was hard for me to do that so quickly. But this year, I have a lot of time, but it's still, like, working it into the hour or the hour and a half. And where do you go? And how do you go about it? It's—it's just this environment is not conducive to that. It's you know, we're in a very sterile, traditional place. So, I try to talk about ceremony. I do use natural science and symbols and things when I present my medicine bundle. I—I try to do it, but I think I'm going to try to do it a little more. I'm going to try to bring in some Elders or other teachers who have actually, you know do teachings or actual—actually do—weaving or things that, you know, because those things are educational processes. I understand that. And I think it needs to link it back to the overall structure, so I'm going to try to do that this year. So that I can give them a bit of a more hands-on, you know. Because that's a challenge. I mean, I think we need to model what we're trying to teach here. And I'm telling them when you get to your places, it doesn't have to be you who delivers it. Can you find an Elder or somebody else who can deliver it? Does it have to be you? So, I think I need to model that, so I'm going to try to contact some people and see if they'll come in and actually do some activities or do medicine walk or whatever. And I'm going to check with cultural services, too. I think there's ceremonies, but, again, that's very delicate.

Ma'iingan is experiencing a couple of iterations of the structural obstacles mentioned earlier in this dissertation, and that were in my own reflections: Being new to a context, and not being sure about institutional protocols regarding leaving the classroom; the structural difficulty of the short time period of the classes; not being sure who to be in touch with; and being uneasy about stuffing Indigenous ceremony and teachings into an academic setting (the possibility that it might diminish them seems to be inferred here). I did not teach outside the classroom enough in my first year of teaching. As a graduate student as well as an instructor, as opposed to being a new faculty member like Ma'iingan was, I was probably more comfortable apologizing rather than asking permission to deviate from the norms of classroom teaching. Madden (2014; 2015), Tompkins (2012) and Tupper & Cappello (2008) all verbalized the struggle of new teachers to leave the classroom, or to deviate from curricular norms; many of my students have voiced these concerns.

There is a dissertation in and of itself to be written on the question of ceremony and teachings in a university setting: Is this respectful? Authentic? Who are these practices for? Are they diminished in an institutional setting? Who is authorized to perform them, and what authority does this give to the participants? This is most definitely not for me to say or theorize about. I had good teachers, I do as I was taught, and will never profess any kind of authority on these matters. I have empathy for new teachers who struggle with these questions, and I continue to encourage new teachers to take the students on the Land, into communities (if that is welcome), and to learn the structural hoops that need to be jumped through to engage in these practices.

Toby experienced some similar challenges, but reported that their students' experience at an (outside of class time) Indigenous community event had a hugely positive impact on their learning.

> **Alexa**: Did you spend time in your classes in—outside?
>
> **Toby**: Yes. And so I had two different experiences teaching it in the fall semester and teaching it in the winter semester. And my heart is to be outside all the time. (Laughter)
>
> But the reality—I found it one of the hardest things to make happen because I was so concerned with being able to cover the material. That to be able to try and find how the Land and the material met together that I would be able to cover it well. I really struggled with that from a personal perspective, but there was a natural flow in the fall semester. And I didn't actually—I made it optional, and it wasn't incorporated into assignments. So, those who were interested took the initiative to go. So, throughout both semesters, I advertised whatever was happening, but it just so happened that the fall semester was strong in experiential, so…there was a quite a large group that came out to a local Indigenous community event. And that group was all in one class, and that took them right through the semester. And it was my best class, because they were experiencing it, and it made a difference in their learning in the classroom. And it made a difference in their assignments because they spoke out of that, and they took the initiative to connect. It was just a very natural way for it to happen because it was happening on campus. And the other thing that happened was *Walking With Our Sisters*. That display was on at the local art gallery, and it was a very select number of students that were really committed to experiential learning. It took a little bit more for them to be able to go and do something like that, but there were some students that did that. And it impacted them greatly because it was just a whole different focus that we didn't really get a chance to dissect enough in a 4416 class. So that experiential—it was unreal. The difference that it made for students.

Toby's experience here certainly supports my experiences, and the data recorded in my journals and in my instructor evaluations, that experiential learning with and in local Indigenous community has a deep and positive impact on the learning that is possible in these short classes.

The experience that colleagues shared regarding structural obstacles is also reported by Heron as a fear that pre-service teachers profess, just as my own students did. Heron said:

> And they're worried about the ways in which what they want to accomplish may be undermined by school structures and mentor teachers that aren't supportive. So, that's why I think the research that people were talking about is necessary in that your, your colleague [name] is doing as part of her doctoral work is so critical because we can create all of these opportunities for our students to engage differently in thinking about narratives of Canada, about the significance of place and space and our own identities and the context of that. But what does it look like for them a year into their teaching? Or two years into their teaching? Or three years into their teaching? There's a lot of literature that suggests it's very easy to become re-enculturated into dominant practices in schools, but one of the things that I think is hopeful, and I can't speak to other contexts, that's my context, is the commitment of many teachers, newer teachers, teachers who have graduated within the last eight years, to doing that work meaningfully in relation to place and alongside Aboriginal Elders, community members, and families as well.

As this work becomes more supported by universities and by school boards, I hope that these obstacles are diminished, and that these practices can be taken up in a good way in Indigenous education, and perhaps in education writ large. Rather than an absence of curriculum and support, that is, a null curriculum, there must be implicit curriculum, that is, pedagogies and practices that demonstrate the value of Indigenous and Land-based knowledges, and curricular content and resources, the explicit curriculum, that supports Right Relation and Indigenous futurities in teacher education, as Battiste (1998, 2000) has been calling for now for decades.

Certainly, one aspect of Land education that can take place inside and outside of the classroom, and through implicit and explicit curricula, is Treaty education.

Treaty Education as Land Education

As this was a specific question on the conversation guide, each participant did address Treaty education as an element of their practice. For Heron, Treaty education is a provincial mandate, and has been the subject of a great deal of her teaching, research and writing.

> **Alexa**: I wonder how you see Treaty education in relation to Place and Land in your context?
>
> **Heron**: Yeah, it's not separate from. In fact, I see them as interlocked, or interlocking. Because Treaties and the Treaty relationship are all about an agreement to share the land. And, what does that mean? And, what is this land that we are on? And, so I can say to my students, well, we're on [Treaty] land. It means nothing to them. Let's get onto the land and begin to unpack that and peel it back. I read a really excellent book recently by Candace Savage who is a U of S scholar, and it's called *Geography of Blood: Unearthing Memory from a Prairie Landscape*, and she talks about, at length, her own learning about the history, and the often traumatic history of this country for Aboriginal peoples in the context of the land and the stories that the land tells us about the place and the people. And so, Treaty education is very much about the stories of the land and the places and the people that occupy those lands prior to colonization in the midst of the white settler invasion of the Prairies and in ongoing processes of colonization. And, for many of our students, they don't think of the land in those kinds of really deeply historical ways. They don't think of the land as having a memory, and the people that were on it before and the experiences they had.
>
> I'll just give you an example. In her book, she talks about, the decimation of the buffalo on the Prairies, but the dominant narrative is the disappearance of the buffalo. As if they just suddenly ceased to exist while, in fact, they were systematically slaughtered by white

> settlers. And often, for no other reason, except to starve First Nations populations on the Prairies. And they were left on the landscape to rot, so their bones are part of the landscape, right? The memory of those animals is, is there if you stop and listen and pay attention. And so, for my students, in the context of Treaty education, it is about stopping and listening and paying attention to what it is the Land has to tell us about our relationships with one another, and, what the significance of the Land is for all of us materially, politically, socially, interculturally, etc. You can't always learn that in a classroom. You can talk about it in the classroom, but you can't experience it really deeply unless you're, you know, on the Land, so [University] is closely situated to where [Treaty] was signed. So that's an obvious way to connect the students to that place. I think it's a very sacred place. ********** is right across the way, and that is a very sacred place also. And so, we do work over there as well, so that the students can experience that place in that particular part of the city and the significance of it. You know, it's, and the land is not just, I think that there's sort of some assumptions that people make about place-based or land-based education as being outdoor education.

For Heron, it has been the Treaty education where the Land has entered into her teaching in a powerful way.

Treaty education is not only about learning the historical agreements, or lack thereof, it is about the foundation of the relationship between Indigenous and settler people in Canada (Tupper, 2012, 2013), and this is all about Land. Toby acknowledged that their own Indigenous education had not sufficiently included Treaty education and therefore they chose not to teach about Treaties directly out of respect and conscious positioning: They describe their own learning journey with regards to Treaties as being in its infancy despite her area of study:

> **Lex:** Treaty territory and, traditional territory are things that I find take on different importance in different people's sort of imagining of this work. And I wonder, like you've said that it's something you didn't do a lot of, and I wonder what would help support you in doing more of that in the future or even if that's something you could see doing more of?

> **Toby:** Mmhm. Yeah, definitely. I think that it's really important in terms of putting things in historical context and a lived reality, at the present time. And it would be something that I would like to strengthen. It didn't come up a lot in my own education, certainly not at all, in my personal history. But even within my master's degree, very little did I actually touch on—on the Treaties.

For Stella, the territory where she teaches has an unsettled comprehensive Land claim. Unlike other places in the country where settler Treaty is older and more established, the contested nature of this claim makes bringing Treaty into the classroom a different proposition; I would argue, perhaps even more important. "We are in the very early stages of that process of reclaiming land, and making sure that the Treaty responsibilities are in place" (Stella). As discussed in Chapter Four, while not all of Canada is covered by Treaty, all Canadian citizens are implicated in the presence or the absence of such Treaties; they are entered into or not in the name of every citizen of Canada. So, while not all Indigenous people in Canada are 'Treaty people', all Canadian settlers are (Tupper, 2012).

Out of the eight conversations, Heron centered Treaty education the most. This can be explained in part by an emphasis on her context and in her research on Treaty education. And, Treaty education holds different importance and implication in different parts of Canada, depending on how the Treaty process has played out over time. Treaty education is a complex and important element of Indigenous education in Canada, and is deeply tied to Land-based education.

Treaty education, then, is critical Place-based teacher education that can shift the common knowledge of Canadians. The well-documented ignorance of pre-service teachers with regards to Treaties speaks to the lack of acknowledgement and awareness about the long history of interrelationship between settler and Indigenous peoples in Canada, and to the central

importance of Land in this relationship (Donald, 2009). Upholding and enforcing the nation-to-nation principles of Treaty relationships will mean rematriation and restitution (Alfred, 2009), in service of Indigenous futurities.

Discussion

There are many ways in which critical Place-based education is evident in the practices of the participants in the conversations. In all of the conversations, the participants spoke about the absence of understanding of ethical relationality with Indigenous peoples and territories that they encounter in the students in the class, and many spoke of the importance of anti-oppression practices. There is a deep range in the pedagogies of the participants in terms of how Land is included, or not. Every participant engages in Land-based education in some way. Bear's class is a Land-based Indigenous learning elective. A large part of Jasperdaniel's program takes place in an Indigenous community. Heron's program has a large focus on Treaty education. Lark centres her classes on the Indigenous territories where the classes take place. Ma'iingan brings his medicine bundle into the classroom. Stella begins with, centres, and ends with Land. Toby appreciated the community events outside of class for what they brought into the class in terms of Land and community experience and perspective, and Florence is moving towards Land in a good way while attending carefully and intentionally to structures of location and privilege.

These educators each include Land to different degrees, and there are clear examples of Eisner's (1985) explicit, implicit and null curricula in these practices. There are also some patterns that I was surprised to discover. I had not expected the explicit emphasis on Land to cut quite so dramatically across the Indigenous/settler divide: The Indigenous educators centred Land in their self-identification, in their trajectory, and in their practice from start to finish. The

settler educators were very open about their “coming to know”; about a moment or experience that showed them what they did not know about Indigenous peoples, Lands, or histories. Common across all of the conversations was an emphasis on relationships—on the importance of classroom dynamics, building relationships to places and communities, and of understanding self-in-relation in order to come to know Indigenous peoples and Lands better. The importance of personal history and positionality, ethical relationality, and forming communities of practice are reinforced in these conversations and themes, and echo the emphases on these concerns in S-STEP literature. I learned a great deal from each of these educators.

Additionally, it is very clear to me that context, both personal and material, play a huge role in how these courses and pedagogies are enacted and engaged with. Elective courses invoke little resistance; Treaty is emphasized in a province where Treaty education is mandatory. Indigenous educators centre Land more, in every way, than settler educators do. Although I endeavour to centre Land in my classes, in future, I will do so even more. Newer and precariously employed educators are more cautious about taking schooling outside and bringing Land into classrooms. Compulsory anti-racist education is hard, emotional, and sometimes violent, and levies an especially large cost on racialized educators. Each of these observations can be traced back to settler colonialism, and that is just what I will do in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

"Land Over Errrrything"
Anishinaabe comedian Ryan McMahon

Since I began teaching EDUC 4416 at Lakehead University on Chippewa Tri-Council territory in 2009, Indigenous education in teacher education has expanded in faculties of education across Canada, from coast-to-coast-to-coast. L. Simpson (2011) asks, "I wonder how we can reconcile when the majority of Canadians do not understand the historic or contemporary injustice of dispossession and occupation" (p. 21). She also states that "Nishnaabeg thought was not meant to promote assimilation or normalization within a colonial context. It was not meant to be reduced and relegated to a decorative window dressing in western scholarship" (p. 20). As the practice grows and matures, we must keep the goals in sight: This practice is not about improving the praxis of education both in faculties of education and in K-12 environments (although I believe that it does). It is about serving Indigenous futurities in Canada through conscientization and shifting Canadian common knowledge and accountability as these relate to Indigenous Lands, communities and histories in Canada.

Earlier in this work, the goals of Indigenous education are articulated as: To transform Indigenous education in Canada for increased success by Indigenous learners, justice for Indigenous peoples, and greater cross-cultural understanding by non-Indigenous learners (e.g., Battiste, 1998, 2000; Den Heyer, 2009; Dion, 2009; Godlewska et. al., 2010; Haig Brown & Hodson, 2009; Kanu, 2005; Schick, 2000; St. Denis, 2007; Tompkins, 2002; Tupper, 2012, 2013). How might white settler Canadians contribute to this? How can teacher education contribute to these goals? Employing critical Place-based education with Land and

decolonization at the centre in initial teacher education has great potential to work towards Indigenous futurities in Canada.

This research contributes to the field by showing consistent needs across different programs, and by reinforcing a central challenge to cPBE in Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education. Through this S-STEP research, I have documented the importance of cPBE and Land-based learning in my practice as it has evolved through my reflections on journals, dialogue with critical friends, the construction of, and feedback on, public presentations and publications, my efforts at reform through institutional advocacy, and finally seeing my work in ethical relationality to the literature in the field and to the conversations with peers. In Chapter Four, the research methodology of S-STEP is described as having two intermingled aims: that the research be of significance to one's own practice and that it also contributes to the community of practice. S-STEP centers practitioner accountability, and requires vulnerability and transparency in terms of the personal location and reflections of the teacher/educator researcher. It also requires exemplar-based validation (Lyons & LaBoskey 2002) – clearly articulated examples of practices to be assessed by the community of practitioners for "trustworthiness". These exemplars have formed the heart of this dissertation, and of the articles and presentations that I have written during this work. Through documenting my experiences in the classroom as they were happening, I was able to better communicate and check my experience against those of my critical friends. The journals also helped me to write in to the challenges and successes in my practice for the many presentations and articles that I wrote during this teaching: These public expressions of my study held me accountable, and made me vulnerable, to critiques and multiple perspectives on my work. Through being asked to consult about the policies and practices for compulsory Indigenous education in the university where I

worked, and through my own initiatives in seeking support and changes in policies and practices, I was able to advocate for more support, both financial and structural, to the Indigenous education courses. And finally, through ongoing reading, and through the conversations with other practitioners in the field, I triangulated and analysed my own practices-in-relation with the practices and perspectives of others in Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education. Data from conversations, reported in Chapter 5, confirmed and sometimes extended my practices, described in Chapter 4. Because the contexts varied greatly, it was not possible to look for one-to-one correspondences, but I believe the spirit of the cPBE practices that I have been working on employing resonated with the spirit of those described by others.

These multiple methods, all designed to hold me accountable to the field of Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education and to the communities impacted and implicated in it, helped me to arrive at some conclusions regarding what is happening, and what is needed, in this exciting and evolving context. Positive change in this field will require some transformations in faculties of education in administrative procedures and protocols and in community-building both inside and outside of the faculties. Even more complicated than changing mindsets and structures in the institutions, though, is contending with the Canadian relationship to Land. Both of these topics emerged in my own practice and in the conversations with the participants in this research.

How is critical Place-based education in Canadian teacher education supporting Indigenous futurities in Canada by interrupting settler colonialism? This research seeks to examine, express and explain my experiences over the last nine years as an instructor of a compulsory course in Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education, striving to teach in a way that serves Indigenous futurities in Canada. My early impressions about this teaching—that

this work is complex, seriously challenging, overwhelming in its implications for shaping Canadian relations with Indigenous peoples, and conversely that this is an exciting opportunity—these all remain true nine years later. These impressions have been supported by the literature, and by the experiences of peers and mentors who are also engaged in this work and who shared some of their experiences with me in our conversations. One consistent theme throughout has been the need for changes in the universities themselves—for greater and more consistent institutional support.

Institutional support. Is it even possible to do a good job of Indigenous education in universities? Might doing a "good job" in these contexts actually be further colonization and more assimilation (Tuck & Yang, 2012)? What might valuing the Land in schooling look like? What might taking seriously, let along centering, Indigenous knowledge, look like? How can this be supported?

In university settings, there are some important changes and structures that need to be put in place to even begin to address these very serious concerns. In general, having policies in place that encourage, instead of permit, practices that contribute to Land-based and community-based education would be a very positive change. Having clear, consistent and easily available guidelines about holding classes outside of the classroom is very important, both for universities and for schools. These guidelines and practices must account for inclusion, access and ability. Additionally, offering this option to teachers and instructors as a part of a general orientation could normalize this practice. Likewise, policies that support ceremony are needed (and, in the case of smudging, if scent will threaten peoples' life/health, then a navigable alternative location or arrangement could be suggested). As mentioned by Stella, and as I have experienced, some

students may not be okay with ceremony in class for religious reasons (either because a practice clashes with their religion, or because they see the practice itself as religious); opting out must be factored in.

In many institutions that I have worked in, honoraria seem to be an annual and complicated fight. It is hard for me to imagine a Faculty of Education without an honorarium policy at this stage, but I know it is still outside of the norm for some institutions. For Elders, this financial challenge can be further complicated if the honorarium is paid out by the institution in a way that counts as income for tax purposes; their federal pensions may then be reduced and in this way they are not really paid at all. Some institutions offer gifts or gift cards, some fundraise to offer cash. Furthermore, guidelines around transportation and support of the Elders (comfortable spaces, interpreters if necessary, helpers, accessibility) must be included in considerations around involving Elders in institutional settings and practices. Additionally, for this work, I believe in including not only Elders but local Indigenous community members of different ages and genders, with different jobs and skillsets. While some community members might be paid for this work as outreach, it would be beneficial for instructors of these classes to have access to gifts for these guests.

Instructors of these classes need structures to build communities of practice like those that were shared by Stella—time together as a group to share successes and challenges, and to craft a cohesive set of guiding principles or goals for this work. Florence spoke of this too—attending to group dynamics and power structures in the groups in the classrooms, and in administrative responses and requirements regarding instructor evaluations. As has been mentioned many times, this work is difficult, emotional and even violent, and the university administrations need to support those who do it.

Another crucial part of supporting these practices lies in honouring the time it takes to foster deep relationships with local communities and community members. Place-based relationships are crucial to a critical Place-based education – both with Land and with communities. More stable employment for instructors, and more stable relationships with communities and community members is a huge element of doing this work with respect and integrity. Relationships over time are at issue here: hundreds (even thousands) of years, for some Indigenous communities, and for longer than one semester, certainly, for instructors, and hopefully for much longer.

As is evident from the conversations, different places have different programs and structures. As Indigenous education in teacher education proliferates, and universities promote their Promising Practices, they must also support the pedagogies and people that enact this work. There is an Indigenization industry happening across Canada right now: Many institutions and organizations, and certainly many universities, are publicizing and promoting their commitment to Indigenous peoples. But as Donald (2018b) tells us, there can be no cultural change without structural change. In these institutions, the moves to "Indigenize" are not sufficiently funded or supported. Indigenous faculty are hired, but are quickly overwhelmed as they are inundated with 'requests' in terms of teaching and service, not to mention the isolating and emotional work of not having many Indigenous colleagues (yet) (Todd, 2017; Tuck, 2018). Elders-in-residence are hired, but are asked to come to classes on the days of their residency—then they are not available to the Indigenous students who need their council or presence. It is of great importance that the universities (and other institutions) do not just add-in *Indigeneity*. Universities are sites of colonial violence; colonial logics operate in the physical and administrative structures that they are made of (Tuck 2018). As of May 2018, there is a push against Indigenization, and a call back

to decolonization (Todd, 2018). M. Giroux (2017) writes this about the efforts to Indigenize the academy:

> Ultimately, much of what has happened around indigenizing the academy has been aimed at making the university — a settler institution — a better system. As Hill says, this creates "a better kind of university, with knowledge toward a better kind of still colonial Canada." That the term indigenous — and indeed the verb to indigenize — does not need to refer to Indigenous peoples (that is, distinct nations) should not be forgotten.
>
> Indigenizing as it is now practiced is largely good — for settlers, and perhaps for individual Indigenous students.
>
> But it comes with a profound risk: Will Indigenous nations lose control over their intellectual property? Over how their traditions are taught and written? Will universities continue to facilitate colonization, reinforcing the belief that all that is worth knowing, all intellectual traditions, are, or should be, centred within the university?
>
> Instead of working in their communities, will elders be asked to put their time and energy into supporting settler faculty as they attempt to "indigenize"?

As universities profit from publicizing their new "woke" status with regards to Indigenous peoples and knowledges (Tuck, 2018), Tuck is troubling the way that the Indigenizing movement in universities is being weaponized against other communities, as administrations are rationalizing spending for Indigenization over spending and support for the concerns of Black and/or gender diverse students and communities; another example of Sefa Dei's (2005) "competing marginalities". In a recent tweet, Tuck wrote "Universities seem to think that 'indigenizing' is just add Indigenous people and stir. No. It will need to mean that the university stops harmful practices. Practices which speak against us" (Tuck, 2018). So, the question remains: Who is this Indigenization for? Is it for the benefit of settlers, so that we feel better? Is it for the universities so that they can proclaim best practices in a newly media-friendly

field? Is it for me, as a settler academic, to profit from in my career? Am I one of the white people controlling the narrative of Indigenization, and concentrating Indigenous material and cultural capital in the university's white hands (Todd, 2018)? The goal must be community-driven and -responsive support for relationship building with particular communities, in/with particular contexts, for healthy, self-determined Indigenous futurities. As Manuel and Derrickson (2017), Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel (2014) and Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013) remind us, these futures include rematriation and reparations of Land.

The trouble with Place and Land. What I failed to anticipate was that my hypothesis about doing this work well, that is, by centering Land, exposes an even greater complexity at the heart of this work. The challenge to be addressed in Indigenous education in teacher education is not only about widespread ignorances about Indigenous peoples, Land and histories in Canada—it is also that many students do not seem to understand themselves *in relation to* Place, to Land, to one another.

The dual oppressions of Land and of people has a shared foundation: the Eurocentric worldview that positions Nature as a resource to be admired or consumed, and that positions non-white people, and more-than-human beings, as consumable (Apfell-Marglin, 2011; Evernden, 1992; Snelgrove et al, 2014). This dual oppression is a foundational understanding of cPBE (Greenwood, 2013). So, the assertion that Land must be at the heart of cPBE that works towards Indigenous futurities in teacher education creates multiple and interrelated challenges to address; these epistemological obstacles go to the heart of the Canadian identity. Canada *The Good*, that values "Indians", and loves the wilderness, is the Canada that continues to rely on primary resource extraction, and relies on the continued oppression and erasure of Indigenous

peoples, and *these are interrelated* (Greenwood, 2013; Scully, 2015). Fair dealings with Indigenous peoples in Canada mean restitution, reparations and rematriation, and deep respect and support for Indigenous languages, bodies and *Land* (Manuel & Derrickson 2017; Snelgrove, Dhamoon, & Corntassel, 2014; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013).

One challenge, then, is a struggle between essentialisms. In Indigenous education, we are working to disrupt monolithic stereotypes of Aboriginal people. A violence done to Indigenous cultures by colonialism, and by settler colonialism, is to render them static: In this way, culture become less flexible, less vernacular, and less resilient. Rather than relating to culture and Land with humility, with humour and respect, culture is rigidly interpreted, and factions emerge about how culture and language are enacted. Friedel's (2011) troubling of outdoor education and (non-critical) PBE as experienced by the Indigenous youth in her research expresses some of the violence done by OE and PBE that does not do a good job of learning from and expressing Indigenous connections with Land, with Place.

Conversely, though, can it be inferred that OE and cPBE that does a good job of centering and learning from particular and relevant Indigenous knowledges and understandings of Place will mean schooling, or education, that works better for Indigenous youth? I think so, and so do Battiste (1998), Donald (2009), and many eminent Indigenous educators and scholars who work for better education for Indigenous youth (e.g., Bang et al., 2014; Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Battiste, 1998, 2000; Brayboy & Maughan, 2009; Donald, 2009; Friedel, 2010a, 2011; Marker, 2000, 2006). cPBE in teacher education, for OE and for Indigenous education, must work alongside, and centre, Land and Indigenous knowledges so that Indigenous and non-Indigenous students in Canada might have teachers who have been schooled themselves

in education for Indigenous futurities. These futurities may be supported both by exposing interrelation and implication of all Canadians in positive Indigenous futurities. But how?

By calling for Land-based education, we are in danger of rigidly interpreting Indigenous knowledges and identities; what about urban Indigenous peoples, and those who are not interested in or engaged with Land? So – Indigenous education in teacher education cannot only be about Land, as this would elide, again, many complex iterations of Indigenous knowledges and identities. And yet – Land is the progenitor of Indigenous knowledge, Land, people. Alfred and Corntassel (2005) described Indigeneity as an "oppositional, place-based existence, along with the consciousness of being in struggle against the dispossessing and demeaning fact of colonization" (p. 597). Throughout my learning about and from Indigenous peoples, I have been taught, and heard reference to, the "Original Instructions" (Chief Jake Thomas, personal communication, January 1996).

> No matter where you go on the planet, Indigenous and traditional cultures regularly refer to the "Original Instructions" or "First Teachings" given to them by their Creator(s)/Earth-maker/Life-Giver/Great Spirit/Great Mystery/Spirit Guides. Original Instructions refer to the many diverse teachings, lessons, and ethics expressed in the origin stories and oral traditions of Indigenous peoples. They are the literal and metaphorical instructions, passed on orally from generation to generation, for how to be a good human being living in reciprocal relation with all of our seen and unseen relatives. They are natural laws that, when ignored, have natural consequences. (Turtle Mountain Chippewa scholar Melissa Nelson, 2008, p. 2)

Learning these "Original Instructions" is crucial to living well in particular places, and are the pathway to *right relation*. These instructions are responsive and dynamic to changes in ecosystems, relationships, and communities, while expressing ancient knowledges built from time on the Land.

Place discourse is full of essentialism – the spirit of place, the genius loci, as immutable, and as discoverable by new inhabitants of place—and can be very exclusive. Progressive Place theorists (e.g., hooks, 1990; Malpas, 1999, 2009; Massey, 1994), geographers (Baldwin, 2012) and cPBE theorists (Chambers, 2006, 2008; Greenwood, 2013) hold that Places, while they can be sites of domination, also hold multiple experiences, perspectives and dynamic relationships. I align myself with those who understand that Indigenous perspective and knowledge of Place is the deepest—the most adaptive, informed, resilient, dynamic—after millennia, or even 500 years, of the pattern recognition that forms relationships with place. Where does the wind come from at what times, in which seasons? Where do the plants grow? What factors correlate with the ebbs and flows of populations of plants, animals, birds, insects? What is here now that was not before, in an ancestor's time? Is there one way to connect to Land? And yet, after deeply studying Place discourse, I am confronted by the understanding that Place, too, is based on colonial logics (Lloyd & Wolfe, 2016) of Indigenous erasure and settler futurities. As I point out repeatedly in Chapter Two, Place discourse has not included Indigenous peoples, knowledges, and connections to place. As I call for Land-based learning and knowledges to be centered in cPBE, I want to be very clear that Land-based learning, or a pedagogy of Land, is not a subset of cPBE, but it may be a practice alongside it; it is a call to center the Original Instructions, and *all my relations*, in education. cPBE calls into view intersectional oppressions, multiple perspectives on Place, and relationships between communities and human and more-than-human community members. Learners inhabit and inequitably benefit from Indigenous lands, and it is learning from Indigenous peoples and knowledges that demands ethical relationality that is particular to these territories, and to Indigenous peoples and communities. Just like with the Indigenization of the university, the call to 'include' Land-based learning misses the point that the problem is that it

needs to be called in at all: That the colonial structures and practices of Education, and of teacher education, make this necessary.

The framing of Land as static, or as a call to authenticity, is another potential interpretation of my earnest call for Land-based education that centres Indigenous knowledge and connection to place, to *Land*. However, this would gravely misunderstand Indigenous connections to Land and Place. Over thousands of years, Indigenous connections to Place/Land are adaptive, vernacular, innovative, flexible. Ecosystems change, cultures change. It would also misunderstand how powerful Indigenous knowledge of Place must be, how grounded, to roll with the dynamics of these changes. Two hundred years of industrial capitalism is turbo-charging change, but the most sophisticated observers of those changes are those whose language and daily practices are tied to those particular places. These knowledges are of profound and immeasurable value—and this value should be for the wellbeing of Indigenous peoples and Land, and they are also fundamentally pragmatic instructions about how to live well in a place, with an understanding of interrelationship, of kinship, and of human dependence on and responsibility to the more-than-human.

> For us, the ownership of territory is a marriage of the Chief and the land. Each Chief has an ancestor who encountered and acknowledged the life of the land. From such encounters come power. The land, the plants, the animals and the people all have spirit – they all must be shown respect. That is the basis of our law.
>
> The Chief is responsible for ensuring that all the people in his House respect the spirit in the land and in all living things. When a Chief directs his House properly and the laws are followed, then that original power can be recreated. That is the source of the Chief's authority….By following the law, the power flows from the land to the people through the Chief; by using the wealth of the territory, the House feasts its Chief so he can properly fulfill the law. This cycle has been repeated on my land for thousands of

> years…Our histories show that whenever new people came to this land, they had to follow its laws if they wished to stay. The Chiefs who were already here had the responsibility to teach the law to the newcomers. They then waited to see if the land was respected. If it was not, the newcomers had to pay compensation and leave. The Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en have waited and observed the Europeans for a hundred years….We do not seek a decision as to whether our system might continue or not. It will continue. (Gitskan Chief Delgam Uukw, May 11, 1987 in Wa & Uukw, 1989, pp. 7-9)

Reading what the chiefs said…the relationships between the chief, the Land and the community all flow through each other….The Indigenous connection to Land is this too.

My (white settler) connection with Land cannot replace this – cannot displace this. I can learn from and respect this relationship, and understand that I have no such claim. In these Indigenous territories, this is part of connecting well to Land, to Place. Enacting this is perilous, and brings the ever-present danger of colonization, of privileging my own futurity over Indigenous futurity, especially considering the pernicious ways whiteness works.

And yet – Land is at the very heart of how I see myself in the world – particular Land, in Anishinaabe territory. Ten years after I have been there, I can walk every inch of it in my head and heart. My connection to Place, and Land, and my relationships to particular Indigenous people, communities, and Lands does not qualify or authorize me to speak for, or to speak over, Indigenous knowledge holders. I hope to be a wedge that demands Place, and resources, to support Indigenous knowledge, scholarship, and community members to support Indigenous futures. I hope to teach in a way that inspires and supports action by settlers, to fight for Indigenous Lands and futures.

> If curriculum can be understood as stories we tell about the world and our place in it, then we need to start telling different stories in order to renew balanced and sustainable relationships with the more-than-human entities that give life. What can be the sources of

> inspiration for these stories of relationship renewal? Becoming wisely aware to the unique animacy of places is a very good place to start. (Donald, 2018a)

Settlers *must* understand themselves in relation to Land – the obstacles to doing so, and the dysconsciousness that supports exploitation of Land continue to result in terrifying extractions and changes to the lifeways that we, and all other beings on Earth, rely on. Settlers *must* understand themselves in relation to Indigenous peoples: the unbearable violences that continue to be enacted upon Indigenous communities and bodies are the responsibility of every Canadian. Learning Land and learning about, with and from Indigenous peoples must take their central place in Canadian education: Initial teacher education is a pathway to make widespread change in service of Indigenous futurities in Canada and the Lands that we all live on.

References

A Solid Foundation: Second Progress Report on the Implementation of the Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework (2013). Ontario: Ministry of Education. Aboriginal Education Office.

Abram, D. (1996). *The spell of the sensuous: Language and perception in a more than human world*. New York, NY: Pantheon.

Adair, J. (2008). White pre-service teachers and "de-privileged spaces." *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(4), 189 – 206.

Adichie, C.N. (2009, October). The danger of a single story [video file]. New York: Ted Talks. Retrievedfromhttps://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story

Agnew, J. (1987). *Place and politics*. Boston, US: Allen and Unwin.

Ahmed, S. (2004) Declarations of whiteness: The non-performativity of antiracism. *Borderlands E-Journal*, *3*(2).

Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alfred, T. (1999). *Peace, power and righteousness*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, T., & Corntassel, J. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against contemporary colonialism. *Government and Opposition 40* (4), 597-613.

Apffel-Marglin, F. (2011). *Subversive spiritualities: How rituals enact the world*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ardoin, N. (2006). Towards an interdisciplinary understanding of place: Lessons for environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 11*, 112–126.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2003). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. London, UK: Routledge.

Association of Canadian Deans of Education (2010). *Accord on Indigenous Education.* Retrieved from www.csse.ca/ACDE.

Bachelard, G. (1994). *The poetics of space*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Baldwin, A. (2012). Whiteness and futurity: Towards a research agenda. *Progress in Human Geography 36*(2), 172 – 187.

Bang, M., Curley, L., Kessel, A., Marin, A., Suzukovich III, E.S., & Strack, G. (2014). Muskrat theories, tobacco in the streets, and living Chicago as Indigenous land. *Environmental Education Research 20*(1), 37-55.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Barnhardt, The Honourable Dr. Gordan L., Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan. (Monday, December 10th, 2007). *Securing the Future*: Speech from the Throne 2007, delivered on the occasion of the opening of the First Session of the twenty-Sixth Legislature, Province of Saskatchewan. Retrieved on November 15, 2017, from https://www.saskatchewan.ca/~/media/.../throne%20speech%202007%20english.pdf?...

Barnhardt, R. & Kawagley, A.O. (2005). Indigenous knowledge systems and Alaska. *Native Ways of Knowing, Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 36* (1), 8-23.

Basso, K. (1996). *Wisdom sits in places: Landscape and language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language, and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 22*(1), 16-27.

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

Battiste, M. (2018). *Decolonizing and Indigenizing the Academy: Achieving Cognitive Justice.* (Plenary). Canadian Society for Studies in Education Conference. University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Battiste, M. A., & Barman, J. (Eds.) (1995). *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Battiste, M., Bell, L., Findlay, I. M., Findlay, L., & Henderson, J. S. Y. (2005). Thinking place: Animating the Indigenous humanities in education. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *34*, 7-19.

Battiste, M., & Henderson, J. S. Y. (2009). Naturalizing Indigenous Knowledge in Eurocentric Education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education 32*(1), 5-18.

Beck, C., & Kosnick, C. (2001). From cohort to community in a preservice teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 925-948.

Bell, A. (1997). Natural history from a learner's perspective. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education(CJEE) 2*(1), 132-144.

Benton-Banai, E. (1988). *The Mishomis Book*. Minneapolis, MN: Red School House.

Berger, P. (2008). *Inuit visions for schooling in one Nunavut community* (doctoral dissertation). Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada. ProQuest.

Berry, A. (2007). *Tensions in teaching about teaching: Developing practice as a teacher education.* Dordrecht, HL: Springer.

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

Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawanaungatanga.* Palmerston North, NZ: Dunsmore Press.

Bishop, R. (1997). Interviewing as collaborative storying. *Educational Research and Perspectives, 24(*1), 28-47.

Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Māori approach to creating knowledge. in Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (107-138). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research,(3rd Ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

http://www.blackfeminisms.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Intersectionality-Reading-List.pdf)

Blenkinsop, S. (2005). Martin Buber: Educating for Relationship 1. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, *8*(3), 285-307.

Blenkinsop, S., & Beeman, C. (2010). The world as co-teacher: Learning to work with a peerless colleague. *Trumpeter*, *26*(3), 27-39.

Blenkinsop, S., Affifi, R., Piersol, L., & Sitka-Sage, M. D. D. (2017). Shut-Up and Listen: Implications and Possibilities of Albert Memmi's Characteristics of Colonization Upon the "Natural World". *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *36*(3), 349-365.

Blenkinsop, S., Piersol, L., Sitka-Sage, M. D., & Ho, Y. C. J. (2016). The Natural World as Colonized Other(s): Educational Implications. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education (CJEE)*, *21*, 198-217.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2006). Qualitative research in (validation) and qualitative (inquiry) studies. *Qualitative Research in Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Pearson.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In other word: Essays toward a reflexive sociology*. Stanford, CA: Standford University Press.

Bowers, C.A. (1993). *Education, cultural myths, and the ecological crisis*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bowers, C.A. (2001). *Educating for eco-justice and community*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Brayboy, B. M. J., & Maughn, E. (2009). Indigenous knowledges and the story of the bean. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79, 1–21

Brown, E. (2004). The significance of race and social class for self-study and the professional knowledge base of teacher education. In J. J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V. K. Laboskey, & T. L. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp.517 - 574). Dordrecht: Springer.

Bullough, R. V. Jr., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 13-21.

Cajete, G. (2009). Indigenous knowledge: The Pueblo metaphor of Indigenous education. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press. 181-191.

Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education*. Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.

Calderon, D. (2014). Speaking back to Manifest Destinies: a land education–based approach to critical curriculum inquiry. *Environmental Education Research, 20*(1). 24-36.

Cameron, J. (Producer/director). (2009). *Avatar* [motion picture]. United States: 20th Century Fox.

Carson, T., Donald, D., Johnston, I., Kim, M., Plews, J., & Richardson, G. (2009). Awareness, discovery, becoming, and debriefing: Promoting cross-cultural pedagogical understanding in an undergraduate education program. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research Vol. 55,* (1), Spring, 1-17.

Casey, E. (1996). How to get from space to place in a fairly short stretch of time, in *Senses of Place,* ed. S. Feld and K. Baso, Santa Fe, School of American Research, pp. 13-51.

Cashman, T. G. (2016). Navigating the intersection of place-based pedagogy and border pedagogy: Resituating our positions through dialogic understandings. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *7*(1) pp.29-50.

Chambers, C. (2006). “the land is the best teacher I ever had”: Places as pedagogy for precarious times. *JCT: Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *22*(3), 27-37.

Chambers, C. (2008). Where are we? Finding common ground in a curriculum of place. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 6* (2) 113-127.

Cherubini, L., Kitchen, J., & Hodson, J. (2008). Aboriginal epistemologies and new teacher induction: The context of a bi-epistemic research endeavour. *Brock Education Journal*, *18*(1).

Clandinin, D., and Connelly, F. (2004). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(5), 2-14.

Conniff, R. (March 17, 2014). Rebuilding the natural world; A shift in ecological restoration. *Yale Environment 360.* http://e360.yale.edu/features/rebuilding_the_natural_world_a_shift_in_ecological_restoration

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

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law. Review*, *43*, 1241.

Cresswell, T. (2015). *Place: an introduction* (second edition). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice*, *39*(3), 124-130.

Crichton, K. (Series Producer). (2011). *8th Fire: Aboriginal Peoples, Canada, and the Way Forward*. Canada: CBC.

Cruikshank, J. (2005). *Do glaciers listen? Local knowledge, colonial encounters, and social imagination*. Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press.

Cronon, W. (Ed.). (1996). *Uncommon ground: Rethinking the human place in nature*. WW Norton & Company.

Darder, A. Baltodano, M. & Torres, R. (Eds) (2009). *The critical pedagogy reader, 2nd ed.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Davis, B., Sumara, D. J., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2000). *Engaging minds: Changing teaching in complex times*. New York, NY: Routledge.

DeLanda, M. (2006). *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London and New York: Continuum.

The Decolonial Atlas (April 14th, 2015). The great lakes: An Ojibwe perspective. Retrieved November 15, 2017, from: https://decolonialatlas.wordpress.com/2015/04/14/the-great-lakes-in-ojibwe-v2/

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Continuum.

Deloria, P. J. (1998). *Playing indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Deloria, P. J. (2004). *Indians in unexpected places*. Kansas City, KA: University Press of Kansas.

Deloria Jr, V. (2001). Power and place equal personality. *Power and place: Indian education in America*.

Deloria, Jr., V. (1994). *God is Red; a Native view of religion*. New York, NY: Putnam Publishing.

Deloria, V., & Wildcat, D. R. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

den Heyer, K. (2009). Sticky points: Teacher educators re-examine their practice in light of a new Alberta social studies program and its inclusion of aboriginal perspectives. *Teaching Education, 20*(4), 343-355.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Derby, M. (2015). *Place, being, resonance: Towards a critical ecohermeneutic approach to education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Dewey, J. (1907). *The school and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Retreived from https://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Dewey/Dewey_1907/Dewey_1907c.html

DiAngelo, R., & Sensoy, O. (2009). "We don't want your opinion": Knowledge construction and the discourse of opinion in the equity classroom. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 42*(4), 443-455.

DiAngelo, R. & Sensoy, Ő. (2014). Getting slammed: White depictions of cross-racial dialogues as arenas of violence. Race & Ethnicity in Education, 17(1), 103-128.

DiAngelo, R., & Sensoy, O. (2014). Leaning in: A student's guide to engaging constructively with social justice content. *Radical Pedagogy*, *11*(1), 1-15.

Di Chiro, G. (1987). Environmental education and the question of gender: A feminist critique. In I. Robottom (Ed.), *Environmental education: Practice and possibility* (pp. 23-48). Geelong, AU: Deakin University Press.

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

Dion, S. D. (2009). *Braiding histories: Learning from aboriginal peoples' experiences and perspectives*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Dlamini, S. N. (2002). From the other side of the desk: Notes on teaching about race when racialized. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 5*(1), 51-66.

Donald, D. T. (2009). Forts, curriculum, and Indigenous Métissage: Imagining decolonization of Aboriginal-Canadian relations in educational contexts. *First Nations Perspectives: The Journal of the Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre, 2*(1), 1-24.

Donald, D. T. (2018a). *Curriculum Keyword: Place*. Unpublished manuscript.

Donald, D. T. (May 29th, 2018b). CATE Panel on Truth and Reconciliation. Canadian Society for Studies in Education. Regina, SK.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1935). Does the Negro need separate schools? *Journal of Negro Education*, *4*, 329-335.

Eisner, E. W. (1985). *The educational imagination*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Ellis, G. W. (1917). Psychic factors in the new American race situation. *Journal of Race Development*, 4, 469-48

Evernden, N. (1985). *The Natural Alien*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, White masks: The experiences of a Black man in a White world*. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Fawcett, L. (2000). Ethical imagining: Ecofeminist possibilities and environmental learning. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 5*, 134-149.

Fawcett, L. (2013). Three degrees of separation: Accounting for naturecultures in environmental education research. In R. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. Wals (Eds.), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp. 409-417). New York, NY: Routledge.

FitzMaurice, K. (2010). Are White people obsolete? Indigenous knowledge and the colonizing ally in Canada. In L. Davis (Ed.) *Alliances: Re-envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships* (pp. 351-367). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Flaherty, Colleen. (2016, September 21). Zero correlations between evaluations and learning: New study adds to evidence that student reviews of professors have limited validity.

Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/09/21/new-study-could-be-another-nail-coffin-validity-student-evaluations-teaching

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. New York, NY: Pantheon Press.

Francis, D. (1992). *The Imaginary Indian*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (MB Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum.

Frideres, J. (2007). Being white and being right: Critiquing individual and collective privilege. In P. Carr & D. Lund (Eds.) *The great white north: Exploring whiteness, privilege and identity in education* (pp.43-53). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Friedel, T. (2010a). The more things change, the more they stay the same: The challenge of identity for Native students in Canada. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, *2*(1).

Friedel, T. L. (2010b). Finding a place for race at the policy table: Broadening the Indigenous education discourse in Canada. *Aboriginal policy research: Exploring the urban landscape*, *3*, 171-198.

Friedel, T. L. (2011). Looking for learning in all the wrong places: Urban Native youths' cultured response to Western-oriented place-based learning. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *24*(5), 531-546.

Friedel, T. (2016). *"We Have Always Been Researchers": Indigenous Science and Land Pedagogies*. Presentation, Washington, DC.

Froman, K. (2005). Buffalo Tales and Academic Trails (pp.133-144). In D.H. Taylor, (Ed) *Me Funny*. Vancouver, BC: Douglas and MacIntyre.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2012). Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1(1), 41–67.

Giroux, H. A. (2009). Critical theory and educational practice (pp. 27-51). In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres, (Eds) *The critical pedagogy reader, 2nd ed.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H.A. (1981). *Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Giroux, M. (2017, November 19). If 'indigenizing' education feels this good, we aren't doing it right. Retrieved from: https://theconversation.com/if-indigenizing-education-feels-this-good-we-arent-doing-it-right-87166

Godlewska, A., Moore, J., & Bednasek, C. D. (2010). Cultivating ignorance of Aboriginal realities. *Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe Canadien, 54*, (4), 417–440.

Gough, A. (1999). Recognising women in environmental education pedagogy and research: Toward an ecofeminist poststructuralist perspective. *Environmental Education Research, 5*(2), 143-161.

Gough, A. (2013). Researching differently: Generating a gender agenda for research in environmental education. In R. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. Wals (Eds.), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp.375-383). New York, NY: Routledge.

Government of Saskatchewan (2013). Treaty Education Outcomes and Indicators Saskatchewan Ministry of Education 2013 p.3

Grande, S. (2015). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Graveline, F. J. (1998). *Circle works: Transforming Eurocentric consciousness*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Press.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Greenhalgh-Spencer, H. (2008) Audience and author: The reading of the 'White Expert'. *Borderlands E-journal 7*(3).

Greenwood, D. (2013). A critical theory of place-conscious education. In R.B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A.E.J. Wals (Eds.) *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp.93-100). New York, NY: Routledge.

Greenwood, D. (2010). Nature, empire and paradox in environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education (CJEE)*, *15*, 9-24.

Greenwood, D. (2009). Place, survivance and white remembrance: A decolonizing challenge to rural education in mobile modernity. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 24*(10), 1-6.

Gruenewald, D. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher, 32*(4), 3-12.

Gruenewald, D. and Smith, G. (Eds.). (2008). *Place-based education in the global age*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Haig-Brown, C. (2009). Decolonizing diaspora: Whose traditional land are we on? *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry, 1*(1), 4-21.

Haig-Brown, C., & Dannenmann, K. (2002). A pedagogy of the land: Dreams of respectful relations. *McGill Journal of Education*, *37*(3), 451.

Haig-Brown, C. & Hodson, J. (2009). Starting with the Land: Toward Indigenous thought in Canadian education. In P. Woods & G. Woods (Eds.) *Alternative Education for the 21st Century; Philosophies, approaches, visions* (pp.167-187). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haluza-DeLay, R. (2013). Education for environmental justice. In R. B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp. 394–403). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hamilton, M.L., & Pinnegar, S. (1998). Conclusion: The value and promise of self-study. In M.L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp.235-246). London: Falmer.

Hampton, E. (1995). Towards a redefinition of Indian education (pp.5-46). In M. Battiste & J. Barman (Eds.) *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Hare, J. (2011). Indigenous knowledge in education. In O. Dickason & D. Long (Eds.), *Visions of the Heart* (3rd ed., pp 90-112). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Harvester, L., & Blenkinsop, S. (2011). Environmental education and ecofeminist pedagogy: Bridging the environmental and the social. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 15*, 120-134.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers

Hayden Taylor, D. (Ed) (2005). *Me funny*. Vancouver, BC: Douglas & MacIntyre.

Henderson, J. Y. (1995). Treaties and Indian education. In M. Battiste, & J. Barman (Eds.), *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 246-261). Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.

Henry, F., Dua, E., James, C. E., Kobayashi, A., Li, P., Ramos, H., & Smith, M. S. (2017). *The equity myth: Racialization and indigeneity at Canadian universities*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.

Higgins, M., Madden, B., & Korteweg, L. (2013). Witnessing (halted) deconstruction: White

teachers' 'perfect stranger' position within urban Indigenous education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *18*(2), 251-276.

Higgs, E. (2003). *Nature by design: people, natural process, and ecological restoration*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hill-Jackson, V. (2007). Wrestling whiteness: Three stages of shifting multicultural perspectives among white pre-service teachers. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(2), 29-35.

Hookimaw-Witt, J. (1998). Any changes since residential school? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *22*(2), 159-70.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politic*s. Boston, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology: An introduction to phenomenological philosophy*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Illich, I. (Spring 1984). Dwelling. *Co-Evolution Quarterly* 41.

Ingold, T. (2000) *The perception of the environment: Essays in livelihood, dwelling, skill*. New York, NY: Routledge.

James, C. (2001). *Experiencing Difference*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Kahn, R. (2010). *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, & planetary crisis: The ecopedagogy Movement.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Kane, S. (1998). *Wisdom of the Mythtellers*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Kanu, Y. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of the integration of Aboriginal culture into the high school curriculum. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 51*(1), 50-68.

Kelchtermans, G., & Hamilton, M. L. (2004). The dialectics of passion and theory: Exploring the relation between self-study and emotion (pp. 785-810). In J. J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V. K. Laboskey, & T. L. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices.* Dordrecht, HL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kermoal, N., & Altamirano-Jiménez, I. (Eds.). (2016). *Living on the Land: Indigenous Women's Understanding of Place*. Athabasca University Press.

Kerr, J. & Andreotti, V. (2017). Crossing borders in initial teacher education: mapping dispositions to diversity and inequity. Race, Ethnicity and Education. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2017.1395326

Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants*. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). Critical pedagogy and the knowledge wars of the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 1*(1), 1-22.

King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education (60)*2, 133-167.

King, T. (2007). I'm not the Indian you had in mind. Spoken word performative piece accessed at: http://www.nsi-canada.ca/2012/03/im-not-the-indian-you-had-in-mind/

King, T. (2008). *The truth about stories*. Toronto, ON: House of Anansi.

Kitchen, J. (2005a). Conveying respect and empathy: Becoming a relational teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education, 1*(2), 194-207.

Kitchen, J. (2005b). Looking backwards, moving forward: Understanding my narrative as a teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education, 1*(1), 17 – 30.

Kitchen, J., & Ciuffetelli-Parker, D. (2009). Developing self-study communities of practice (pp. 101-122. In C.Lassonde, S. Galman, & C. Kosnik (Eds.), *Self-study research methodologies for teacher educators*). Rotterdam, HL: Sense.

Kitchen, J., & Russell, T. (Eds). (2012) Canadian perspectives on the self-study of teacher education practices. *Canadian research in Teacher Education: A polygraph series / La recherche canadienne sur la formation des enseignants: une collection de polygraphies*, Volume 2. Ottawa: Canadian Association for Teacher Education.

Kitchen, J., Tidwell, D., & Fitzgerald, L. (2016). *Self-Study and Diversity II: Inclusive Teacher Education for a Diverse World*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (1994). Researching the good life: Reflections on professional practice. *The Professional Educator, 17*(1), 49-60.

Korteweg, L. & Russell, C., (Eds.) (2012). Decolonizing + Indigenizing = Moving Environmental Education Towards Reconciliation (Special Issue). *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 17*, 5-14.

Korthagen, F. & Lunenberg, M. (2004). Links between self-study and teacher education reform (pp.421-449). In J. J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V. K. Laboskey, & T. L. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices.* Dordrecht, HL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*.

Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Kulchyski, P. (2013). *Aboriginal rights are not human rights: In defense of Indigenous struggles*. Winnipeg, MA: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Kulchyski, P. (2005). *Like the sound of a drum: Aboriginal cultural politics in Denendeh and Nunavut*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Kuokkanen, R. (2011). Indigenous economies, theories of subsistence, and women: Exploring the social economy model for Indigenous governance. *The American Indian Quarterly*, *35*(2), 215-240.

Kuokkanen, R. (March 17, 2016). Reconciliation and mandatory Indigenous content courses: What are the University's responsibilities? *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*. https://decolonization.wordpress.com/2016/03/17/reconciliation-and-mandatory-indigenous-content-courses-what-are-the-universitys-responsibilities/

Kurosawa, Akira (dir). (1950). *Rashomon*. Japan: Daiei Motion Picture Co. Ltd.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817-869). Springer Netherlands.

LaBoskey, V. K. (2009). "Name it and claim It": The methodology of Self-Study as social justice teacher education. In D. Tidwell, M. Heston, L. Fitzgerald (Eds), *Research methods for the self-study of practice* (pp. 73-82). Springer, Dordrecht.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). Beyond multicultural illiteracy. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60(2), 147-157.

Larsen, S. C., & Johnson, J. T. (2017). *Being together in place: Indigenous coexistence in a more than human world*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lather, P. (2001). Validity as an incitement to discourse: Qualitative research and the crisis of legitimation. *Handbook of research on teaching*, *4*, 241-250.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lawrence, B. (2002). Rewriting histories of the land: Colonization and Indigenous resistance in Eastern Canada. In S. Razack (Ed)., *Race, space, and the law: Unmapping a white settler society*, (pp. 21-46). Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.

Lawrence, B. (2004). *" Real" Indians and others: mixed-blood urban Native peoples and Indigenous nationhood*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing antiracism. *Social justice*, *32*(4) (102), 120-143.

Lee, Damien. (2014). Thunder Bay Settlers in Solidarity, Part 1. Retrieved from: https://zoongde.com/2014/06/23/tbay-settlers-in-solidarity-p1/

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Livingston, J. A. (1983). The dilemma of the deep ecologist. In N. Evernden (Ed.). *The paradox of environmentalism* (pp.61-72). Downsview, ON: York University.

Lloyd, D., Wolfe, P. (2016). Settler colonial logics and the neoliberal regime. *Settler Colonial Studies, (6)* 2, 109-118.

Loughran, J.J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V. K. Laboskey, & T. L. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp.7-39). Dordrecht, HL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M.L., Laboskey, V. K., & Russell, T. L. (Eds). (2004). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices.* Dordrecht, HL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Louv, R. (2008). *Last Child in the Woods: Saving our children from Nature Deficit Disorder.* Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill: Chapel Hill, NC.

Lowan, G. (2010). Exploring place from an Aboriginal perspective: Considerations for outdoor and environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education (CJEE)*, *14*, 42-58.

Lowan, G. (2011). Ecological metissage: Exploring the third space in outdoor and environmental education. *Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education*, *23*(2), 10-15.

Lowan-Trudeau, G. (2012). Methodological métissage: An interpretive Indigenous approach to environmental education research. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, *17*,113-130.

Lyons, N., & LaBoskey, V. K. (Eds.). (2002). *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of teaching* (Vol. 22). Teachers College Press.

Madden, B. (2014). Coming full circle: White, Euro-Canadian teachers' positioning, understanding, doing, honouring, and knowing in school-based Indigenous education. *InEducation*, *20*(1), 57-81.

Madden, B. (2015). Pedagogical pathways for Indigenous education with/in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education 51*, p.1-15.

Maina-Okori, N. M., Koushik, J. R., & Wilson, A. (2017). Reimagining intersectionality in environmental and sustainability education: A critical literature review. *The Journal of Environmental Education*. 1-11.

Malpas, J, (2009). Place and human being. *Environmental and Architectural Phenomenology, 20*(3), (fall 2009), 19-23.

Malpas, J., (1999). *Place and experience: A philosophical topography*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Manuel, A., & Derrickson, R., (2017). *The reconciliation manifesto; Recovering the Land, rebuilding the economy*. Toronto, ON: James Lorimer and Company Ltd.

Marker, M. (2000). Lummi identity and white racism: when location is a real place. *Qualitative Studies in Education, (13)* 4, 401 – 414.

Marker, M. (2006). After the Makah Whale Hunt: Indigenous knowledge and limits to multicultural discourse. *Urban Education, (41)* 5, 482 – 505.

Martusewicz, R. A., Edmundson, J., & Lupinacci, J. (2014). *Ecojustice education: Toward diverse, democratic, and sustainable communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

McHarg, I. (1969). *Design with Nature*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

McIntosh, P. (2009) White privilege: An account to spend. St. Paul Foundation, 1-8.

McKenzie, M., Koushik, J. R., Haluza-DeLay, R., Chin, B., & Corwin, J. (2017). Environmental justice. In A. Russ, & M. Krasny (Eds.), *Urban environmental education review* (pp. 59–67). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

McLaren, P. (1995) *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture*. NewYork, NY: Routledge.

McMahon, R. (n.d.) http://www.wreckonsillynation.com/. Accessed November 12, 2017.

Memmi, A. (1991). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Introduction by Jean-Paul Sartre, afterword by Susan Gilson Miller (trans: Howard Greenfeld). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Memmi, A. (2006). *Decolonization and the decolonized* (trans: Robert Bononno). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Mena, J., & Russell, T. (2017). Collaboration, multiple methods, trustworthiness: Issues arising from the 2014 International conference on self-study of teacher education practices. *Studying Teacher Education, (13)* 1, 105-122.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945/1996). *Phenomenology of perception*. Motilal Banarsidass Publisher.

Miller, H. K. (2017). Developing a critical consciousness of race in place-based environmental education: Franco's story. *Environmental Education Research*, 1-14.

Milloy, J. S. (1999). *A national crime: The Canadian government and the residential school system, 1879 to 1986* (Vol. 11). Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Mishler, E. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (4), 415-442.

Monture-Angus, P. (1995). *Thunder in my soul: A Mohawk woman speaks*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishers.

Morgensen, S. L. (2014, May 26). White settlers and Indigenous solidarity: Confronting White supremacy, answering decolonial alliances. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*. Retrieved from https://decolonization.wordpress.com

Morrison, T. (1987). *Beloved*. London, UK: Pan Publishers.

Nadasdy, P. (2005). Transcending the debate over the ecologically noble Indian: Indigenous peoples and environmentalism. *Ethnohistory*, *52*(2), 291-331.

Native Women's Association of Canada, "Missing and Murdered Aboriginal Women and Girlsin British Columbia, Canada" briefing paper published by the Native Women's Association of Canada for the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Ottawa, 2012, 3.

Nelson, M. K. (2008). Introduction: Lighting the sun of our future—How these teachings can provide illumination. In M. Nelson (Ed.) *Original Instructions—Indigenous Teachings for a Sustainable Future*, (pp.1-19). California: Simon and Schuster.

Nieto, S. & Bode, P. (2008). Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education, 5th eds. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Olwig, K. (1996). Reinventing common nature: Yosemite and Mount Rushmore—A meandering tale of a double nature, (pp.379-408). In W. Cronon (Ed) *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the human place in nature*. New York, NY: Norton.

Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit education policy framework: Delivering quality education to Aboriginal students in Ontario. (2007). Ontario: Ministry of Education. Aboriginal Education Office.

O'Riley, P. & Cole, P. (2009). Coyote and raven talk about the land/scapes. In M. Mackenzie, P. Hart, H. Bai, & R. Jickling (Eds.), *Fields of green: Restorying culture, environment, and education*, (pp. 125-134). New York, NY: Hampton Press.

Orr, D. W. (1992). *Ecological literacy: Education and the transition to a postmodern world*. Albany, NY: Suny Press.

Ostertag, J. K. (2015). *School gardening, teaching, and a pedagogy of enclosures: threads of an arts-based métissage* (doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Palmater, P. (2012, March 19). AFN Election 2012: Stopping the Assimilation of First Nations in its Tracks [Blog Post]. Retrieved from http://rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/pamela-palmater/2012/ 03/afn-election-2012-stopping-assimilation-first-nations-its-tracks

Palmer, M. A., Menninger, H. L., & Bernhardt, E. (2010). River restoration, habitat heterogeneity and biodiversity: a failure of theory or practice? *Freshwater biology*, *55*(s1), 205-222.

Parmenter, J. (2013). The meaning of Kaswentha and the Two Row Wampum Belt in Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) history: Can Indigenous oral tradition be reconciled with the documentary record? *Journal of Early American History 3*(1), 82-109.

Piersol, L. (2014). Listening place. *Australian Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, *17*(2), 43-53.

Piersol, L., & Timmerman, N. (2017). Reimagining environmental education within academia: Storytelling and dialogue as lived ecofeminist politics. *Journal of Environmental Education, 48*(1), 10-17.

People for Education (2016). *Moving toward reconciliation in Ontario's publicly funded schools*. People for Education. Toronto: April 18, 2016.

People for Education (2013). *First Nation, Métis and Inuit Education: Overcoming the gaps in provincially funded schools*. Toronto, ON.

Pinar, W., & Grumet, M. R. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum*. Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co.

Pinnegar, S. (1998). Methodological perspectives: Introduction. In M.L. Hamilton (Ed) *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp.31-33). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Dordrecht, HL: Springer.

Plumwood, V. (2002). *Environmental culture: The ecological crisis of reason*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Probyn, F. (2004). Playing chicken at the intersection: The white critic of whiteness. *Borderlands*, *3*(2), 14-29.

Raibmon, P. (2005). *Authentic Indians: Episodes of encounter from the late-nineteeth century northwest coast*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rasmussen, D. (2011). Some honest talk about non-Indigenous education. *Bright ideas: Students and educators challenge limits on education*, 19-33. Accessed from: http://ccpanews.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2011/01/OSOS_Winter2011_Non-Indigenous_Education.pdf

Razack, S. (2002). Gendered racial violence and spatialized justice: the murder of Pamela George. In S. Razack (Ed.) *Race, space, and the law: Unmapping a white settler society*. (pp.121-156). Halifax: Between the Lines.

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

Relph, E. (1976). *Place and Placelessness*. London, UK: Pion.

Root, E. (2010). This land is our land: This land is your land? The decolonizing journeys of white outdoor environmental educators. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 15.* 103-115.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Dussault, R., & Erasmus, G. (1996). *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples: Looking forward, looking back*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Russell, C. L. (1999). Problematizing nature experience in environmental education: The interrelationship of experience and story. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *22*(3), 123-137.

Russell, C., & Bell, A. (1996). A politicized ethic of care: Environmental education from an ecofeminist perspective. In K. Warren (Ed.), *Women's voices in experiential education* (pp. 172-181). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Russell, T. (2006). How 20 years of self-study changed my teaching. In C. Kosnik, A. R. Freese, & A.P. Samaras (Eds.), *Making a difference in teacher education through self-study: Studies of personal, professional and program renewal* (pp.3-17). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.

Russell, T., & Bullock, S. (2010). From talk to experience: Transforming the preservice physics course. *Brock Education, 20*(1), 19-33.

Said, E. W. (1978.). *Orientalism /* (1st ed. -- ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Samaras, A. P. & Freese, A. R. (2006). *Self study of teaching practices primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Samaras, A. P., Hicks, M. A., & Berger, J. G. (2004). Self-study through personal history. In J. J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V. K. Laboskey, & T. L. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 905-942). Dordrecht, HL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Santoro, N. (2009). Teaching in culturally diverse contexts: What knowledge about 'self' and 'others' do teachers need? *Journal of Education for Teaching 35*(1) 33-45.

Saul, J. R. (2009). *A fair country: Telling truths about Canada*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Canada.

Schick, C. (2000). 'By virtue of being white': Resistance in anti-racist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 3*(1), 83-102.

Schick, C. (2004). Disrupting binaries of self and other: Anti-homophobic pedagogies for student teachers. In Cronin, M., & McNinch, J. (Eds.)*"I Could Not Speak My Heart": Education and Social Justice for Gay and Lesbian Youth* (pp. 243-264). Regina, SK: University of Regina Press.

Schick, C. & St. Denis, V. (2003). What makes anti-racist pedagogy in teacher education difficult? Three popular ideological assumptions. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *49*(1), 55-69.

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.

Scully, A. (2012). Decolonization, reinhabitation and reconciliation: Aboriginal and Place-Based education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education. (17)*, 148-158.

Scully, A. (2015). Unsettling place-based education: Whiteness and Land in Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *38* (1), 80-100.

Sefa Dei, G. (2005). Unmasking racism: A challenge for anti-racist educators in the 21st century. In L. L. Karumanchery (Ed.), *Engaging equity: New perspectives on anti-racist education* (pp.135-148). Calgary, AB: Detsilig Enterprises.

Shepard, P. (1982). *Nature and madness*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Shohat, E., & Stam, R. (1994). *Unthinking eurocentrism*. New York and London: Routledge.

Silko, L. M. (1977). *Ceremony*. New York, NY: Viking.

Silman, J. (1987). *Enough is enough: Aboriginal women speak out*. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson, A. (2015). *Decolonizing our Minds: Life is a protest* (Keynote). Presentation, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON.

Simpson, L. (2011*). Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence and a new emergence*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring.

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

Smith, A. (2015). *Conquest: sexual violence and American Indian genocide*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Smith, A. (2005). Native American feminism, sovereignty, and social change. *Feminist Studies*, *31*(1), 116-132.

Smith, G. A. (2002). Place-Based education: Learning to be where we are. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *83*(8), 584-94.

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

Smith, L. T. (2005). Building a research agenda for indigenous epistemologies and education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *36*(1), 93-95.

Snelgrove, C., Dhamoon, R., & Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *3*(2).

Sobel, D. (2004). Place-based education. *Connecting Classrooms & Communities, The Orion Society, Great Barrington, MA*.

Soja, E. W. (1999) Thirdspace: Expanding the scope of the geographical imagination, In D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre (Eds). *Human Geography Today* (pp. 260-278), Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Soja, E. W. (1989). *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London, UK: Verso.

Somerville, M. (2007). Place literacies. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 30*(2), 149-164.

Somerville, M., Power, K., & De Carteret, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Landscapes and learning – place studies for a global world*. Rotterdam, NL: Sense.

Spirn, A. W. (1998). *The language of landscape*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). London, UK: Macmillan Education UK.

Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues*. London, UK: Psychology Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1993.). *Outside in the teaching machine*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Spraggins, T. (2006). A self-study on raced and gendered discourse: Seeking internalized oppressions and practices. In D. Tidwell & L. Fitzgerald (Eds). *Self-study and diversity* (pp. 19 – 49). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

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* (2),1068-1092.

Statistics Canada, 2016. *Census Profile, 2016 Census. Thunder Bay, ON*. Retrieved November 15, 2017 from: http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CMACA&Code1=595&Geo2=PR&Code2=35 &Data=Count&SearchText=Thunder%20Bay&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1 =Aboriginal%20peoples&TABID=1

Steinhauer, E. (2002). Thoughts on an Indigenous research methodology. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26*(2), 69-81.

Strong-Wilson, T. (2007). Moving horizons: Exploring the role of stories in decolonizing the literacy education of white teachers. *International Education, 37*(1), 114-131.

Styres, S. (2011). Land as first teacher: a philosophical journeying. Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives, 12(6), 717-731.

Styres, S., Haig Brown, C, & Blimkie, M. (2013). Towards a pedagogy of Land: The urban context. *Canadian Journal of Education 36*(2), 34-67.

Swan, M. (nd) Who we are as Anishinabe. Retrieved from http://anishinaabemodaa.com/data/upfiles/media/Who%20Are%20We%20-%20Ceremonies.pdf

Swiencicki, J. (2006). The rhetoric of awareness narratives. *College English, 68*(4) 337-355.

Tanaka, M. T. D. (2009). *Transforming perspectives: the immersion of student teachers in Indigenous ways of knowing* (doctoral dissertation) University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

Tidwell, D., & Fitzgerald, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Self-study and diversity* (Vol. 2). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Todd, Z. (2018, May 4) Indigenizing Canadian academia and the insidious problem of white possessiveness. Retrieved from: https://zoestodd.com/2018/05/04/indigenizing-academia-and-the-insidious-problem-of-white-possessiveness/?platform=hootsuite

Todd, Z. (2017, April 27). Indigenous stories, knowledge, legal traditions, ontologies, epistemologies as unneeded territory (or: Hands Off of Our Teachings) [Blog Post]. Retrieved from https://zoestodd.com/2017/04/27/indigenous-stories-knowledge-legal-traditions-ontologies-epistemologies-as-unceded-territory-or-hands-off-of-our-teachings/

Thomashow, M. (1996). *Ecological identity: Becoming a reflective environmentalist*. Cambridge, MA: Mit Press.

Tompkins, J. (2002). Learning to see what they can't: Decolonizing perspectives on Indigenous education in the racial context of rural Nova Scotia. *McGill Journal of Education, 37*(3), 405-422.

Treib, M. (2005). *Settings and stray paths: writings on landscapes and gardens*. Taylor & Francis.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission Canada: Calls to Action. (2015). Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2012. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Tuan, Y. –F. (1977) *Space and Place; the Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Tuck, E. (2018 May 18). Twitter thread on Indigenization and anti-Blackness. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/tuckeve/status/994544182617231361

Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *JCT (Online)*, *29*(1), 72-90.

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

Tuck, E., McKenzie, M., & McCoy, K. (Eds) (2014). Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research (Special Issue). *Environmental Education Research, (20)* 1, 1-23.

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

Tupper, J. (2012). Treaty education for ethically engaged citizenship: Settler identities, historical consciousness and the need for reconciliation. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, *7*(2), 143-156.

Tupper, J. (2013). Disrupting ignorance and settler identities: The challenges of preparing beginning teachers for treaty education. *in Education*, *17*(3).

Tupper, J. A., & Cappello, M. (2008). Teaching Treaties as (un)usual narratives: Disrupting the curricular commonsense. *Curriculum Inquiry, 38*(5), 559-578.

The United Nations General Assembly. (2007). *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People*.

Vanassche, E., & Kelchtermans, G. (2015). The state of the art in self-study of teacher education practices: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *47*(4), 508-528.

Veracini, L. (2011). Introducing. *Settler Colonial Studies 1*(1): 1–12.

Vowel, C. (2016). *Indigenous writes: A guide to First Nations, Métis and Inuit issues in Canada*. Winnipeg, MB: Highwater Press.

Wa, G & Uukw, D. (1989). *The Spirit in the Land: Statements of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en hereditary Chiefs in the Supreme Court of British Columbia 1987-1990*. Gabriola, BC: Reflections.

Wattchow, B., & Brown, M. (2011). *A pedagogy of place: Outdoor education for a changing world*. Clayton, AU: Monash University Publishing.

Weber-Pillwax, C. (2001). Orality in northern Cree Indigenous worlds. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *25*(2), 149.

Weber-Pillwax, C. (*2004*). *Identity formation and consciousness with reference to Northern Alberta Cree and Métis Indigenous Peoples* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Wenzel, G. (1991). *Animal rights, human rights: Ecology, economy and ideology in the Canadian Arctic*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

White, R. (1996). 'Are You an Environmentalist or Do You Work for a Living?': Work and nature. In W. Cronon (Ed.) *Uncommon ground: Rethinking the human place in nature*, (pp.171-185). New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Co.

Whitehead, J. (1993). *The growth of educational knowledge*. Bournemouth: Hyde.

Whitehead, J. (1989). Creating a living educational theory from questions of the kind,'How do I improve my practice?'. *Cambridge journal of Education*, *19*(1), 41-52.

Whitehead, J. (2000). How do I improve my practice? Creating and legitimating an epistemology of practice. *Reflective Practice, 1*(1), 91-104.

Williams, D. G., & Evans-Winters, V. (2005). The burden of teaching teachers: Memoirs of race discourse in teacher education. *The Urban Review*, 37(3), 201-219.

Wilson, S. (2001). What is Indigenous research methodology? *Canadian Journal of NativeEducation, 25*(2). 175-179.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *8*(4), 387-409.

Woodhouse, J. L., & Knapp, C. E. (2000). *Place-Based Curriculum and Instruction: Outdoor and Environmental Education Approaches*. ERIC Digest.

APPENDIX A

Participant Consent Form

Place-based Indigenous Education in Teacher Education for Right Relation.

This is to certify that I, ________________________, have read and understood the cover letter describing the study: Place-based Indigenous Education in Teacher Education for Right Relation, conducted by Alexa Scully.

☐ I agree to participate in this study.

☐ I understand the potential risks and/or benefits of the study.

☐ I understand that I am a volunteer and can withdraw from the study at any time, and may choose not to answer any question. I understand that the data I provide will be securely stored at Lakehead University for a minimum of 5 years. I have understood that the research findings will be made available to me – Alexa Scully will send me her findings in writing before they are disseminated through dissertation defense, publication or presentation.

☐ I will remain anonymous in any publication/public presentation of research findings if that is my choice: I must explicitly agree to have my identity revealed.

__________________________ __________________________

Signature of Participant Date

☐ I consent to the interview being audio-recorded.

☐ I consent to the interview being video-recorded.

I would like to be named in the findings and waive my right to confidentiality.

______________________________ ______________________________
Witness signature Date

Research Conducted by Alexa Scully: ajscully@lakeheadu.ca (416) 919-4942
Research Project Supervisor: Dr. Paul Berger: paul.berger@lakeheadu.ca (807) 343-8708

Research Ethics Board, Lakehead University: research@lakeheadu.ca

APPENDIX B

Semi-structured Interview Guide

- Tell me a bit about yourself. How did you come to teach Indigenous education in a faculty of Education?
- Describe the nature and purpose of the courses that you teach.
- What is the traditional territory that you teach in? Is there a treaty in your territory? Are your students aware of traditional or/and of treaty territory? Is this a knowledge that is useful/important to how you approach your classes?
- How is the traditional territory and the treaty or land-claim agreement factored in to your teaching?
- Do you spend time in your classes outside of the classroom?
- Do community members from local Indigenous community join your classes? In an official or unofficial capacity?
- Do your students see themselves as territorially or culturally situated? Is facilitating an awareness of self as a cultural being in a contested place something you address in your teacher-education classes? How do you approach this?
- Were there experiences or literatures that fostered an appreciation of place from Indigenous perspective (history, knowledge) in your teacher-education classes?
- What are some of the most successful practices that you have employed in your class – what are favourites? What do you think fostered the most learning?
- What have been some of the more contentious experiences in the class? Have you changed your practice in response to these challenges?

Appendix C

Conference Presentations

Scully, A. (2016). *Whiteness and Land in Indigenous Education in Canadian Teacher Education* (Scholarly Paper). Canadian Society for the Study of Education: Annual Conference. Calgary, AB, May 28th – June 2nd, 2016.

Scully, A. (2016) *S-STEP for Right Relation: Indigenous Education in Teacher Education.* (Scholarly Paper). American Education Research Association Annual Meeting – Self-Study Special Interest Group. Washington, DC, April 8-12th, 2016.

Scully, A. (2015) *Striving for Solidarity in Place-Based Education.* (Scholarly Paper). American Education Research Association Annual Meeting. Chicago, Illinois, April 16-20th, 2015.

Scully, A. (2015) *Redressing the Miseducation of non-Indigenous Canadians Through Teacher Education.* (Scholarly Paper). The Canadian Society for the Study of Education: Annual Conference. Ottawa, Ontario, May 31 – June 3, 2015.

Scully, A. (2014) *Place-based Education for Right Relation. (*Scholarly Paper). American Education Research Association Annual Meeting. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 2-6th, 2014.

Scully, A. (2013) *I Never Saw It That Way Before: A Self-Study of Indigenous and Place-based Teacher Education.* (Scholarly Paper). The Canadian Society for the Study of Education: Annual Conference. Victoria, BC, June 1-4.

Scully, A. (2013) *Learning Relationships in Context: Indigenous and Place-based Teacher Education, A Self Study.* (Scholarly Paper). American Education Research Association Annual Meeting. San Franciso, CA, April 27th – May 1st.

Scully, A. (2012) *Location, Location, Location: Aboriginal and Place-Based Education.* (Scholarly Paper). The Canadian Society for the Study of Education: Annual Conference. Waterloo, ON, May 27 – May 30.

Scully, A. (2012) *Decolonization, Reinhabitation and Reconciliation: Aboriginal and Place-based Education.* (Scholarly Paper). American Education Research Association Annual Meeting 2012: Non Satis Scire: To Know Is Not Enough. Vancouver, BC, April 13 – 17.

Scully, A. (2012) *Location, Location, Location: Place-based Aboriginal Education*. (Paper presentation). Lakehead University Faculty of Education Graduate Student Conference 2012. Thunder Bay, ON, February 17.

Scully, A. (2011) *Why is the Whitest Woman on the Planet Teaching Aboriginal Education?* (Scholarly Paper). The Canadian Society for the Study of Education: Annual Conference. Fredericton, NB, May 28 – June1.

Scully, A. (2011) *Failure as Transformation: Critical Reflections as a White Teacher educator in Aboriginal*

Education. (Poster). Lakehead University Faculty of Education Graduate Student Conference 2011. Thunder Bay, ON, Feb.25th.