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Abstract

Following up on the thousands of pages collected from testimonies by residential school survivors and former employees between 2010 and 2015, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC) presented 94 recommendations to Canadian society, effectively making a call for systemic changes across all forms of governance and organization. Their expressed concern was that Euro-colonial practices continued to systemically discriminate against and cause grievous harm to Indigenous people within the Canadian nation-state. The purpose of this thesis is to answer to their call, specifically, to examine both from within a post-secondary academic institution and beyond its epistemological parameters, how one might attempt to reshape one’s approaches to knowledge formation in trying to build more respectful relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Taking to heart Indigenous scholarship prioritizing relationships over object-centric pursuits of knowledge, the author draws upon her linguistic, cultural and political upbringing as a member of a Japanese and multi-Asian diasporic community to reach toward Indigenous artists, whose works compel their audiences to be widely socially inclusive, to remember Canada’s colonial past in addressing the colonial present, and to respect one’s elders and ancestors. Distinct relationships are established between the author and Cree multi-media artist, Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Siksika interdisciplinary artist, Adrian Stimson, and Tahltan performance artist and object maker, Peter Morin. Rather than adhering to a pre-set methodology, a mentoring connection with L’Hirondelle, a role model relation with Stimson, and a best friendship with Morin guide the author’s processes of coming to know. Witnessing their practices, the author explores becoming sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows to L’Hirondelle, Stimson, and Morin, respectively. Consequently, the narrative and epistemic organization of the author’s personal experiences and institutionalized learning scatter and are drawn upon so far as they contribute to the relationship at hand. Throughout the dissertation, critical questions are raised and performatively considered to: challenge settler-Indigenous binaries of knowledge formation; investigate the limits of the known and knowable; and, include unexpected others. The dissertation concludes with the suggestion that reconciliation and witnessing are practice-based, and that collective responsibility is an intersubjective regard for that which has been experientially gathered along the way.

Key Words: Reconciliation; Indigenous/non-Indigenous relations; Relationality; Witnessing performance; Shadow; Collective Responsibility
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Aboriginal Curatorial Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFN</td>
<td>Assembly of First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNPAC/RACA</td>
<td>The Association of National Non-Profit Artists Centres/Regroupement d’Artistes des Centres Alternatifs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTH</td>
<td>Bringing Them Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Citizenship and Immigration Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS</td>
<td>Canadian Security Intelligence Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INM</td>
<td>Idle No More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRER</td>
<td>Immigrant, Refugee, Ethnocultural, and Racialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOII</td>
<td>No One Is Illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP</td>
<td>Ontario Provincial Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATRC</td>
<td>South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC</td>
<td>Truth and Reconciliation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCC</td>
<td>The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC-IRS</td>
<td>Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Indian Residential Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary of Japanese Terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese Term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Romanization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>間柄</td>
<td>aidagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>阿蘇郡</td>
<td>Aso-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>阿蘇山</td>
<td>Aso-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あなた</td>
<td>anata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陰</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>受身</td>
<td>ukemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>梅酒</td>
<td>umeshu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>裏</td>
<td>ura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お陰で</td>
<td>okagede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お母さん</td>
<td>okāsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お正月</td>
<td>oshōgatsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お爺さん</td>
<td>ojīsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>オタク</td>
<td>otaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お父さん</td>
<td>otōsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お握り</td>
<td>onigiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>叔母さん</td>
<td>obasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お婆ちゃん</td>
<td>obāchan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>帯</td>
<td>obi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表</td>
<td>omote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お利口</td>
<td>oriko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>甲斐</td>
<td>Kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陰</td>
<td>kage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>合作</td>
<td>gassaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>片仮名・カタカナ</td>
<td>katakana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我慢</td>
<td>gaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>外来語</td>
<td>gairaigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>漢字</td>
<td>kanji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>河童</td>
<td>kappa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>きもの</td>
<td>kimono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>清川</td>
<td>Kiyokawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>空</td>
<td>kū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>グラビアアイドル</td>
<td>gravure idol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>繰り返し</td>
<td>kurikaeshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>食たれ</td>
<td>kusotare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>心</td>
<td>kokoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孝行</td>
<td>kōkō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コスプレ</td>
<td>kosupu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後藤</td>
<td>Gotō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後輩</td>
<td>kōhai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>共同生活</td>
<td>kyōdōseikatsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自分</td>
<td>jibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>桜</td>
<td>sakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>素直</td>
<td>sunao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>守破離</td>
<td>shuhari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>生活の美学</td>
<td>seikatsu no bigaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>先輩</td>
<td>senpai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>曽祖母</td>
<td>sōsobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>草履</td>
<td>zōri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>付け回す</td>
<td>tsukemawasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>東京農業大学</td>
<td>Tōkyō nōgyō daigaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人間</td>
<td>ningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>白水村</td>
<td>Hakusui mura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>場</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>場所</td>
<td>bashō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>母親</td>
<td>hahaoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>平仮名・ひらがな</td>
<td>hiragana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>風土</td>
<td>fūdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後藤</td>
<td>Gotō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後輩</td>
<td>kōhai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>共同生活</td>
<td>kyōdōseikatsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自分</td>
<td>jibun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>桜</td>
<td>sakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>素直</td>
<td>sunao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>守破離</td>
<td>shuhari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>生活の美学</td>
<td>seikatsu no bigaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>先輩</td>
<td>senpai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>曽祖母</td>
<td>sōsobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>草履</td>
<td>zōri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>付け回す</td>
<td>tsukemawasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>東京農業大学</td>
<td>Tōkyō nōgyō daigaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人間</td>
<td>ningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>白水村</td>
<td>Hakusui mura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>場</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>場所</td>
<td>bashō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>母親</td>
<td>hahaoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>平仮名・ひらがな</td>
<td>hiragana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>風土</td>
<td>fūdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>弁当</strong></td>
<td><strong>bentō</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>幕間</strong></td>
<td><strong>makuai</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>矛盾</strong></td>
<td><strong>mujun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>浴衣</strong></td>
<td><strong>yukata</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>陽</strong></td>
<td><strong>yō</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ロールモデル</strong></td>
<td><strong>rō-ru moderu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>わがまま</strong></td>
<td><strong>wagamama</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>わきまえ</strong></td>
<td><strong>wakimae</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>私</strong></td>
<td><strong>watashi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>我々</strong></td>
<td><strong>wareware</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pronunciation Guide**

In the Romanization of Japanese terms, five sounds are expressed. These are:

- “a” – uh as in cup
- “i” – ee as in feet
- “u” – oo as in food
- “e” – eh as in pet
- “o” – oh as in so
Preface: In the spaces in between

When I was five years old, my family travelled together to Japan. It was the first time I would fly in an airplane. As I heard the roar of the engines and peered out of the window, experiencing the landscape whiz swiftly backwards, I decided that this place, Japan, must be in the sky, and that we had to board a plane in order to fly up to reach the next land mass, which floated above Canada. So then began years of deciding that the earth was neither flat nor round, rather, it was a series of floating islands connected through air travel.

This early insistence has profoundly affected my relationships to language, culture, nationalism, imagination, and the land itself. In the home, 日本語 (Nihongo) was the first and main spoken language. お婆ちゃん (obāchan), who came down from the sky to Canada at age 60, never learned English beyond simple phrases of greeting, yesses, and nos. In the household, お婆ちゃん was the foundation and the persistence of the everyday. A quiet, solemn woman, one could easily describe her as severe. In actuality she was worked so ragged, there was no room for idle conversation. Her daily responsibilities included doing mountains of laundry for a household of seven: her son-in-law, her only daughter, her four granddaughters, and herself. She kept the floors and rugs, curtains and windows immaculate, made elaborate soups for our dogs, and maintained a spotless kitchen so that her daughter could cook for the family. There would be whispers in the home regarding お婆ちゃん’s honorable sense of 我慢 (gaman), understood as her ability to withstand without complaint or selfishly requesting rescue. Only at night, once all of the chores had been completed, would she allow her shoulders to slouch, as she sipped a small glass of 梅酒 (umeshu) and kneeled in front of the television to watch the late night news with Lloyd Robertson. She hadn’t a clue what he was saying but would piece together the world as split images of newsworthy events flashed across the screen. Mostly, she and お母さん (okāsan) laughed amicably while commentating on Lloyd’s attire.

In our home, culture often had less to do with its precipitates and representations of symbols and longstanding myths. Instead, it was the everyday, including the gaps in

---

1Throughout the thesis, I will be referring to many Japanese words in Japanese script. A pronunciation and meaning guide is available in the glossary on page xvii of the dissertation.
histories, memories, and the incomplete knowing of other families, found in similar circumstances as our own. The practice of culture was often a non-cognitive meditation on self-exile and endless wishes for the homeland. Culture, like bacteria and wind, easily crosses borders. It cannot be contained, erased, and if blocked in one direction, always finds other ways to surround and at times saturate one's existence.

Culture in my mind became equated with nationality. From my early youth, I knew that almost all Japanese people lived in Japan, the place in the sky, and that our family was one of the unusual outliers, the ones who left in attempts to make roots elsewhere, anywhere beyond a land that was too homogeneous, rule-bound, and morally broken, or so お父さん (otōsan) would say night after night, sitting back on his creaky chair, sipping at his whiskey. His grand critiques of Japanese culture deeply impacted my understanding of national pride and humiliation, and it would take decades of conversing in Japanese with お父さん about Japan's socio-political history and listening intently to お婆ちゃん when she revealed snippets of her own tumultuous life before I could begin to appreciate just how much has carried through and impacts my daily actions, decisions, and affiliations.

Culture beyond the family home, お父さん's mushroom farm business, was a multi-linguistic, multi-Asian affair, with aural streams of Cantonese, some Mandarin, Vietnamese, a Cambodian language (perhaps Khmer), Korean, Japanese, broken and unbroken English intermingling and juxtaposing through the halls. The business was built and maintained by an influx of Asians who arrived as economic immigrants, refugees, and student-visa workers. The employee list also consisted of a very small minority of White people or “Canadians” as お母さん was fond of saying, mostly teenagers who were hired during the summer months to make pocket money or errant delinquents forced to work off their community sentences for petty crimes committed in the local area. They often stayed on long after their punishments had been meted in full. English was a marginalized language in this work environment, altering noticeable cultural power relations. Surrounded by languages that I would never come to understand, the absorption of voices nonetheless became a source of comfort as well as a lesson on how to keep one's counsel. Only through the sudden drop in another's volume and tone would I realize that secrets were being passed in plain sound, conversations to which I was not privy. Only when a story eventually filtered through, somersaulting over months, years, several languages and retellings, was it understood
that enough of a trust had been developed between the speaker and listener. Tales of suffering and tumult were meant to be held dear and not used to cause further harm. Of course, there were always exceptions.

The mushroom farm was one of the largest employers in a rural Southern Albertan setting, a land inhabited primarily by Euro-descended wheat farmers. Reflecting back, the cultural composition at the mushroom farm may have dramatically shifted social interactions in an otherwise White culture in the broader community. I often wonder if the racism that I as a self-identified non-“Canadian” experienced was in part directly related to this sizable Asian presence. Perhaps we were perceived as a cultural invasion, daring to take up space upon land where lines of ownership and rightful occupation had long been drawn. And it could have been that we were seen as an imminent threat to social order where English was the official language to be spoken about town, and bodies were expected to move in a particular way and give off familiar scents. Through お父さん and お母さん’s and Chinese restaurateurs’ habitual conflation of “Canadian” with so-called White people culture, I came to accept that people who looked like me were often unwelcomed guests rather than citizens of this land.

Growing up in this racially contested situation, there were others who could not and would not capture お父さん’s and therefore my imagination, for I would keenly adhere to his point of view. I was inquisitive about the local school’s rationale for dividing our intramural teams into Blood, Sarcee, and Stoney. I do not recall coming across the term “Treaty 7”; had I heard it, it would have meant nothing to my everyday interactions. I have lasting memories of seeing other “people of colour” sauntering along downtown streets as I entered and exited tiny to medium-sized communities during mushroom deliveries and sports-related bus trips across Southern Alberta. As well, I remember – much to my present shame – not really feeling anything except a weak sense of association as my eyes fell upon them and then swiftly turned away. We were all in the same boat, I would surmise, assuming that they too must have come from faraway places, and they too were just passing through.

As an adult, having lived much of my life within the nation-state imaginary of Canada, I wonder now if perhaps my race assessment through childhood eyes may not have been as distorted as I had begun to imagine it to be as I became older. Indigenous presences, which had become subsumed under totalizing gazes – both governmentally and individually determined – had come from far away. They came far in advance of the
formation of Canada. Were they then currently in a continuous state of knowingly and
unknowingly performing everyday acts of resistance from being systemically assimilated
into the machinery of Canadian nation-building, a system that from the point of Euro-
national inception unwaveringly discriminated against their well-being? Physical
proximities did not represent the distances of whole lives lived independently of one
another. Side by side, we were nations apart, different island existences that could only
be accessed through some form of travel: political, ideological, existential, cosmological.

I do not dwell in the spaces of memory to entrench and represent a certain social
position in fixed relation to other political and racial identities. Nor is it my place to say
that such a diasporic childhood history is a common experience in living on Turtle Island.
The mushroom farm context is both strangely unique and mundane in telling the stories
of multiple migrations. Instead, it is my hope that within instances of this personal history
are opportunities to reimagine and recognize the complexities with which colonialism
persists or ceases, where actions speak more broadly than the theoretical reporting of
events and categorized senses of being, where movements put into context the decision
and demands to stand still.

At times there are resonances and echoes in racialized experiences in Canada
that socially and emotively traverse cultural allegiances and histories. A hurried and
weak association can forego the depths of our differences, possibly in a necessary bid to
create safety in numbers. There is ample evidence that Canada’s nation-building project
discriminates and divides those who do not fit in, whether such decisions are made at
the outset of so-called “first contact” (Haefeli, 2007; Howey, 2011; Kolodny, 2012;
McGhee, 1984); in times of mass migrations so that strange laws are created to deter
successful mooring from distant waters (Kazimi, 2012; Roy & Sahoo, 2016; Surrey Art
Gallery, 2015); or in a state of warfare where one is deemed an illegal alien therefore
unfit for full, if any, citizenship rights (Cho, 2013; Henderson & Wakeham, 2009; Li,
1998, 2000; Miki, 2004; Sunahara, 1981). Our similarities then reside in a state of
wishfulness, one in which you would understand me, and I would understand you.

Pronouns betray certain kinds of knowledges or lack thereof. The third-person
“they” bespeaks of a great chasm of relationality between the “I” and “you.” Use of the
gathered “they” might be a way of expressing one’s separation from personal interaction
with the designated or consequential “them”. Knowledge accrual thus forms in observing
from a state of disinterestedness, indifference, naïve deference, or at times outright
hostility. The collective “we” on the other hand reveals the subsumption of several points
of view under one voice. Such collations create the danger of speaking on behalf of many others, as though thoughts and experiences are easily amalgamated into a singular representation. “We” expresses a camaraderie, a resolve to associate with the tacit understanding of the excluded they. The challenge is to engage in honorific practices regarding they and we, creating opportunities to destabilize the fixedness of one’s position and subjectivities in relation to others.

In the following chapters, this personal history will interweave, and itself be reshaped by new encounters, unexpected affiliations and commitments, in my effort to prioritize relationships to labour through the call for reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities.
Chapter One: Introduction

Following up on the thousands of pages collected from testimonies by residential school survivors and former employees between 2010 and 2015, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC) presented 94 recommendations to Canadian society, effectively making a call for systemic changes across all forms of governance and organization (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRCC], 2015a). Their expressed concern was that Euro-colonial practices continued to systemically discriminate against and cause grievous harm to Indigenous people within the Canadian nation-state (TRCC, 2015b). Within the context of reconciliation discourse in Canada, where thousands of stories from residential school survivors have stirred up people’s traumatic memories and deeply buried senses of guilt, loss, and grief, chance encounters with unexpected others can unwittingly lead to inflicting further cultural damage, fears, actual moments of recolonization, and experiences of social alienation and isolation (Bombay, Matheson, & Anisman, 2011, 2014; Elias, Mignone, Hall, Hong, Hart, & Sareen, 2012; Kwan, 2015; Morrissette & Goodwill, 2013; Wilk, Maltby, & Cooke, 2017). In the present social climate, where Indigenous communities, new immigrants, and those perennially passing through have been both legislated and socially habituated to live apart from each other, it would seem that the task at hand is to think of creating occasions for building respectful relationships that exceed regulations of the Canadian nation-state.

The purpose of my doctoral research is to identify and articulate creative strategies that reimagine and broaden current conceptualizations of reconciliation and witnessing in the Canadian context. I argue that a critical and creative interrogation of witnessing produces new ways of imagining Indigenous and non-Indigenous interactions, which in turn produce substantive insights into the socio-political limits of state-driven reconciliation initiatives. The key research questions in this project are: What can be learned from emerging performative collaborations with Indigenous artists in developing a more nuanced understanding of witnessing and reconciliation? How might these encounters be used to identify the limitations and expectations of national strategies, which attempt to enforce reconciliation en masse within a restricted time frame? My interests lie in exploring from my Asian/Japanese/diasporic perspective collaborations with the land and with specific Indigenous artists, which might come to mean something experientially, socially, and cosmologically. I wish to contemplate the
ways in which such seemingly divided ontologies can at times interweave through recognizing and building relationally motivated, performative, and land-based ways of coming to know.\(^2\)

The current study is premised on my speculation that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC) itself can be considered a performance. The notion that truth and reconciliation commissions are performances or express the performatives (in terms of cultivation) of witnessing has been explored with regard to other commissions conducted elsewhere (Alexander, Giesen, & Mast, 2006; Breed, 2006; Cole, 2010; Drabinski, 2013; Millar, 2012; Moon, 2008; Oboe, 2007; Orford, 2006; Ross, 2003; Walker, 2007). In Canada, widespread wariness of the official Harper apology on Indian Residential schools reflects broader misgivings of the political performances of contrition and memorializing, and of those taking responsibility for the historical legacy of European colonization and its effects on Indigenous communities (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005; Castellano, Archibald, & DeGagné, 2008; Corntassel & Holder, 2008; Green, 2012; Loft, 2012; McCready, 2009). Thus arises the challenge to imagine and practice new ways of building relations that carefully and respectfully contest nationally engendered narratives of contrition and belonging.

Having taken to heart repeated calls from Indigenous scholars to prioritize relationality and relationship building over product-based research (Bastien, 2009; Battiste, 2009; Castellano & Reading, 2010; Little Bear 2000, 2004), the current study is based upon relationships that have been initiated and fostered through the embodied contemplation of moving through the land as well as in my role as guest co-editor of a special issue of West Coast Line, *Reconcile This!* (Dewar & Goto, 2012). This issue showcases the works of visual and performance artists who interrogate current conceptualizations of reconciliation in Canada. Since 2013, I have been developing a performance practice in the attempt to understand through the body the risks, politics, and creativity involved in the works of three of the contributors of *Reconcile This!*: Cree-Métis/French-German-Polish multimedia artist and musician, Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Siksika First Nation interdisciplinary and performance artist, Adrian Stimson, and Tahltan performance artist and object maker, Peter Morin. I have also spent a concerted period

---

\(^2\)In *Blackfoot Ways of Knowing* (2009), Blackfoot scholar Betty Bastien translates and explains the term liisksiniip as “coming to know”. According to Bastien, coming to know arises from a way of being, and involves a life-long pursuit that integrates the sacred, lived experience, and the interrelational.
of time establishing a more engaged and intimate knowledge of the land upon which these thesis ideas are being explored.

Of an exploratory, experimental, and experiential nature, my research will expand upon recent studies that suggest communication through articulated artistic practices can enhance critical understanding of ongoing public and personal negotiations to situate, critique, and creatively rethink contested, and often bureaucratic, policy implementations of reconciliation initiatives (Caracciolo, 2009; Cubitt, 2008; MacNeill, 2010). In effect, I wish to confront the systemic nature of colonialism that persists in Canada today by raising awareness of the challenges of sustaining reconciliatory practices beyond the formal lifespan of the TRCC. Specifically, I wish to explore and work through the complexities that are encountered in attempting to build better political and social relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities from within an institutionalized academic environment.

An ongoing objective of this study is to contemplate how my academic training might fit into Indigenous scholarship and knowledges rather than to expect Indigenous ways of knowing to mold into established disciplines. Because of the Indigenous, relationally-led nature of these investigations, at the beginning of the dissertation, the most I am able to offer in terms of a research methodology is to suggest that, as will be demonstrated in the coming chapters, it moves and shifts relative to the topics covered and the types of personal and interrelational engagements involved. In examining the larger socio-political context, I will take a broadly social scientific review of the literature on witnessing, reconciliation, Indigenous and settler relations.

Cree scholar, Shawn Wilson (2008) discusses the establishment of an indigenist research paradigm to aid in reimagining how research can be shaped and refocused. Wilson centralizes relational accountability of researchers who are interested in working with Indigenous communities. He argues that building relationships as a researcher is interwoven with building relationships with the environment, family, ancestors, and the cosmos (p. 194). Wilson states that indigenist researchers include both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people whose investigations propagate Indigenous ways of knowing (p. 193). He characterizes indigenist research using starting principles as a means to redirect the ways that one comes to know.  

---

3Shawn Wilson’s (2008) conceptualization of indigenist research will be discussed in further detail in Chapter Two.
I listen to Wilson’s suggestions with earnestly, and in coming to know the land, Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Adrian Stimson, and Peter Morin, respectively, I follow their lead, and without intending to, begin to apprentice performatively. Within these relationships, I scramble to draw upon wide-ranging fields of knowledges that include different Indigenous cultural and cosmological perspectives, sociolinguistics, environmental studies, and cultural studies, in my efforts to better abide by their practices. In describing the chasing of visual shadows across the land, sonorously shadowing Cheryl L’Hirondelle, performatively shadowing Adrian Stimson, and tactiley shadowing Peter Morin, the writing and explorations will be of a phenomenological nature, linguistically conveyed as shifts in writing style and content, to present the embodied knowledges that arise from the emerging practice of witnessing these artists. Finally, in gathering these teachings altogether, I reconnect to my philosophical training, particularly in the area of moral and ethical discourse, to retrospectively examine national and intersubjective senses of collective responsibility concerning calls to reconcile with the past and in relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

At this point, one might wish to inquire, “Why Cheryl? Adrian? And Peter? What is the draw toward these particular individuals?” From this purview, ostensibly at the end of the investigation, I could suggest a number of rationales for focusing on their respective creative practices. I might present ways in which their art pieces fit into the canons of politicized and activist art (Bowles, 2011; Cha, 1982; Davis, 2017; DeLaure & Fink, 2017; Lichtenfels & Rouse, 2013; Madison, 2010). I could talk specifically about counting them among the artists who have responded to the TRCC’s articulations of reconciliation and residential school experiences (Debassige, 2013; Devine, 2007; Dewar & Goto, 2012; Dowell, 2017; Robinson & Martin, 2016; Stewart, Benesiinaabandan, Garneau, & Busby, 2016). And I may declare an inexplicable fascination with performance art practice in general (Carr, 2012; Heathfield & Hsieh, 2015; Phelan, 1993; Yoshimoto, 2005). But to do so would be to reverse the causality with regard to activist performance art practice. Such interests are outcomes of rather than catalysts in developing relationships with Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter. Beyond artworlds, their various artistic responses to colonization and national reconciliation
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4As will be discussed in the coming pages, the term “performatively” is used in terms of cultivation, rather than Judith Butler’s (1988, 2010b) and J.L. Austin’s (1962) conceptualization and embodiment of speech acts. This notion of cultivation is a practice-based meaning that has emerged from shadowing Cheryl L'Hirondelle, Adrian Stimson, and Peter Morin.
discourse have certainly caught my attention, because the scope and depths of their works surpass the superficiality of spectacular outrage and knee-jerk advancement of moral superiority. At least, this has been my interpretation of their performance pieces.

In speaking to Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter’s practices collectively, I could surmise that Indigenous performance artists express new social relations and ways of witnessing, which are premised upon honouring Indigenous ways of knowing while simultaneously confronting stereotypical representations and misappropriated beliefs that have been adopted in the wider Canadian context. Once removed from the familiar, from a distance that signifies a surname relational basis, each artist can be shown to demonstrate the complexity and multiple skills with which they address wide-ranging political and cultural concerns. In an interview with artists Cheryl L’Hirondelle and Archer Pechawis, Anishinabe-kwe curator Wanda Nanibush (2008) presents performance as a form of communication that exceeds verbal language (p. 27). In recognizing the impossibility of containing knowledge, Pechawis argues that performance rehumanizes Native people who have been objectified and stereotyped in social science research (Nanibush, 2008, p. 29). L’Hirondelle suggests that at present we are “in a state of being a vidience,” rather than an audience. Those present at a performance have the potential to witness and open up to variegated experiences including the refusal to necessarily synthesize and catalogue the surrounds (Nanibush, 2008, p. 29). As a singer/songwriter and multimedia artist who strongly draws upon her Métis-Cree heritage, L’Hirondelle describes how she remaps the land through song, creating what she describes as songlines, where one’s experience and knowledge of the land is reconfigured through culturally embedded sound (L’Hirondelle, Jimmy, & Bose, 2012). For L’Hirondelle, witnessing is a fully engaged, shape-shifting experience that challenges modernist, single-bodied individualistic modes of being in the world.

Siksika performance and interdisciplinary artist Adrian Stimson deliberately pushes the boundaries of audience comfort in his ultra-camp performances of Buffalo Boy, an alter-ego trickster who humorously and playfully resists and revises heteronormative creation stories of the Canadian nation-state (Bell, 2007; Gonick, 2009; Goto, 2014). According to Wanda Nanibush (2014), through his performances, Buffalo Boy invalidates “the value system that supports colonialism…and reverses the value system that marginalizes Indigenous people as uncivilized” (p. 40). She argues further that Buffalo Boy sends spinning binary hierarchies of “clean and dirty, savage and civilized, diamonds and coal, power and working class, control and excess, male and
female, heterosexual and homosexual," drawing audience attention to the ways that these binaries shape and determine social actions (p. 40). Through his alter egos, including Buffalo Boy, Stimson animatedly defies Euro-centrically devised categories of sexuality, gender, and race.

And Tahltan First Nation performance artist and object maker Peter Morin draws upon ancestral knowledge to thwart European, modernist notions of space and time. In so doing, Morin addresses how European colonization continues to systemically discriminate against Indigenous people living within Canada today. In the exhibition *Peter Morin’s Museum* (2011), Morin decolonizes artistic spaces such as Satellite Gallery by repatriating the conceptualization of the museum and gallery as particularly Tahltan (Morin & Duffek, 2011). In his hands and performances, the gallery becomes a place of gathering, where “objects speak Tahltan” (2011, pp. 10-11). According to Morin and curator Karen Duffek, through the process of making, dreaming, and sharing, traditional Tahltan objects, Indigenous culture is remade every day (p. 11). Morin’s works defy the misanthropic misperception that Indigenous knowledges have all but died out with the onset of European colonization of North America.

Yet, accounting for my interest in these artists on a surname basis does not get to the heart of the question of what has compelled me to follow their leads. A fuller response to this requires going into deeper, prolonged relational engagement, to move from a surname to first-name basis, where unexpected proximities, uncanny affiliations, and the particulars of their ways of being come to be known. During our first artist residency together at Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops in 2013, Reconsidering Reconciliation, I remember Cheryl reflecting one evening that she, Adrian, and I had in common our abidance to tradition. I have mulled over Cheryl’s comment over the years, having come to the realization that not only was she referring to the culturally informed contents of our different practices, but she also identified our senses of trying to act responsibly and responsively with regard to our ancestors and Elders. I see this very much in Peter’s work too. I can now say that wordlessly, I was attracted to the different ways in which all three interwove a cultivated sense of cultural and social respect into their artistic labours. From my upbringing, this could be labelled, “filial piety” (Hsu, 1971; Xing, 2010), and although the terminology and philosophical articulations may vary considerably in Cree, Siksikaitsipowahsin, and Na-Dene (Tahltan language), the embodied expressions of respect create unanticipated gestural resemblances. Were this inference based upon one-off chance encounters with Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, then
perhaps it could be attributed to social coincidence. However, over the years, through multiple situations of converging at social gatherings, artist residencies, and conferences, I have witnessed their senses of social respect streaming through the everyday, inclusive of their performance practices. Their expressions of social respect extend beyond the human realm to encompass honouring relationships with their traditional territories and the lands that they continue to pass through. That is, they teach me how to contemplate land-human relations from multiple cultural and historical contexts that far exceed my expectations and imagination.

Witnessing Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter from shifting proximities, it would seem that the integration of social respect into their very ways of being and doing effectively breaks down categorical barriers of that which constitutes performativity and performance. While scholars and artists alike have spent much energy on distinguishing these terms both in theory and practice (Austin, 1962; Bial, 2004; Butler, 1988, 2010a, 2010b; Denzin, 2003; Schechner, 2003; Stoller, 2010), I wish to suggest that in Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, the term “performativity” becomes understood in relation to cultivation in the everyday (Nagatomo, 1992), aspects of being which are both intentionally and unintentionally highlighted in an intentional performance. In other words, “performative” and “performativity” are used as a state of being and practicing that at times culminates into a presentation. In contrast to Judith Butler’s logocentric, critical gender analysis of being performative (Butler, 1988, 2010a, 2010b), my apprehension of “performativity” is a term that has been instilled, alongside “performance”, through becoming shadows to Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, respectively. From what I have been able to learn so far, performance work is profoundly humbling, for, in all of one’s concerted efforts to cultivate actions and values that can be called forth in a good way, it is impossible to account for everything else that accompanies one’s intentional actions. That is, performances continuously exceed expectations, pre-determined meanings, and one’s initial cognitive awareness. In considering performance to be a manifestation of cultivated acts of witnessing, time and again, one is confronted with the limited scope of their own knowledge, experiences, and engagement with the world at large.

Post-colonial, Indigenous, feminist, critical race, and queer performance theorists have abundantly countered the tendency to atomize the performances of witnessing, arguing that the creative range of calls and responses potentiates transformative political actions that disrupt rather than reinstate established binaries of perpetrator/victim, powerful/powerless, observer/observed (Alexander, Giesen, & Mast, 2006; Billingham,
2005; Butler, 2010a; Cohen-Cruz, 2010; Conquergood, 2004; Kester, 2004; Phelan, 1993; Reinelt & Roach, 2007; Sosa, 2012). I wish to consider the notion that witnessing expressed as an embodied and socio-politically immersive experience bridges art and the everyday. Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter continuously demonstrate that even in the disturbance and deconstruction of multiple political identities and boundaries, their enactments of social respect invite participation and care in excess of experiencing life from within the confines of predetermined categories.

This investigation is presented at a time in which the Indigenous-settler binary seems to have forestalled possibly rich creatively critical collaborations between Indigenous people and those engaged in postcolonial work across Canada. In the Canadian context, there appears to be a hesitancy to bridge Indigenous and post-colonial methodologies and activisms to overturn colonizer-colonized race and class relations. Over the years, I have wondered why this might be the case, and a number of
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5 Researchers in other parts of the world are beginning to intertwine Indigenous and post-colonial knowledges. For example, Tswana education scholars, Bagele Chilisa and Gaelebale Tsheko (2014) endorse a “post-colonial Indigenous research paradigm,” which places an emphasis on relationship building and gathering cultural knowledges that integrate largely marginalized knowledge systems. In a post-colonial research paradigm, knowledge is socially constructed by a community of knowers who are interconnected with the living and non-living and in the realms of ancestors and the non-human. They draw upon Shawn Wilson’s (2008) seminal work, Research is Ceremony, and specifically on his relational ontology as it echoes with traditional African values of esteeming the community over the individual. Elsewhere, Hawai’ian education scholar, Julie Kaomea (2016) bridges Indigenous and post-colonial methodologies to challenge oppression and to culturally empower those telling stories of their lives and communities. Kaomea utilizes Lévi-Strauss’s (1964) term bricoleur to formulate a “jack of all trades” methodology, which includes the appropriation of Western and missionary knowledges by Hawaiians in a bid to assert their native identities. A bricolage methodology embraces multiple ways of learning and knowing, bringing together Hawaiian and other culturally and politically derived research tools into an eclectic approach that very much reverberates with Chilisa and Tsheko’s (2014) description of mixing methods in post-colonial Indigenous research. The key purpose of bricolage in a Hawaiian context is to promote analytical and social emancipation of those whose traditional practices and beliefs have been erased or overridden in settler-colonially instituted educational environments and in the everyday. Third, Hong-Kong Chinese-Canadian social work scholar, Yuk-Lin Renita Wong (2002) examines how post-colonial epistemology of location can contribute to Indigenous theory. Wong argues for recognizing Chinese women’s senses of agency through the application of a post-colonial epistemology of location, or the work of researchers to reflect continuously on the power privileges of their social position in relation to others. The aim is to redress and avoid reinstating dominant power dynamics both locally and globally. In comparing Chilisa and Tsheko (2014), Kaomea’s (2016) and Wong’s (2002) varied methods for combining Indigenous and post-colonial strategies for practising decolonizing research, it becomes clear that these scholars have different meanings of who and what is Indigenous. Chilisa and Tsheko identify specific types of research practices as being Indigenous: naming, storytelling, yarning, talking circles. Chilisa and Tsheko draw on a globalized notion of Indigeneity and reflects on how they are akin to Batswana peoples while foregoing clarifying enactments that are particularly localized and historicized in Botswana. Alternatively, Kaomea draws upon Hawai’ian linguistically derived and land-based art practices that talk back to Western
possible reasons have come to mind. First, as will be discussed in the next chapter, in *Colonial Proximities*, Renisa Mawani (2009) argues that European colonialism systemically separated Indigenous and non-European populations along the West Coast of a nascent Canada. In carefully combing through archives of working and living arrangements, Mawani concludes that the heterogenizing and deliberate separation of colonized bodies were maintained even after racialized groups such as the Chinese, Indigenous, and Japanese over time were legally afforded civil rights and liberties that had once been exclusive to European settlers. The question remains: How have previous laws habituated bodies to move away from those identified as non-self? In this case, I understand the body both as the individual, physical body and a body of people, collectivized based on a particular gaze such as race, class, and movement.

Second, with increasing focus on settler colonialism transnationally in political sciences, anthropology, and broadly within the humanities and social sciences, those who have experienced race-related personal and systemic discrimination in Canada have suddenly been shunted into the category of settler. Settler colonialism studies have tended to place theoretical, social, and ethical precedence in critiquing White settler presence on Indigenous territories (Ingram, 2001; Rose, 2001; Veracini, 2014). But many do not fit a certain trajectory of settling on a new land because they may have landed unintentionally, or they do not forget where they have come from, or they do not intend to stay permanently, or they are ambivalently present. Their unexpected presence confronts settler colonial studies scholars who argue that settler colonialism is premised upon an intentional, permanent, and entitled occupation of the land through the destruction and erasure of Indigenous peoples (Ingram, 2001; Mackey, 2014; Veracini, 2014). It would seem that those who are forcibly dispersed from their homeland due to natural or human disasters or brought in as cheap labour on a temporary basis, or who

domination, whilst using Western-based cultural and research-based practices as an act of methodological subversion. Finally, Wong identifies Chinese nationals as Indigenous in contrast to the West, modifying an East-West divide that is premised upon a nation-based sense of Indigeneity. Wong (2002), Chilisa and Tsheko (2014), and Kaomea’s (2016) diverse interpretations of Indigenous ways of being, aligns with the Annex of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations General Assembly, 2007). This declaration recognizes that the situation of Indigenous peoples varies regionally as well as from country to country, and that such national and regional particularities should be taken into consideration, given the diversity of historical and cultural contexts. At the same time, it raises questions about how decolonizing research strategies might define Indigeneity in a way that entrenches a modernist conception of nation-building and the nation-state, rather than contesting it. The three examples also reveal that the categories of “Western” and “Indigenous” shape-shift with regard to changing geopolitical contexts and the politics of inclusion.
continue to adhere to religious and cultural practices from their ancestries, are reimagined as the White settler who has been on the colonized territory for many generations. This transformative homogenization occurs both within settler colonial and Indigenous scholarship. For the former, the non-White presence is a passing consideration that comes as an accidental property or substrate of settler studies (Veracini, 2014). For the latter, the racialized presence is either over-affiliated as an immediate ally or under-imagined and collapsed into whiteness (Alfred, 2005b; Davis, 2010). I am concerned that there is little if any self-determination by those who neither identify as a White settler nor an Indigenous person within the Canadian context. Simultaneously, it gives me pause to consider those who are reluctantly identified with Eurocentric or Indigenous categories, while they themselves do not abide by what has been ascribed to their respective communities and affiliations. One of my overarching worries regarding the collapse of heterogeneous states of being into a homogenized settler identity is that it is at the risk of recreating race-based social hierarchies of power within a Canadianized context. At several conferences, I have witnessed those who have been on the land as a settler for many generations declaring their status as such and then directing newcomers on how to be better citizens in relation to Indigenous people. The actions and lack of experience of these newcomers are problematized as ignorant, especially if they do not fit into a script of enacting responsible citizenship. This trend troubles me deeply because, on the one hand, it might be duly instructive to learn from the lives of well-established others to, if nothing else, avoid previous mistakes in building respectful Indigenous-non-Indigenous relationships; on the other hand, it restricts the understanding of one’s life into re-establishing a nation-based approach to social inclusion. There seems to be a curious incuriosity to the wisdoms of those who are not from these parts of the world, who nonetheless carry stories, histories, memories, practices, languages, beliefs, philosophies, cosmologies that might dwell beyond the confines of geo-political permanence, and whose knowledges would provide insights into the perennial tensions and debates that shape and divide what it means to live on traditional Indigenous territories. And the land itself continues to shift. Not all settlers are white; not all racialized are permanently unsettled; not all Indigenous are territoried.

1.1 Welcome to Canada?

In Welcome to Canada: What You Should Know published by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) (2013), the sourcebook available to the newly arrived, discussion of Aboriginal presence, communities, and cultures is collapsed into a one-
paragraph précis about the founding peoples of Canada on a page which also identifies French Canadians, Quebecers, and most English-Canadians amongst the original members of the nation-state (CIC, p. 21). This paragraph is the only time that Indigenous peoples are mentioned in a 148-page document, that is meant to legally and socially acclimatize newcomers into a Canadian context. Here is the paragraph in full:

“Aboriginal peoples” are people whose ancestors lived in Canada before the arrival of European explorers, pioneers and settlers. The term refers to three distinct groups: First Nations (sometimes called “Indians”), Inuit and Métis. Aboriginal peoples live across Canada in their own communities as well as in cities. They have interesting cultures and make important contributions to Canadian society. 

(CIC, 2013, p. 21)

There are many reasons why this inadequate lip service to Indigenous presence in Canada is so troubling. First, it glosses over the thousands of years of Indigenous presence across very different lands prior to European settlement in present-day Canada. Second, it presents en masse Aboriginal peoples as a singular, collective and collaborative founding member of Canada. Third, it suggests that all peoples of Aboriginal descent are willingly living within and contributing to the Canadian nation-state. Together, these can lead newcomers to have a grossly ill-informed expectation of who and how they will encounter when meeting Indigenous people for the first and consequent times. Moreover, with so little written about Indigenous lives, this information bite is easily forgotten or overlooked in the surfeit of advice and resources presented to the newcomer in the rest of the 147.8 pages. There is a high possibility that the lives of Indigenous people do not even enter into the imaginary of those who have just entered Canada and attempting to build lives on these new/old lands. However, the Welcome to Canada (2013) sourcebook is only one of many publications that CIC has released over the years to prepare newcomers to live in the nation-state.

In Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship by CIC (2012), the official study guide for those applying for citizenship, the representation and presentation of Indigenous lives is marginally increased. In the introductory section, “Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship,” Aboriginal peoples’ rights are presented as having treaty rights that are not to be adversely affected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (p. 8). However, negligible information is provided in the section, “How Canadians Govern Themselves.” Two sentences are used to summarize First
Nations’ structures of governance on reserves, which follow from six pages of Canadian governance at federal, provincial, and local levels (CIC, 2012, pp. 28-33). No mention is made of the controversial Indian Act throughout the study guide. In the “History of Canada” section, the Huron-Wendat, Cree, and Dene are specifically named; however, this information is followed up by the statement, “warfare was common among Aboriginal groups as they competed for land, resources and prestige” (CIC, 2012, p. 14). Although Europeans were cited as bringing diseases, there was no acknowledgment of the conflicts and ultimate colonization that arose because of their presence on Indigenous territories (CIC, 2012, p. 14). Finally, in the section, “Modern Canada,” only two Indigenous artists, Mohawk performer, Pauline Johnson (Tekahionwake), and Inuit printmaker and carver, Kenojuak Ashevak, are mentioned. No Indigenous contributors are named in the section, “Great Canadian Discoveries” (CIC, 2012, p. 27).

Since its introduction in 2011, itself an overhaul of the previous citizenship preparation guide, A Look At Canada (CIC, 2005), the Discover Canada (CIC, 2012) study guide has been met with a wide range of critical feedback. Whereas more conservative political historians have commended the guide for reinstating a sense of political cohesion and establishing a set of core Canadian values (Blake, 2013), other scholars have criticized it harshly for those very reasons (Jones & Perry, 2011; Tonon & Raney, 2013). One of the most notable critical responses to Discover Canada (CIC, 2012) has come from historians, Esyllt Jones and Adele Perry, who edited the People’s Citizenship Guide: A Response to Conservative Canada (2011). In the monograph, they argue that the People’s Guide provides a “more honest account of Canada” while recognizing that it is not the only correct version (Jones & Perry, 2011, p. 5). Taking a strong settler-colonial stance, the People’s Guide downplays pointed race-based discrimination against specific communities in the history of Canada, and instead collectivizes, for the most part, the category of settler in relation to Indigenous people. I take issue with the limitations in the use of the term “settler” in reference to Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations. I wish to expand the conversation to be more inclusive of those persons who might not even be aware that they fall under this socio-political category. Although the People’s Citizenship Guide has been lauded for providing an alternative view for newcomers as they prepare to settle in Canada, the question remains: what kinds of opportunities can be created for Indigenous people and newcomers to meet?

Among the 94 recommendations made by the Truth and Reconciliation
Commission of Canada (2015a), the penultimate call, number 93, addresses newcomers:

We call upon the federal government, in collaboration with the national Aboriginal organizations, to revise the information kit for newcomers to Canada and its citizenship test to reflect a more inclusive history of the diverse Aboriginal peoples of Canada, including information about the Treaties and the history of residential schools.

(pp. 10-11)

Both the federal government and grassroots organizations have been responding to this call. As of 2016, the liberal government under Justin Trudeau has been in a state of overhauling the Discover Canada (CIC, 2012) guide, which was penned by the conservative government during Stephen Harper’s tenure as Prime Minister. In the newly drafted version, discussion of the War of 1812 has been drastically reduced. Furthermore, statements such as the “barbaric practices such as genital mutilation” as well as the denunciation of honour killings have been removed from the section on gender rights (Levitz, 2017). It is not clear when the new citizenship study guide will be formally released to replace the current one.

Many community-based organizations run by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people are also responding to this call. For example, the grassroots organization, Circles for Reconciliation, based in Winnipeg, Manitoba, has been established in response to all of the TRCC calls to action. The purpose of the organization is to create opportunities for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to come together in talking circles on a regular basis, with the aim of facilitating 100 circles over a two-year period (Circles for Reconciliation, n.d.). In January 2017, a group gathered to discuss the theme, “New Canadians and Indigenous People” (Circles for Reconciliation, 2017).

Building upon previous research by political geographers, John Gyepi-Garbrah and Ryan Walker, and political scientist, Joseph Garcea (2014), the purpose of the meeting

---

6 Some examples of grassroots organizations include: (1) Reconciliation Canada, founded by Chief Robert Joseph, is focused on revitalizing relations between Indigenous peoples and all Canadians (reconciliationcanada.ca); (2) Canadian Roots Exchange is a youth organization that attempts to bridge the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people (canadianroots.ca); (3) Programming at The Native Canadian Centre of Canada includes Indigenous Cultural awareness training inclusive to Indigenous and non-Indigenous attendees (http://ncct.on.ca/programs/); (4) The mission of the Canadians for a New Partnership organization is to create and support “a broad based inclusive leadership initiative” to build new partnerships between “First peoples and other Canadians” (http://www.cfnp.ca).
was to continue to reflect on commonalities such as traditions and rituals, experiences and histories of colonization, and familial and community practices that resonated between Indigenous people and newcomers. Furthermore, they wished to extend conversations regarding the shared obstacles and struggles that might impact the way in which Indigenous and non-Indigenous people interact with each other (Circles for Reconciliation, 2017). One of the questions posed was:

What is the balance between promoting multiculturalism and nationalism (e.g., pride in being Canadian) with the parallel acknowledgement of the oppression of First Nations, the diminishing of their unique and special status under rubric of “multiculturalism.”?

(Circles for Reconciliation, 2017)

A number of unspoken assumptions ground the above discussions as to how to go about building better relationships between Indigenous people and newcomers. First, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous are encompassed within a Canadian nation-state framework. This assumption could mean that in attempting to respond to the question raised by Circles for Reconciliation, participants are politically constrained from asking more fundamental questions about how such gatherings might reinstate nation-building and a nationalism, which is premised upon multicultural goodness. As political scientists, Laura Tonon and Tracey Raney (2013) argue, Discover Canada (CIC, 2012) replaces the previous citizenship study guide, A Look at Canada (CIC, 2005), which emphasized multiculturalism and pluralism, with a renationalism established through militarism and neo-liberal conservatism. I can’t help but wonder though if in lauding multiculturalism as a morally and socially superior cultural value, it might surprisingly ignite a sense of birthplace + new country double nationalism, to work against one’s capacity to witness empathetically Indigenous calls for sovereignty and nationhood, which challenge the persistence of Canada as the all-encompassing nation-state.

Second, along the same lines, newcomers are treated in a unidirectional sense of migrational certainty. It is assumed that they are future or newly minted, enthusiastic citizens of Canada, erstwhile, even the most cursory glances reveal the large number of those who are left uncounted, who are passing through temporarily, the individuals who never imagined they would be living on such lands, and those who die in Canada all the while expecting that they would return home. Included in this count could be the families and individuals who have lived in Canada for years and might either hold permanent residency status or full immigrant status. It could also account for the people who despite
being born into automatic citizenship in Canada live in a state of permanent displacement due to race, class, gender, sexuality, religious, and beliefs-based discrimination in Canada or elsewhere. Beyond the privacy of one’s home or between intimate relations, what spaces are available for those passing through to question their allegiance to their old and new countries of residence? Where can they speak critically about the limitations of nationalism in a way that opens up conversations with different Indigenous individuals and communities about respectful ways of belonging?

Many scholars have argued that multiculturalism within a bilingual national framework serves as an assimilationist tool to create a sense of national unity (Cui, 2011; Haque, 2014; Li, 1998). Sociolinguist Eve Haque (2014) argues that Pierre Elliot Trudeau’s declaration of Canada as “multicultural within a bilingual framework” effectively homogenized all other groups - Indigenous and non-Indigenous – as “merely cultural” while elevating English and French as equal founding members of Canada. But maybe multiculturalism can be repurposed, excised from its role of feeding into a nationalizing and nationalistic discourse. Rather than being presented as a whole package, that is, the imagined amalgam of languages, food, beliefs, religions, historical collective narratives that are all magically supposed to fit together, the fragmentation of multiculturalism might provide several multidirectional and multi-relational opportunities to establish a caring regard for one another, inclusive of unexpected others. A call for the fragmentation of multiculturalism is not meant to be a return to critical debates about the politics of recognition, along the lines of Glen Coulthard (2007, 2014) and Charles Taylor (1997), which will be discussed in Chapter Three. Instead, I wish to investigate how certain aspects that potentially contribute to senses of becoming morally and politically good citizens, can instead be used to refashion relationships that bypass and ultimately decentralize the role of the Anglo-Franco nation-state in building interconnections between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people across Turtle Island. In other words, the practice and the surprises that arise from living multiculturally can become the means through which multiculturalism as a political-ethical imperative for nation-building comes under critical scrutiny.

I had the opportunity to listen to an in-depth presentation by Māori scholar and activist, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, who spoke about Māori activism, the Treaty of Waitangi,\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{7}\textit{Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi} is a bilingual Māori/English treaty. First signed in 1840, it was meant to establish respectful political relations between the Māori people and the British Crown. Great controversy has arisen with regard to what agreements were forged,
and political life on the marae. Smith was invited along with her husband, Graham Smith, to be keynote speakers at the University of British Columbia-Okanagan Indigenous Summer Art Intensive in July 2017. During her presentation, *The Intellectual Project of Decolonizing and Indigenous Methodologies*, and following up on providing key life-learning moments in her expansive work in activism, academia, and community outreach, Smith frequently discussed inadvertently coming across the “soft human aspects” that cause humans to retaliate, react, respond (L. T. Smith, personal communication, July 2017). Smith recalled that in her years as a young activist in the 1970s, where she and others called upon the New Zealand government and all Pakeha (White settlers) to honour the Treaty of Waitangi, she would “hit them in the vulnerable spot,” the soft parts that the opposition did not know existed. She also emphasized the unquestionably unromantic and often very messy work of activism and decolonization, arguing that in the throes of activist intention, the goals of that which was being fought for and the imagined better future were often unclear.

While Smith (2012) reflects back upon the passion and limitations of being a youthful activist in Aotearoa, her words about identifying the “soft human aspects” make a strong impression. In the early years of street activism, the “soft human aspects” were the emotional pressure points that she realized could shift the power relations between activists and the Pakeha police force. She states that the contents of Māori demands and rights could not change people’s minds. Rather, it was by touching upon their vulnerabilities as fellow humans and causing them to lose control, that would lead to reconfiguring their political engagement. Whereas the “soft human aspects” initially were used as a means through which emotional unsettlement could be exacted, by shifting


8The marae is a spiritual and social gathering place for the Māori. For more information on Smith’s education and activism history, her 2002 interview with Marie Battiste, Lynne Bell, and Len Finlay is particularly elucidative.

9Smith’s and the other keynote presenters’ talks will be published and made available to the public. The other keynote presenters were: France Trepanier and Chris Creighton-Kelly, Monika Kin Gagnon, Graham Smith, Jeannette Armstrong, Shawn Wilson.
from a period of intense activism into becoming a community-based health, cultural, and language educator across Māori communities, Smith demonstrates how the soft human aspects could be transformed from being that which can be used to cause harm into a possible locus of intimate interconnections. I wish to suggest that somehow one’s mother tongue or the language that comforts might provide a way to create one of several soft human spots that enable Indigenous and non-Indigenous to meet whilst bypassing Canadian nation-state building.

1.2 With respect to mother tongues

Statistics Canada (2013, p. 18) defines mother tongue as “the first language a person learned at home in childhood and still understood at the time of the survey.” According to the 2011 National Household Survey (NHS), in Canada, more than 200 languages were identified as mother tongue in addition to French and English. The NHS study also reveals that of the immigration population reporting a single mother tongue, 72.8% named a language other than French or English (p. 18). Importantly, of the approximately 6.8 million immigrants in Canada, less than 0.1% of the total immigrant population and almost 0.0% of all recent immigrants indicated knowledge of Aboriginal languages (Statistics Canada, 2013, p. 20).

In the same 2011 survey, of the 200 languages identified as mother tongue, approximately 60 are Aboriginal languages (Statistics Canada, 2014, p. 6). One out of six Aboriginal people or 240,815 can speak conversationally in an Aboriginal language (Statistics Canada, 2014, p. 6). It is important to point out this number includes but is not limited to those who reported an Aboriginal language as their mother tongue (202,495 people) (Statistics Canada, 2014, p. 6). This statistic means that although in some instances the spoken language was not the first one learned at home, it has been

10 In the 2011 NHS study (Statistics Canada, 2013), "knowledge of Aboriginal languages" was not clearly defined. At the time of publication, Aboriginal languages were considered non-official languages in the study.

11 In the 2011 Census survey (Statistics Canada, 2014), 31 Indian reserves and settlements were not included, either because enumeration was not permitted or interrupted because of natural events (e.g. forest fires in N. Ontario). This might mean that counts for certain Aboriginal languages are underestimated in the 2011 survey. Please see footnote 4 in Statistics Canada (2014), Aboriginal Languages and Selected Vitality Indicators. UNESCO has identified 88 Aboriginal languages, all of which are considered in danger of extinction, ranging from vulnerable to critically endangered. Please see the UNESCO site, Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger (Moseley, 2010), available at http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/index.php?hl=en&page=atlasmap
acquired as a second language. The acquisition of an Aboriginal language as a second language is crucial at a time when many of the identified languages are increasingly under threat of extinction (Settee, 2008; Moseley, 2010). In the 1981 Census of Canada, 28.1% of Indigenous people (140 570 people) reported an Aboriginal mother tongue (Jarvis & Heaton, 1989). By the 2011 survey, the percentage of people reporting an Aboriginal language as a mother tongue had reduced to 17.2%, however, in terms of absolute numbers, those who could speak in their mother tongue Aboriginal language have increased to 202 495 people, in part due to the high rate of growth in the Indigenous population (Statistics Canada, 2014, p. 6).

For decades Indigenous communities, scholars, and language activists have been calling upon the federal government of Canada to protect and revitalize Indigenous languages (Galley, Gessner, Herbert, Thompson & Williams, 2016; Haque, 2014; Settee, 2008; Task Force on Aboriginal Languages & Culture, 2005). The Task Force on Aboriginal Languages and Culture (2005) has pushed to designate all Aboriginal languages as having official language status, and to ensure proper financial and political support from the federal government to sustain and revitalize Aboriginal languages in Canada (p. 10). At this point in time, there is no national statutory legislation or federal policy to recognize Indigenous languages in Canada (Galley et al., 2016). However, recently, demands to actively protect the multitudinous Indigenous languages spoken across Canada are being increasingly heard at the federal and provincial levels of governance, especially following up on the recommendations made in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015a) calls to action. Action points 13 to 17 specifically address the protection of Indigenous languages and culture. Actions 14 and 15 state:

14. We call upon the federal government to enact an Aboriginal Languages Act that incorporates the following principles:

i. Aboriginal languages are a fundamental and valued element of

The push for Aboriginal language revitalization has gained increasing traction in Canada, in keeping with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which was adopted by the General Assembly on September 13, 2007. Within the declaration, Article 13.1 states, “Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons.” Article 14 goes on to demand Indigenous peoples’ rights to establish and have control over their educational systems, and to teach in their own languages. For a full transcript of the Declaration, please see: United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP): resolution/adopted by the General Assembly, 2 October 2007, A/RES/61/295, available at: http://www.refworld.org/docid/471355a82.html
Canadian culture and society, and there is an urgency to preserve them.

ii. Aboriginal language rights are reinforced by the Treaties.

iii. The federal government has a responsibility to provide sufficient funds for Aboriginal-language revitalization and preservation.

iv. The preservation, revitalization, and strengthening of Aboriginal languages and cultures are best managed by Aboriginal people and communities.

v. Funding for Aboriginal language initiatives must reflect the diversity of Aboriginal languages.

15. We call upon the federal government to appoint, in consultation with Aboriginal groups, an Aboriginal Languages Commissioner. The commissioner should help promote Aboriginal languages and report on the adequacy of federal funding of Aboriginal-languages initiatives.

(TRCC, 2015a, p. 2)

On December 6, 2016, at the annual winter gathering of Assembly of First Nations, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced a federal commitment to protect, preserve and revitalize Indigenous languages (APTN News, 2016; Everett-Green, 2016). In his speech, he identified the programming of Indian Residential Schools and other governmental decisions as having been used as tools to eliminate Indigenous languages and culture deliberately (APTN News, 2016).

It might initially appear as though a call to nationalize Indigenous languages would work against the overall objective to create opportunities for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to meet and acknowledge one another in the everyday. The

---

13 As a national Indigenous organization, the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) has come under much political criticism for sustaining ongoing colonial relations with the Canadian nation-state. For introductory information on the history of the AFN and these unfolding debates, please see: Jeff Cortassel & Richard C. Witmer (2008), Forced Federalism; Glen Coulthard (2011), Red Skin, White Masks; Arthur Manuel & Ronald C. Derrickson (2015), Unsettling Canada: A National Wake Up Call; Pamela Palmater (2011), Beyond Blood; Julie Tomiak (2016), "Navigating the contradictions of the shadow state: The Assembly of First Nations, state funding, and scales of Indigenous resistance"; Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs (2012), Recovery and Renewal. The AFN also has embarked on self-critical assessment regarding its struggles for sovereignty in the midst of functioning within Canadian federal economic structures. Please see: AFN (2005), A Treaty Among Ourselves.

14 At this point, I wish to be clear that the term ‘everyday’ as it is used in the thesis is to be
inadvertent separation of these groups might seem further supported by the suggestion that aspects of multiculturalism could be used to critique and reject national senses of belonging. Whereas the former is a demand to become a more fundamental aspect of the Canadian nation-state, the latter is a critical decision or an unplanned happenstance to function outside of those parameters. I wish to argue that this inside-outside binary creates a false political division. Rather, the two relative positions together generate an abundance of opportunities for new conversations to arise. By ensuring that Indigenous languages are formally protected and supported at the federal level, more potential openings, the “soft human spots”, emerge for people to come together, speaking mother tongue to mother tongue, or using the languages of comfort, rather than relying upon the discomforts of dwelling in the linguistic imaginaries of English or French. 200+ languages are spoken, remembered, considered, in practice and memory, across lands that are collectively and currently called Canada. Given that there are 140+ mother tongues in immigrant communities and that there are currently over 60 Indigenous languages, it is almost mindboggling to imagine the multiplicities of interactions. 15

Support for the nationalization of all Indigenous languages expresses support for people like お婆ちゃん, お父さん, and お母さん. Exemplary proficiency of one national language, English or French, may create a linguistic measure of political inclusion or exclusion. It implies the correlation between the mastery of language and socio-political and economic navigability and acceptance. If one can use the right words at the right
distinguished from European and Anglo-American traditions. The contributions of these scholars regarding the conceptualization of the everyday cannot be underestimated. However, their attempts to theorize such an ambiguous term tend toward homogenizing large groups of people and temporalities of human activity, which overlook the enfoldments of uniqueness due to culture, language, gender, etc., especially with lives that exist outside of the European and Anglo-American philosophical imagination. I do not mean to be dismissive of their investigations; rather, through this current research, I wish to open up the discussion to include voices, languages, and ways of being that dwell in excess of the theoretical and historical parameters of their investigations. For background to European and Anglo-American theorizing of the everyday, please see: John Roberts (2006), *Philosophizing the Everyday: Revolutionary Praxis and the Fate of Cultural Theory*; Ben Highmore (2002), *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory*; Michel de Certeau (1988), *The Practice of Everyday Life*; Michael Sheringham (2006), *Everyday Life: Theories and Practices from Surrealism to the Present*; Erving Goffman (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*; and Henri Lefebvre (1947/1991), *The Critique of Everyday Life*.

15Sociologist, Brian Harrison and demographer, Mary Jane Norris (2012) discuss the challenges faced by Aboriginal and immigrant mother tongue speakers in Canada with regard to retention, critical mass, and, community and familial immersion. For a full discussion, please see their article, “Influences on Aboriginal and immigrant language groups in Canada” (Harrison & Norris, 2012).
time in the right order with the right accent, arguably, it creates a certain ease in moving well in relation to others. Thus, the pressure is on for non-English, non-French speakers to learn to communicate enough to be treated with linguistic and social respect. Furthermore, the process of learning one of the two national languages includes the unwritten rule to not speak in one’s mother tongue in public places.  

I have been accompanying お母さん to doctors’ and health appointments as she deals with age-related health conditions. During several visits, I have been surprised by the complexity of the questionnaires that are handed out to her. Living in a smaller city like Kelowna, Japanese language translators are not readily available, nor are any of the forms written in Japanese script. Without my assistance, お母さん would be unable to fill out the forms, nor would she understand the bulk of the questions and medical explanations communicated to her in English. In these situations, even when I am in the room, お母さん’s wellbeing is in part connected to the medical professional and staff’s linguistic patience.  

---

16Education scholar, Dan Cui (2011) discusses the systemic and institutional racism that affect Chinese immigrants’ senses of cultural belonging in Canada. Upon conducting a series of interviews with Chinese-Canadian youth in Alberta (ages 15-25), Cui infers that multiculturalism is more of a symbolic recognition of different cultures, while expectations to speak well in English create cultural divisiveness between Chinese-Canadian youth and their non-English-speaking parents. He suggests that in the attempts to react to different forms of racism experienced outside of one’s household as well as attempts to follow tacit linguistic expectations to fit into society, many Chinese-Canadian youth ultimately struggle to maintain their ethnic languages and cultures. And in a research study regarding information learning and teaching strategies of immigrant parents, education scholar, Yan Guo (2011) reports that the children’s schools mostly overlook the first languages of immigrants. Guo’s findings reveal that immigrant parental involvement in their children’s formal education often come into conflict with the teacher’s and school’s expectations, because of the school’s lack of consideration for language and cultural distinctions in learning. He suggests that educators take into consideration the significance of informal learning in how parents support their children, such as the passing of cultural and linguistic values and the transmission of first language knowledge. Citing a kindergarten teacher’s invitation to parents from 11 different languages to participate in a family reading program, Guo contends that the validation of first languages of immigrant families creates all students’ increased appreciation of their classmates’ multilingual abilities. In the acknowledgment (and further, the incorporation) of multiple languages, it could be argued that the culture of learning in an educational institution will be methodologically and socially affected.  

17Several health studies have shown that language proficiency in one of the national languages is directly related to emotional and physical wellbeing in immigrants. It has been found that the longer immigrants stay in Canada, their health is detrimentally affected, with a direct link to perceived language-based discrimination. According to statistical analysis conducted by health analyst, Edward Ng, clinician scientist, Kevin Pottie, and anthropologist, Denise Spitzer (2011), immigrants with consistently limited national language proficiency would report poor health, nearly three times the odds of immigrants whose language capacities were reported as good. For more a more detailed discussion, please see Ng, Pottie, and Spitzer’s (2011) health report, ‘Official
Because the above situation is so commonplace in お母さん and my encounters with health care in Canada, I cannot help but consider how English or French might create a sense of hegemonic social control over the movements of such diverse cultures and lives in Canada. Among the many unspoken expectations is the concern that linguistic big brother is watching, policing one’s mother tongue usage versus being the good citizen doing their communicative best to fit into Canadian society. Linguistic big brother is a shape-shifter; reprimands for mother-tongue language use leap from the voices of professionals to the random passersby. These demands for linguistic assimilation could be based in part on several fears: of exclusion, the unknowable, and the uncontrollable.

I wish to think of possible ways to reach out linguistically to new immigrants and those temporarily present in Canada, so they might contribute to and enrich social engagements between Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships, due to lessons I have learned in my upbringing. Growing up in a multilingual context at the mushroom farm, spending hours at a time in a picking room, where Cantonese, Vietnamese, Korean, and other Asian languages were spoken in plain sound, has been a very illuminating experience. I could not verbally understand any of these languages, yet I could tell when something private was being discussed by the suddenness of hushed tones. They could have been talking about what a crappy businessman お父さん was (because he was) or their concerns that the farm would fold (because it came so close many times). Or they could have been complaining about what shitty slow pickers my sisters and I were (because we were), and how they would have to help finish our beds so that we could collectively move onto the next room. They could have been talking about their lives prior to coming to Canada, or about wanting to leave such a rural area.

language proficiency and self-reported health among immigrants toCanada”. In a separate quantitative analysis on immigrants in Canada self-reporting their health statuses, sociologists Reza Nakhaie and Rochelle Wijesingha (2015) discuss how language-based discrimination negatively affects immigrant health. They suggest that discrimination may be switching from focus on racial makers such as differential skin colour to other non-ethno-racial markers such as speaking a national language like English with an accent, or from speaking a foreign language in public places. For further reading on this subject, please see Hyung Chol Yoo, Gilbert C. Gee, & David Takeuchi’s article (2009), “Discrimination and health among Asian-American immigrants: Disentangling racial from language discrimination.”

I use the phrase, “in plain sound” in allusion to the expression “in plain sight”. The languages spoken at the mushroom farm were clearly audible, and used as a matter of course, with no fears of repercussions.
Equally likely, they were talking about none of the above. After listening for hours and hours and hours, and never learning any of the languages, I thought, “what the hell?” it wasn’t actually any of my goddamn business what they were talking about. In concluding that it was most likely not my concern, I was freed up to think about other things, figuring that when it was my concern, they would talk to me. It is epistemically humbling to realize that you cannot demand to know everything in your aural proximity.

A certain social comfort is established in the absence of monolinguistic surveillance in shared spaces. While I have neither the space nor sufficient knowledge to delve too deeply into grander debates regarding private versus public spaces, I wish to point out that the categorical distinction of the two fails to capture the blurring of those lines socially and politically, as well as the experience of their concurrency. Is a workplace a public space in its entirety or are there relational instances and locations where privacy is protected? Do the conversants determine the parameters of that which constitutes the private versus public realm in unspoken agreements established in the course of their conversations? In a mushroom picking room, workers can sometimes spend hours facing one another. Through the practice of working alongside for years, as well as silently and mutually deciding upon the “middle of the mushroom bed,” the pickers make decisions with regard to the extent of their harvesting reach. From listening into the sounds of the conversations that have arisen in between, I have imagined that very intimate histories, ideas, beliefs, and disagreements have been exchanged across the shared picking space. In the midst of all of this, it would have seemed strange and controlling for お父さん to have stomped in to disrupt the work and conversational flow to insist that they speak in English, a language that he too struggled to grasp. As it was, people communicated in their mother tongue languages for the most part, without the fear of regulation or having to translate. The experience of linguistic social comfort is multidirectional. The familiar sounds of languages left untranslated mean that one can be left alone, unmonitored, and trusted to do the work that needs to be done. It means that when speaking in my mother tongue, Japanese, the other workers will not expect me to explain myself. And it highlights the relational agreements that are in place to ground a conversation: one needs to invite or to be invited to speak and to listen with meaningful linguistic regard.

When so many languages are spoken, relationships between people and attendant underlying assumptions change. It cannot be assumed that one person, say, the boss, will understand or dictate all the different movements and decisions of the
employees. Further, the hermeneutical limits of each language, in so far as it comes into relational translation with another language, begin to reveal themselves. For instance, the head picker tried teaching me basics in Vietnamese. She taught me that counting and rounding took place in multiples of five rather than ten. And she said that past and future tenses were not based on verb conjugations like English but signified by temporal framing in stating “in the past” or “in the future.” A lot of teasing and laughter arose in many pedestrian attempts to learn each other’s languages, where misunderstanding was not seen as one’s personal failing to master the unifying language, English, but as something that may have arisen from the multiple translations required to reach an understanding.

Scant explanations and language lessons evoke the imagination to reconsider the assumptions made in one’s own mother tongue and how languages shape experience, including thought (Deutscher, 2010). How does the world shift if I were to count in multiples of five rather than ten? What happens if verbs are not time-based conjugations? These linguistic questions continue to crop up and inspire one to consider other worlds that exist concurrently and intermingle. In the here and now, in the has been and will be again, in the 60+ Indigenous languages that exist across these lands, perhaps at least 60+ different ways to translate time and space emerge. The multiple possibilities show that English or French do not have the final say but serve as two of many languages that can be called upon to offer an explanation. And with the presence of the other 140+ languages non-Indigenous to Turtle Island, thousands of translations and conversations can bypass the two official languages in Canada in consideration of space, time, and movement.

I have been told many times that you truly understand a language when you can joke or dream in it. You understand the puns, wordplay, tonalities that change the meanings and intentions of the words, not just in relation to each other but also to the contexts in which they are being articulated. I would go even so far as to say that one of the unspoken challenges of living in a community, which speaks a language different from one’s own, is that the bare minimum levels of communication render the second-language speaker serious-faced, seemingly uninterested, and unable to engage further. And those around who take for granted the flexibility of their language usage begin to suspect the moral goodness of the person unable to laugh with abandon. Humor allows you to take the piss out of the language itself, recognizing that sometimes words reach their own semantic limits and are ill-equipped to describe your experiences in full. At the
same time, there is a type of joyful levity that arises when two people encounter one another, and speaking in different tongues, fumble their way to appreciate what is being articulated.

When a language shows up in one’s dreams, it is said to have seeped beyond rational thought, burrowing into the secret passageways that help you to feel what you feel, say what you say, a place of wishing, pasts and futures. The language goes to a place beyond words, only to return to whisper into and outward from the auditory canals of the dreamer. And sometimes it may be the voice that awakens you from the most active state of slumber.

Mother tongue could be considered one of the vulnerable spots or sensitive points that Linda Tuhiwai Smith first discovered during her street activist days. Mother tongue simultaneously might have the potential to prompt one’s greatest powers and deepest anxieties. For me, Japanese is the language of comfort. It is the interior voice, which speaks kindly and quietly, words of encouragement in the first moments of wakefulness and the last moments before sleep. It is literally お母さんとお婆ちゃんの声が巻き込んでいます. Recently, it has come to include 曾祖母 and お父さん’s voices, competing to come to the fore in the bright of day and activity. Yet, mother tongue can lead to profound experiences of loss and unease (Kokalliari, Catanzarite, & Berzoff, 2013). Sometimes, when the language is concealed within the furthest reaches of the mind, one can no longer retrieve it to speak the words at will. The tongue moves clumsily and counter to one’s wishes to convey an idea, emotion, or everyday act. My own use of Japanese is fluid; there are times that the words just roll out with the greatest of ease, and other moments when I am unable to say even the simplest expressions, and it is like I actually experience the words evaporating in front of my mind’s eye. In considering linguistic flow, it could be that there is a perfect tone, tempo, and frequency at which the language is best spoken, thought, written, and heard. There might be a fine balance at which different languages stream well together. They can borrow from one another, loan words, pronunciations, and through such exchanges, the languages themselves continually shift, transform, and expand in excess of themselves. But what of those other cases, such as in Canada, when one language is enforced, intended to be a complete replacement? English or French may create blockages and obstacles in the flow of mother tongues or the preferred languages used by the speaker and subsequent generations, so that they would seem to have all but vanished. But in contemplating language as a liquid form, it might be insightful to speculate how it flows throughout the
rest of the body.

I have met many Japanese-Canadians who tell me that they do not speak the language, were never taught, or have all but forgotten. However, when I witness how their bodies move, physically, socially, and emotionally, or the artworks they create, I would have to beg to differ (Cabri, 2013; Ibuki, 2016; Miki, 2011). For if the mouth is unable to shape the words into a vocalization, the language finds another route for expression. Nisei (second-generation Japanese-Canadians) and sansei (third-generation) facial and full-bodied gestures articulate what the mouth cannot. Two, three, four generations away from speaking Japanese as a mother tongue, the body defies linguistic erasure through ancestral movements. And similar to written and spoken vocabulary, there are many body movements that serendipitously transcend to resonate familially, transculturally, and transnationally. These social resemblances could be signifying something shared cosmologically and politically in faraway pasts and futures. Or maybe it is the movements of others in the present that lead to socio-visceral translations.

It could be that whole-bodied gestures can transform and communicate meaning where verbalized words alone have failed. There have been many occasions that I have been mistaken as Chinese, Filipina, Thai, Vietnamese, or one of the many Asian cultures. In the past, it used to aggravate me to no end trying to convince doubters that I was ethnically Japanese. But only after the twentieth time that a Chinese grandmother frowned and insisted that I was actually Chinese did I begin to wonder if my body had learned to respond to certain voices, the musicality of untranslated languages, and kinetic cadences, expressing a type of embodied attentiveness as a result of all of those years at the mushroom farm, waiting to abide by directions coming from others. And if this were the case, then perhaps the grandmothers were not necessarily trying to engage me in an intense philosophical debate regarding cultural and racial identity. Rather, they were calling me over for another reason. When I let go of the need to “correct” their misconception, I often learned that they had been trying to catch my attention because they could not find a bathroom, or they needed assistance reaching an item off of a tall shelf in a supermarket, or they were lost in a new city. These interactions made me reflect somewhat shamefully upon all of those times that I must have missed treating a person well because I was so single-minded about being acknowledged through a particular politico-cultural category. But is not the world much greater than how we intend to be seen in it?
1.3 The spaces in between languages

One of the objectives of this thesis is to affiliate post-colonial and Indigenous thinking through resonant ways of being. I wish to demonstrate the building of interrelations that dwell within acknowledgments of one’s history, values, and life experiences. The bridging of post-colonial and Indigenous ideas is itself brought about from outside both areas, where I rely upon Japanese philosopher, Watsuji Tetsurō’s (1937/1996) concept of 間柄 (aidagara) or “inbetweenness.” In his formative tome, Rinrigaku, Watsuji refers to the 間柄 of human beings, where 人間 (ningen) or human is described as an outcome of the individual in dynamic relation to the social. 人間 is not a permanent, fixed self, but fluid, always shifting and changing with respect to the perceived context (p. 117). Subsequently, 間柄 is an outcome of movements in the relational shifts of being and not being, individual and social (Watsuji, 1937/1996, p. 18).

It is with intellectual and political caution that I apply Watsuji’s ideas on climate and ethics in subsequent chapters. Watsuji has been criticized widely for promoting Japanese nationalism and imperialism in his quest to assert traditional and authentic Japanese thinking (Arisaka, 2014; Nagami, 1981). Indeed, in Watsuji’s (1935/1961) first major monograph, 風土 (fūdo), his climatic analyses of monsoon cultures of Japan and China, and his accounting of the Indian as “pastmasters in this art of resignation” (p. 24) in reference to the temporal unchangeability of humid, hot climates, are given to anachronistic homogenizing of cultures, nations, and people. I cannot help but wonder if Watsuji’s ideation of historical climate became too fixated on space, while he tacitly adhered unproblematically to a whole-bodied notion of the individual. In other words, it is as though Watsuji’s Japanese philosophy emerged in strong contrast to problems in “Western philosophy” while leaving out of his critique (European) modernist assumptions of the individual as well as the totalizing nature of his own project. Embedded in this strong opposition is an intimate knowledge of the “Western” philosophical other.

It might seem perplexing that I should wish to revitalize Watsuji’s works in relation to the contemplation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations across and beyond the Canadian nation-state. I do this for a number of reasons. First, in my attempts to better appreciate Indigenous calls for sovereignty rights and the building of nation-to-nation agreements with the Canadian government, I feel obligated to develop a deeper understanding of how the term “nation” figures into my own senses of Japanese cultural
and political belonging. Over the years, I have become very critical of the nationalistic encasement of that which is deemed Japanese culture. At the same time, I have been coming to the realization of the nationalism and national context in which I myself identify as Japanese. My fear is that were I to deny my own reliance on, and existence within, a nation-based understanding of being of Japanese ancestry and culture, I will overlook or prejudicially determine Indigenous calls for national recognition to be either politically treacherous and/or not my concern. Thus, I look at Japanese socio-political philosophers such as Watsuji Tetsurō and Nishida Kitarō, both of whom have profoundly shaped, for better and worse, Japanese national identity.

Second, a running theme explored within the dissertation is the idea that human actions are not interpreted strictly based upon the actor’s personal intentions. Instead, one’s very sense of identity and wishing to be and do are interwoven with: the desire to belong with a community or group, unexpected feelings of social affiliation, and often, the idealization of one’s own culture. I might be so bold to state that it is impossible to extract the “factual truths” of a culture from everything else that informs its cohesiveness. Although I am ambivalent about Watsuji and Nishida’s philosophical treatises, because of their possible roles in inflaming a sense of cultural and imperial superiority, I am nonetheless drawn to their ideas regarding interrelationships, inbetweeness, human and non-human relations, and embodied knowledge. When I read their works, something within me is genuinely moved, so that I am left wondering if this is a case of cultural wishful thinking. Perhaps I am drawn to these ideas from having been raised by お父さん, お母さん, and お婆ちゃん to value relationships because of what these scholars have written. And perhaps I perceive an ethical reverberation between Japanese and Indigenous articulations of honouring relationships. It could be very well suggested that it is a combination of all of these experiences and much more. From a relational perspective, I cannot help but contemplate that in the careful and critical transplantation of ideas from one socio-political context, Japan, to another, Canada, Watsuji and Nishida’s writings might at times contribute to a more respectful engagement between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

Third, both Watsuji (Watsuji, 1935/1961, 1937/1996) and Nishida (1966, 2012) use binaristic means to outline specifically Japanese thinking in opposition to Western and other world knowledges. The “versus West” advancement of Japanese modernist critical thought and ultimately the uniqueness of Japanese culture is of ongoing concern because it raises the question of how cultures, communities, and nations come to be
delineated, defined, shaped and entrenched. This binaristic methodology resonates with current formulations of Indigenous epistemologies and cosmologies. And I am just as critical of this Japanese-West dualism as I am in Chapter Three where I critically discuss the intertwining of Indigenous versus Western thought. In being mindful of this epistemological strategy, I hope to open up conversations about decentralizing the comparative idealized “West” and refocusing attention upon different ways of interlinking ideas that emerge in unexpected spaces between newly affiliated cultures and worldviews. Such discomforts in thinking through taken-for-granted markers of transnational, cultural, and familial belonging and identity are valuable in evaluating the potential porosities and transience of defining oneself in relation to others, and in expanding the scope of engagement to include those who have been excluded.

Watsuji’s conceptualization of 間柄 (aidagara) or inbetweeness (Watsuji, 1937/1996) resonates with Homi Bhabha’s (1994) notion of the “third space.” In Location of Culture, Bhabha describes this space of the location within which fixed identifications yield to the potential for cultural hybridity that “entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy” (p. 4). Bhabha (1994) writes:

Hybridity is the sign of the productivity of strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the ‘pure’ and original identity of authority). Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects…It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but reimplicates its identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power.

(p. 112)

In the above excerpt, Bhabha unintentionally might be reestablishing the perpetual dyad of the colonizer-colonized relationship, demonstrating how postcolonial unsettlements recentralize the power of the colonizer in their variegated acts of disavowal. Bhabha effectively contains the fluidities of hybridity within the boundaries of the colonial, much like a landlocked lake. Postcolonial historical scholar, Amar Acheraïou (2011) raises the concern that Bhabha, in the height of postcolonial theorizing of the 1990s, overemphasizes the potentials of hybridity to transform colonial relationships, whilst not taking into consideration the biological, historical, and oftentimes racist
underpinnings of the term.\textsuperscript{19} In Acheraïou’s view, Bhabha, as well as other postcolonial scholars, ahistoricizes and idealizes the meaning of hybridity, consequently rendering it impractical in real-life, material contexts (pp. 92-93). Acheraïou argues that Bhabha replaces the totalizing and uncomplicated concept of colonialism with the totalizing force of hybridity in search of the transformative moments that would usurp the colonial structuration of society.

Further to Acheraïou’s (2011) historical and structural critiques of Bhabha, it is important to note that the latter is unclear regarding the extent to which intentionality directs one to produce subversive strategies to challenge colonial inscriptions of self and culture. A subaltern agency is premised upon the constancy of its dislocation, which affords the capacity to act against, to confront, and to amplify colonial power. Subaltern counter-authority is simultaneously empowered and disempowered by its very being, expressing a limited agency that may ironically reconstitute the centrality of colonial valuations of cultural representation. The term “intentionality” is not meant to be conflated with agency, however. Intentionality connotes internal motivation whereas agency speaks toward the capacity to act and to follow through.\textsuperscript{20}

In targeting the limitations of Bhabha’s theorization of hybridity, Acheraïou’s (2011) aim is not to abandon this project altogether. Instead, he attempts to recuperate the stronger conceptual aspects of hybridity through reconsidering its empirical potential, giving due consideration for the remote past and global present (Acheraïou, 2011, p. 107).\textsuperscript{21} As shown in the above quote from Bhabha (1994) himself, hybridity is at times

\textsuperscript{19}Acheraïou’s (2011) reading of Bhabha’s intention to transform colonial dynamics is questionable. Given Bhabha’s articulation of the ambiguities of hybridity, it could be counter-argued that he is at most attempting to make visible colonial strategies to split, deny, and repeat colonial authority over those that have been sidelined and othered. For a deeper consideration of Bhabha’s (1994) conceptualization of hybridity, please see Location of Culture, specifically, “Ch. 3: The Other Question – Stereotype, discrimination and the discourse of colonialism.”

\textsuperscript{20}The term “intentionality” has wide-ranging definitions and intellectual pedigrees, in particular from Continental Philosophy and Cognitive and Perceptual Psychology. In the discussion above, I am trying to decipher the extent to which those who are acting in a culturally hybrid manner do so with political/ethical/cultural motivations and self-awareness of their actions and expected outcomes of hybridity.

\textsuperscript{21}I wish to suggest here that in persisting upon Bhabha’s (1994) ahistorical idealization of hybridity, Acheraïoui (2011) himself has failed to take into consideration the intellectual historical context within which Bhabha was developing his ideas. As evidenced with the surfeit of literary and linguistic examples, Bhabha’s cultural turn demonstrates a period of social and cultural theorizing that valorized pluralities, which emerged from the cult(ure) of deconstructive analysis. In retrospect, Bhabha’s artistic, literary, and cultural references could be perceived as intellectual
intoned with a strong sense of the actor's self-knowledge in relation to the broader political context, defining it as an outcome of a “strategic reversal of the process of domination.” Elsewhere, however, Bhabha describes hybridity as an excess. This excess could be interpreted as actions that surpass actor intention, expectations, and control over the meanings that arise from the act (Bhabha, 1994, p. 70). Bhabha’s discussion of the third space and hybridity as being in excess of representations alludes to surpassing postcolonial expectations themselves. For Bhabha, the ambivalent and agonistic effects of actions borne of the third space reflect the equally heterogeneous and messiness of colonial strategies to divide and conquer designated “Others” (pp. 95-96).

Asking, “Can the subaltern speak?”, post-colonial, Marxist feminist scholar, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1994) presents a less optimistic perspective on the potential for socio-political transformation within the “third space. For her, the subaltern is a woman’s space, a location of culture that has become heavily imbued with politically, psychologically, religiously, and class-based gendered social habits and expectations, with little room for flexibility and transformation.

Within the context of considering cultivating relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, several aspects of Bhabha’s (1994) conceptions of hybridity and the third space and Spivak’s (1994) notion of the subaltern are helpful. As discussed above, Bhabha’s (1994) conceptualizations of ambivalence and excess are meaningful beyond the confines of post-colonial thought and into the realms of lived experiences. As a way of getting started and throughout all of my researches, I draw heavily upon my own familial, social, cultural, and political histories, under the working assumption that the relationships through which those histories have been formed are invaluable for expanding one’s practicable understanding of reconciliation. This serves not as an obscure meditation of a ready-made self in an infinite world; rather, it is performatively
addressed, in keeping with Watsuji’s (1937/1996) notion of 間柄 and in the realm of shadows. The focus on building relationships will lead to a critical investigation of what it means to pass through in relation to specific territories, histories, lands. At times, this present work can be categorized as an auto-ethnography but only so far as it contributes to an Indigenous-led, relationally motivated and guided study.

In the thesis, I rely upon quite a number of Japanese words and concepts presented in the Japanese language. I do this for a number of reasons. First, included within the 94 recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, is a call for the Canadian Government to actively support the revitalization of Indigenous languages (TRCC, 2015a). This call underwrites the efforts of many Indigenous scholars and knowledge keepers who promote their mother tongues languages as articulations of land-specific and culturally derived epistemologies (Armstrong, 2012; Bastien, 2009; Elsey, 2013; Little Bear, 2004, 2012; McLeod, 2016; Morin, 2011; Stimson, 2005). Following their lead, I investigate through my mother tongue, Japanese, the conceptual, relational, and creative reaches that can be made with regard to Cree, Blackfoot, and Tūhltan epistemologies. Second, I assume that the investigation of Japanese to Indigenous linguistically communicated knowledges adheres to a sense of linguistic relativism. Without stating outright, it would seem that many of the Indigenous scholars that are cited in this dissertation adhere to this relationship between language and worldview formation. I too rely upon linguistic relativism as a working assumption to ground my investigations in my attempts to follow linguistically shaped Indigenous scholarship on the articulation of cultural, political, and cosmological knowledge construction and presentation (Armstrong, 2012; Bastien, 2009; Battiste & Henderson, 2000; Edōdsi, 2005; McLeod, 2016). Third, although language might shape one’s experiences of the world, I am also of the view that there exist spaces in between which are not easily contained by verbal and written articulated thought (Krueger, 2008; Krummel, 2015; Nishida, 1966). I speculate that in the inbetweenness of languages, the third spaces of mutable translations, the yet to be cognitively known intermingles creatively, uncontrollably, and oftentimes unintentionally. Such creative mixing may produce new possibilities for speakers of different languages to come together in a new understanding, perhaps in excess of one’s culture, linguistic habits, and historical-political affiliations. In the following chapters, I will explore in more detail the points raised above. In so doing, I hope to show that linguistic diversity within the Canadian nation-state is indicative of the multi-directionality of everyday lives and passages that
take place across widely varying Indigenous territories.

1.4 Knowledge formation in the shadows

I present sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows in my attempts to adhere to the advice of Indigenous scholars to centralize relationality. The substrative nature of shadows is politically methodologically significant in terms of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations in past and current states of being in Canada. Gitxaala Nation anthropologist, Charles Menzies (2013) warns that social science research continues to be done on Indigenous people rather than to be from them or under their direct control and authority (p. 171). In the same vein, Saponi-Tuscarora education scholar, Troy Richardson (2011) warns that the manner in which Indigenous epistemologies are included and incorporated into established research methodologies and teaching syllabi determines whether Indigenous ways of knowing truly can be appreciated or become pedagogically contained. Drawing upon Anishinaabe writer and scholar, Gerald Vizenor’s prose on “shadow survivance,” Richardson articulates Indigenous shadow curricula that can exist in excess of Euro-centric theoretical containments, contesting the parcelling out of Indigenous epistemologies to be fit forcibly into European legacies of knowledge (p. 345). Meanwhile, Mohawk education and ethics scholar, Marlene Brant Castellano (2004; Castellano & Reading, 2010) posits that research with Indigenous communities framed within Aboriginal epistemologies promotes self-determination and wellness. Taking their words to heart, I begin to imagine ways of being present that will neither undercut nor decentralize Indigenous presence and ways of knowing. It would seem that Menzies, Richardson, and Castellano are appealing to researchers and educators to reconsider their personal relationships with the constitution and institutionalization of knowledge. And right in front of me, the land, Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter urge those of us present to pay better and careful attention.

Becoming a shadow presence is an ambivalent state of being. While extensive research has been done in the investigation of visual shadows, I am drawn to imagining shadow existence beyond the visual realm, beyond surface descriptions, and beyond applying modern, “Western” scientific guidelines regarding their accurate representation in art. What happens if the experience of space and time are relationally and subjectively shaped? Do shadows only exist in assuming an objective, visual reality? Indigenous scholars and knowledge keepers suggest an alternative to Euro-Western ways of knowing. Presenting what could be described to be a transnational Indigenous knowledge paradigm, Tewa philosopher, Gregory Cajete (2000) argues that Indigenous
science includes Indigenous consciousness and spirit alongside the practical relationship of the natural world (p. 78). In other words, relationality is integral to coming to know human-land relations. Consequently, Cajete contends that unlike Euro-Western science, which is categorically placed in ontological priority to art, within Indigenous scientific thinking, art and science are considered “two sides of the same coin” (p. 78). Science itself is an art form, just as ritual and ceremony inform human understandings of the land. For Cajete, quantum physicists come closest to appreciating the relational and interdependent nature of human and non-human relations. Cited in Cajete’s articulations of *Native Science*, English theoretical physicist, F. David Peat (2005), is well respected in Indigenous communities for his in-depth investigation of *Blackfoot Physics*. Peat explains that he has been trained in the belief system that the world is objectively measurable. However, in a longstanding collaboration with Blackfoot scholar and knowledge keeper, Leroy Little Bear and other notable Indigenous thinkers, Peat begins to question the limitations of what he deems a Western scientific paradigm. By prioritizing outer over inner vision, Peat speculates that Western science excels at understanding the surface of things, whereas it struggles to move beyond the imaginings of “rational thought,” which is premised upon the visibly measurable (p. 276). In contrast, Peat comes to understand that Indigenous ways of knowing include the heart and whole being, touching the inner essences of existence (p. 276).

As a runner, and oftentimes subconsciously, I have visually benefitted from the scientific laws that govern the formation of shadows, enabling me to anticipate sudden surface frictional shifts on a footpath, obstructions in the road that had not been there the day prior, and animals and plants swooping in from above and below. At the same time, those very shadows have tricked my depth perception. Because of them, I have miscalculated the nearness, farness and sizes of objects on the horizon, and in making these errors, have fallen again and again and again. As I result, I have been known to yell and swear at these deceptive little fuckers, most likely to the alarm of passersby. Beyond their strictly instrumental value to aid in safe physical passages, shadows are often the first beings I notice, and they have drawn my attention to the melody of wind passing through tall grasses along the ditches of a rural road. They remind me to look up

---

22Cajete (2000) quotes and then questions English art historian and philosopher, Herbert Read, who stated, “Science is the explanation, and art is the expression of that same reality.” For a more in-depth discussion, please see Gregory Cajete’s (2000) text, *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence*, specifically, Ch. 2, “Philosophy of Native Science.”
at the sky, that flocks of all shapes and plumage configure synchronically toward and away from one another. Shadows cast a vast array of colours all around, depending upon the humidity, season, and time of day. Ubiquitously present, but developing at distinctive times, at differing states of opacity, to move at variable speeds, shadows provide aesthetical and political depth in experiences of and in the world. In their own state of inbetweenness between material and immaterial reality, they bring to attention the realization that even seemingly stable objects are in a constant state of change. In reaching the limits of following the physical regulations set by visual shadows, meanwhile finding myself more appreciative of what I have witnessed because of them, they capture my imagination and direct me to explore the world beyond visual phenomenon and measure.

What kinds of social, political, and creative meanings can emerge in meditating upon the formation of sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows? How do ideas and bodily movements transform from stumbling through visual shadows, only to become non-visual shadows of Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter? Little Bear (2000) suggests that in Indigenous ways of coming to know, no one person can ever fully describe a collective whole; rather, each reporting is that which has been subjectively experienced (p. 79). The intersubjective sharing of many particular truths culminates in a sense of collective knowledge and the resultant social and ecological responsibilities that accompany that knowledge. The intersubjective nature of shadow formation is sure to be messy, uncontainable, unpredictable, and seriously playful. What emerges in between might beautifully complicate and coalesce into new forms, new conversations, and offer better ways of living well together.

In the following chapters, I will contemplate the cultivation of witnessing the land, Cheryl L'Hirondelle, Adrian Stimson, and Peter Morin, and the witnessing performances that emerge from becoming their shadows. In Chapter Two, I will set up the political and historical context of my current investigation. Specifically, I will delve into current literature on reconciliation and witnessing. Both international and Canadian reconciliation discourses will be examined, and regarding the latter, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s (TRCC) mandate will be presented, as well as procedural, systemic, and general critiques of the TRCC. Next, human rights discourses on witnessing will be discussed briefly, leading to a conversation regarding Indigenous modes of witnessing within a larger context of Indigenous and Indigenist research methodologies. I will close Chapter Two by examining Indigenous scholarship on
building friendships.

In Chapter Three, the challenges of making territorial acknowledgement of the land will be considered through my understanding of Japanese honorific language usage and through contemplation of trauma. An examination of trauma literature on refugee and immigrant populations, and a more personal contemplation of how primary and secondary effects of trauma will be presented as affecting my capacity to witness with respectful regard to the land itself. Moving beyond the state of being a traumatized witness, I argue for the embodied habituations of witnessing, through the inculcation of transnational, cultural, and familial values. This chapter concludes with reflections upon land-human relations, and the need to create new interrelations that reach toward other ways of experiencing and acknowledging the land.

I will develop the idea of sonorously shadowing Cheryl L’Hirondelle in Chapter Four. In this chapter, our friendship is presented as 先輩-後輩 (senpai-kōhai) or mentor/mentee relation. Looking specifically at her works, *Why the Caged Bird Sings*, *Nikamon Ohci Askiy*, and *Cistêmaw Iyiniw Ohci*, I talk about the formation and practice of my responsive performance, *in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu*. Since the guest co-editing of *West Coast Line* in 2012, I have spent considerable amounts of time building my relationship with Cheryl L’Hirondelle. The *in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu* running project has given me the opportunity to work closely with her in terms of learning about her creative practice and relationship to the land. Describing herself as a wandering Cree, she has spoken at length about being a respectful guest on the territories that she has visited, where she has resided or composed music. Most of the performances I have done over the past several years in part hopefully have been reflected in Cheryl’s teachings and practice. Throughout the years, I have come to the realization that Cheryl’s process of collaboration is unequalled in its social and cultural reach, a mixture of Cree and non-Cree scientific and technological knowledges, and in the creation of women-centred spaces that constructively challenge gender relations. In this time, she has become a performance mentor to me.

In Chapter Five, I identify my relationship to Adrian Stimson as that of a ロールモデル (rōru-moderu) or role model relation. I will discuss performatively shadowing Adrian’s alter egos – Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, Miss Chief – and creating my own role, geisha gyrl, in response to the examples that he has set. In short, I argue that Buffalo Boy has given birth to geisha gyrl. In the time that I have gotten to know Adrian
Stimson, I have become aware of the deep level of respect that he holds for everyone and everything involved. In strict adherence to the Blackfoot notion of *nuksukuwa*, which translates to “all my relations”, Adrian Stimson carefully and skillfully honours all, including those who have caused at times deliberate harm to him personally or to the different communities he inhabits. His performances are grand and hopeful gestures of invitation for one to contest social conventions of sexuality, hyper-rationalism, and the all too serious business of being the good citizen (Goto, 2014). Adrian Stimson has inspired me to try to critically examine and theorize upon creative capacities to bridge post-colonial theories that tend to culturally segregate one colonized body from the other. In Chapter Five, I reflect upon my own inclinations toward cultural essentialism and nihilism as a means to identify the creative limits of performative shadowing in this manner.

In Chapter Six, I present Peter Morin and my relationship as a best friendship 合作 (gassaku) collaboration. From our initial acquaintanceship through *Reconcile This!* (Dewar & Goto, 2012), Peter Morin and I have nurtured a close performatively collaborative relationship. In working closely together, I have been struck by the considerable risks Peter Morin takes to his body and spirit to fully explore the affective costs of colonization, oppression, resistance, and survival, both personally and culturally. I am deeply moved by his ability and concerted efforts to connect to his ancestry, as well as his ability to reach beyond his specific history, memories, and past senses of cultural belonging to shape new ways of knowing and articulating the good life. I witness his works fracturing the linearity of time and space, making nonsense of Western-Indigenous binaries of fixed identity formations. As collaborators, we have begun to have difficult and experientially shared conversations about the costs of historical and political erasure upon our respective bodies, and what we are (not) willing to sacrifice in adherence to a particular politic, that is, of centralizing Indigenous knowledge to overturn constrictions imposed by the Canadian nation-state. I do not think that these conversations could have been imaginable were it not for building a trust through our joint work. In the dissertation, I explore these ideas with Peter Morin further and theorize about the laborious process of collaborating, dreaming, and enacting inclusive spaces, which make room for contestation, respectful disagreement, and ongoing negotiation.

Finally, in Chapter Seven, I draw together the lessons from the prior chapters. I begin by reflecting upon the limitations of running through land-human collaborations, 先輩-後輩, ロールモデル, and best friendship 合作 relationships. Keeping these possible
shortcomings in mind, I go on to deliberate upon the relational reshaping of time and space. These reconfigurations provide insights towards understanding research methodologies as a knowledge precipitate, of that which builds in the interstices of relationships. Within a relational framework, I also reexamine the conceptualization of collective responsibility, which in turn aids in reconsidering reconciliation as an ongoing practice-based engagement rather than solely as a political and social ethical imperative.

My overall aim is to transform the current compulsion to bisect Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations by creatively fragmenting and thereby proliferating the possibilities for respectful interactions in the multitudinous experiences of witnessing, in and through performative engagement. I will offer insights into transforming reconciliation initiatives from being event-centred to relationally-based, durational, and process-driven engagements. I suggest that actively witnessing the performative practices of running the land and becoming shadows of Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Adrian Stimson, and Peter Morin, will provide new insights in excess of institutionalized calls for reconciliation.
Chapter Two: Setting up the context

In this chapter, I will be considering the current literature and praxes of reconciliation and witnessing discourses, looking at various national examples. The purpose of this chapter is to establish a broader socio-political context in which reconciliation is theorized, enacted, and critiqued. Towards the end of the chapter, I will discuss different approaches to witnessing. First, the role of the witness in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada will be examined. Next, this role will be associated with human rights discourses on witnessing. Finally, witnessing will be presented as a relationally premised, friendship-building creative act. I will look specifically towards Indigenous performance artists and curators whose politicized work sets examples for understanding and critiquing the staging of reconciliation and understanding performative acts of witnessing within and beyond the Canadian nation-state.

2.1 Reconciliation

In the past thirty years, truth commissions have been utilized as the means through which nation-states attempt to address past colonial and other forms of gross human injustices (Hayner, 2011; Daly & Sarkin, 2007; Lederach, 1997). While the goals of truth commissions are context-specific, they are generally assumed to contribute to peace-building in divided societies and provide socio-economic security in the nation-state (Hayner, 2011; Hoddie & Hartzell, 2005). International relations scholar Priscilla Hayner has extensively studied truth and reconciliation commissions worldwide, and argues that despite variations from one political and historical context to the next, truth and reconciliation commissions share a core set of objectives: to acknowledge past abuses, to respond to the needs of victims in an accountable manner, and to present institutional reforms based upon the findings (Hayner, 2011, p. 20). In the following discussion, reconciliation processes in South Africa and Australia will be presented as a means to provide an international backdrop to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC). These international as well as past national redress movements in Canada will aid in contextualizing the premises, goals, and criticisms of the TRCC.

In South Africa, one of the main objectives of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was to ensure that the newly emerging democratic state would not deteriorate into civil war (Boraine, 2001; Hayner, 2011; Minow, 1998; Opotow, 2001). In A Country Unmasked, Alex Boraine, one of the chief architects as well as the Deputy Chair of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (SATRC), talks at
length about the political decision to grant conditional amnesty to those who committed atrocities either for or against the apartheid regime (Boraine, 2001, p. 145). Boraine explains that the granting of amnesty was central to negotiating the transfer of power from the National Party to the African National Congress Party (ANC) (Boraine, 2001; Moon, 2008). Another important aspect of the SATRC was the increasingly communalized and religiously rhetorical nature of providing and witnessing testimony in the public arena (Boraine, 2001; Moon, 2008; Ross, 2003). According to Boraine, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Chair of the SATRC, had expressed concerns about maintaining the integrity and independence of the commission from the ruling ANC government, and believed that a victim-centred approach would shift attention away from an institutional focus (Boraine, 2001, p. 145). Tutu strongly appealed to victims to forgive the perpetrator, drawing upon the discourse of *ubuntu*, a Xhosa term that translates to “people are people through other people” (Moon, 2008, p. 35). *Ubuntu* stressed the importance of community over individual gain, such that testimonies would (and should) contribute to the wellbeing of society as a whole. Not only was *ubuntu* advocated as an ethical foundation for moving the public away from demanding retributive justice, it intimately located individual identity within the community collective, the new “Rainbow Nation” of South Africa (Moon, 2008).

The SATRC has come under considerable criticism both for granting conditional amnesty and for espousing forgiveness within a religiously and culturally established framework. While those who were granted amnesty were relatively small in number, the public became increasingly disenchanted by what appeared to be an elision of the full prosecution of those who committed at times the most heinous acts in the name of apartheid (Hamber, 2009; Moon, 2008; Opotow, 2001). The notion of justice itself became a slippery concept during the SATRC. Most accepted that the truth-seeking mission of the commission could be compromised were conditional amnesty not offered to perpetrators. Significantly, many of those who testified were seeking answers to the questions they had regarding specific circumstances in the disappearance or murder of family members, friends, or collaborators (Ross, 2003; Hamber, 2009; Moon, 2008). In

---

23By the end of the SATRC, just over 1000 out of approximately 7000 applicants were granted amnesty. Furthermore, the majority of applications were not from officials connected with the apartheid state. See Brandon Hamber’s *Transforming societies after political violence: Truth, reconciliation, and mental health*, pp. 33-35.
this sense, demands for retributive justice were supplanted by the search for narrative truth and closure (Moon, 2008). At the same time, victims anticipated that restorative justice would come, in part, in the form of material reparations. Included in the seven-volume, 4500-page TRC report was an extensive set of recommendations to the ANC to provide monetary compensation for those who testified before the TRC. In 2003, then South African President, Thabo Mbeki announced that survivors who gave testimony would receive one-off payments of R30 000 (approximately USD4000), an amount substantially lower than the six-year payment structure that the SATRC had recommended. This minimal amount left survivors dissatisfied with token gestures of compensation (Hamber, 2009, p. 33). In retrospect, survivors experienced a gross imbalance between retributive and restorative justice.

South African psychology scholar and practising therapist, Brandon Hamber, argues that the provision of testimony did not necessarily produce psychological catharsis. Whereas both Boraine and Tutu had assumed that speaking the truth would lead to personal and collective healing, Hamber and his colleagues found that victims who gave testimonies often experienced retraumatization and revictimization (Hamber, 2009). He argues that in the effort of the SATRC to collate over 19 000 individual testimonies, temporal framing of the testimonies became increasingly narrow, thereby affecting the scope of the victims' statements. In the solicitation of “relevant information,” the commission delimited the reporting of time before and after the documented human rights violation (Moon, 2009, p. 82). As a result, the commission could not adequately attend to the ways in which the apartheid state permeated every day activities. Ugandan political scientist and anthropologist Mahmood Mamdani contends that in focusing primarily on human rights offenses, the SATRC failed to address grievances of the majority of people who suffered as a result of the legal system of apartheid and the structural ways in which their movements were economically, socially, and legally constricted (as cited in Moon, 2009, 72; Opotow, 2001).

In The Location of Culture, post-colonial scholar and critical theorist Homi Bhabha states that the narration of nationness is an apparatus of symbolic power that shapes cultural production and supports its own political projection (1994, p. 201). He argues that maintenance of political hegemony requires solidarity formation in the heterogeneous disenfranchised, and that the continuation of hegemonic rule relies on this fixed alterity (p. 43). In the SATRC’s push to regulate individual narratives in the name of ubuntu to rebuild a “new South Africa” in opposition to the apartheid regime, it
foreclosed possibilities for individual grievances, which could then be perceived as rejections of restoring peaceful relations (Moon, 2009). Furthermore, the concerted search for a linear, historical, and national truth created irreparable psychological and symbolic harm that could never be adequately compensated, monetarily or otherwise (Hamber, 2009). In the end, homogenizing diverse narratives against apartheid in the name of nation-building reinstated the systemic if not legal continuation of apartheid.

Today, the legacy of apartheid and the SATRC have come to haunt contemporary economic and social life in South Africa. South African historian and social justice scholar, Greg Cuthbertson launches into a cutting critique of the ANC government, which is fraught with accusations of nepotism and corruption (2008, p. 300). He argues that inroads have not been made in providing community reparations in the form of land ownership and poverty reduction for those who suffered through apartheid, stating further that the SATRC had overemphasized personal healing over promoting democracy (pp. 297-299). In perhaps a more comprehensive critique, Marxist sociologist Michael Neocosmos traces current explosive incidences and the overall culture of xenophobia in South Africa to apartheid and the liberation nationalist movement (2006, p. vi). Neocosmos argues that there has been a shift in the meaning of citizenship from being a unifying, modernist ideal to one in the post-colony founded on notions of indigeneity and exclusivity (Neocosmos, p. 12). In other words, the “Rainbow Nation” narrative precludes new migrations into South Africa, premised on the creation of strong boundaries between “us” (South Africans) and “them,” other African nationals. Although writing in a completely different context, Mamdani (2001) warns against embracing a victim identity, brought about through anticolonial resistance, that makes violent acts against identified ‘others’ morally ambiguous and/or justified. South Africa continues to exhibit deeply unequal life circumstances that fall along racial lines – a legacy of apartheid – where “indigenous” South Africans are forced to compete for scarce resources in a progressively neo-liberalist economic post-apartheid regime. In this environment, Mamdani’s warnings are muted in increasingly violent acts against “settlers” perpetrated by apartheid’s past victims, who justify their acts as responses to the failures of the ANC to recompense for the systemic and structural longevity of apartheid rule (Neocosmos, 2006; Hamber, 2009).

Reconciliation processes in Australia have taken a very different route from the SATRC, thereby issuing a distinctive conception of nation-building. In Australia, reconciliation is a social movement (Short, 2008; Regan, 2010). Rather than being
commissioned by a small group of political leaders and activists in which the citizenry is expected to benefit from an institutionally administered event, reconciliation in Australia has been defined by the interlinking of historical moments that point to shifts in national identity formation from the ground up (Attwood, 2005). The political demands that Aboriginal people made for sovereignty and rights in the 1970s and 1980s led to the formation of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (CAR). From that moment onwards, two major episodes for promoting reconciliation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people deeply affected the national imaginary and galvanized non-Aboriginal people into action: the release of the Bringing Them Home (BTH) report and the Rudd apology (Dodson, 2009). On August 2, 1995 Australia's Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) initiated an investigation into the forcible separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families and communities. Released on May 26, 1997, the commission’s BTH report concluded that the forcible removal of Indigenous children constituted genocide (Short, 2008; Dodson, 2009). National Sorry Day was established on May 26, 1998 to commemorate the tragedy (Bond, 2008). The irony of establishing a National Sorry Day (which is not yet designated an official holiday today) was that it came on the heels of then Prime Minister John Howard’s speech at the 1997 Reconciliation Convention in which he infamously refused to formally apologize to the Stolen Generations on behalf of past and present racist governmental regimes and policies (Augustinos & Lecouteur, 2004).

The 2008 Sorry Day Address provided by then Prime Minister Kevin Rudd, who succeeded Howard in office, was seen by many Australians as heralding a shift in national consciousness regarding Aboriginal rights (Moses, 2011; Hollinsworth, 2009; Short, 2008). Historian, Dirk Moses argues that many Aboriginal people were moved and accepted the apology, and that they did not see inclusion in the political community of the nation as an effacement of their Aboriginal status (2011, p. 152). Others have been more skeptical of the scope of the apology in transforming social and institutional structures in Australia. For instance, Yawuru barrister and legal scholar Mick Dodson, argues that the apology neither automatically led to the delivery of public policy to instate self-determination of Aboriginal people, nor did it overcome the enormous gaps in the public’s knowledge about Aboriginal cultures and histories (2009, p. 102). However, Dodson remains optimistic about the potential of the apology to lead into more informed reinterpretations of nation-building in Australia.

In separate review, the BTH report and Rudd apology are cast in good light in
terms of a shift in Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal relations; together, however, they raise suspicions about the formation of a new nation-building agenda that propagates intra-national racism against Aboriginal people in the nation-state of Australia. Historian and scholar Bain Attwood criticizes the historical conceptualization of the Stolen Generations and Aboriginal life. According to Attwood, reconciliation has never been clearly defined but instead used politically for nation-building as a means to instate a more respectable nationalism in times of globalization (2005, p. 246). For many Aboriginal people reconciliation taken as self-determination has been subsumed under this nationalist project (Attwood, 2005). Human rights and social justice scholar, Damien Short describes reconciliation as a new form of settler nationalism that seeks to fill a politically rhetorical deficit in the gradual deterioration of Australia’s historical ties to the British Crown (2008, p. 27). Reconciliation offers politically honourable, post-colonial grounds for nation-building.

In the enthusiasm of non-Aboriginal Australians to embrace this new national identity en masse, many Aboriginal and critical non-Aboriginal scholars argue that the general populace has failed to recognize crucial differences in ‘settler’ and ‘Aboriginal’ life. As a survivor of the Stolen Generations, Debra Hocking (2008) writes eloquently about her consuming activist work to fight for truly equal regard in Australia, a European settler society that continues to thrive in the institutionalization of colonial values. Damien Short discusses at length that Federal Court decisions on Native title claims reveal how government and commercial lobbying campaigns of misinformation have dispossessed Indigenous peoples of their traditional territories, which ironically have run in concurrence with an official reconciliation process that is meant to address Indigenous aspirations in terms of land and justice (2008, p. 65). In the case of Mabo v. Queensland, the Meriam people of Murray Island were engaged in a long fight with the Australian legal system to stake a claim on the lands that they had occupied for generations. Although ruling in favour of the Meriam people was heralded as a positive gain for Aboriginal rights, the media coverage of the case was critiqued as constructed to incite fear in non-Aboriginal people. Statements such as “The decision has the potential to destroy our society” and “mining projects are at risk” was aimed at creating a national crisis that pitted Aboriginal greed against the rights of settlers to pursue the good life (Short, 2008). The Mabo case enunciates the heterogeneous nature of settler rights to the land that harken from a wide range of institutions, such as the judicial system, media, and corporate interests. Settler pursuits lay hidden within, nonetheless contradicting, a
unified national identity of reconciliation.

Bhabha argues that the idea of social cohesion is a modernist concept that bases national identity on organic theories of holism of culture and community (1994, p. 204). For Bhabha the “landscape is the inscape of national identity,” which emphasizes the question of social visibility and the power of the eye to normalize the rhetoric of national affiliation and collective expression (p. 205). However, he suggests that in the borderlands of the nation-space possibilities arise for questioning the meaning of the ‘people’ (p. 208). The people are at the cutting edge between the ‘social’ as homogeneous, consensual community and the specific addressing of the contentious, unequal interests within the population. In short, the generalization of knowledge and homogenization of experience disperse in the collapse of certainty. Within the Australian context, the collective subject formation of reconciliation identity is vulnerable to dispersal in the revelation of heterogeneous ways of life within Aboriginal communities (Hocking, 2008), between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, and within the settler state (Short, 2008). However, the splitting of the collective will raise a deluge of deeper questions regarding the subaltern spaces that exist between and within Aboriginal and settler identities. Just as post-colonial feminist scholar, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak speculates on the subaltern capacity to speak (1994), the questions of whether and how the variety of voices of those dispossessed of their complexity and human dignity are uptaken within colonial states needs to be further investigated.

Lessons delved from the South African and Australian contexts raise pressing concerns with regard to assessing critically the outcomes and political function of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Specifically, questions that pertain to the continuation of colonization and neoliberally fashioned modernist nation-building, often continue to be bifurcated between Indigenous and post-colonial scholarship, respectively. As will be discussed throughout the thesis, this intellectual division may be due in part to the political and theoretical directions taken in the wake of criticisms of colonization and nationhood.

In the Canadian context, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC) was established to uncover the truth of the residential school legacy and to raise public awareness of Canada’s past assimilation and eradication policies against Indigenous people (TRCC, 2010). In her essay, “The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Genesis and design”, human rights and transitional justice scholar Rosemary Nagy argues that the design and implementation of the TRCC was
the outcome of a dialectical formulation between the Assembly of First Nations and local, grassroots initiatives (Nagy, 2014, p. 199). According to Nagy, whereas the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) consulted closely with the International Centre for Transitional Justice, locally organized groups comprised of survivors, knowledge keepers, and healers focused upon relationship-building and truth-telling in the disclosures of residential school experiences (2014, p. 212). Nagy suggests that the AFN looked to international precedents of truth and reconciliation commissions worldwide as a means to create a legalistic focus on accountability and creating a factual public record (p. 200). Meanwhile, local roundtables, which had already started functioning since 1990, were moving forward with Christian churches that were attempting to take systemic accountability for their contributions to the administration and continuation of Indian residential schools (Nagy, 2014, pp. 207-8).

Within a nation-state perspective, The TRCC is framed within relatively recent historical and political contexts in which conservative governments have formally apologized for the oppression of visible minority groups in Canada. Critics of the past Conservative government have argued that such gestures were antithetical to then-Prime Minister Stephen Harper's denial that Canada has a colonial legacy (Henderson & Wakeham, 2009; Rice & Snyder, 2008). Henderson and Wakeham argue that these apologies are rhetorical strategies to reinstate Canada as a benevolent and stable nation in the international stage, in the hopes of securing political and economic investments from other nation-states (2009, p. 3). Peace activist and independent scholar, Derek Rasmussen contends that Harper’s wish to “close a sad chapter” in Canadian history signifies forgiveness as a mode of forgetting the past, to remove facts from an otherwise unembellished history. According to Rasmussen (2001), the will to forget comes in the form of a fiscally cautious apology and minimal negotiated compensation. He argues that reconciliation to forget is a tactic by Europeans to assert colonialist claims on land that is not theirs. In accepting Rasmussen’s thesis on forgiving as a form of forgetting, it becomes important to analyse how other demands for apologies sought by ‘visible minority groups’ who have experienced racist policies enacted by the Canadian nation-state might unintentionally establish adversarial relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

Other reconciliation initiatives around the world are instructive for the course Canada is presently on. My interest in questioning the relationships between racialized, diasporic communities and diverse Indigenous groups in the Canadian context stems
from concerns of xenophobia, which have been linked to past truth and reconciliation initiatives that have taken place in South Africa, Rwanda, and Northern Ireland. Political scientist Michael Neocosmos (2006) traces current explosive incidences, and the overall culture of xenophobia in South Africa, to apartheid and the liberation nationalist movement (p. vi). Neocosmos argues that the meaning of citizenship has shifted from being a unifying, modernist ideal to one in the post-colony founded on notions of “indigeneity” and exclusivity (p. 12). In other words, the “Rainbow Nation” narrative precludes new migrations into South Africa, premised on the creation of strong boundaries between “us” (South Africans) and “them,” other African nationals. Writing within the context of post-genocide life in Rwanda, political scientist Mahmood Mamdani (2001) warns against embracing a victim identity, brought about through anti-colonial resistance, which makes violent acts against identified “others” morally ambiguous and/or justified. He claims that the terms “settler” and “native” are political identities, consequent to the history of state formation, and premised on the idea that the post-colonial state accepts as authentic the colonial construction of the native. According to Mamdani, in Rwanda, those who identify as “settler,” the minority Tutsis, and those who identify as “native,” the Hutus, have both embraced “victim” status to justify ethnic cleansing (pp. 27-28). In Northern Ireland, researchers argue that recent xenophobic attacks, primarily against racialized migrant communities, have resulted in part from reconciliatory peace processes in response to The Troubles (Fletcher, 2004; McGill & Oliver, 2002; Steenkamp, 2008). Historian Ian Christopher Fletcher (2004) argues that the sectarian division of Protestants and Catholics into “us” versus “them” in mainstream media constructions, as well as in public institutions at large, have failed to present the heterogeneous and changing political make-up of citizenship in Northern Ireland, ultimately leading to systemic discrimination against visible minority groups (p. 115).

The broad conceptual category of colonization falls grossly short of describing the different kinds of colonialisms that are at play within culturally diverse citizenships and movements, in and beyond the Canadian nation-state. For example, transnational scholar, Yuichiro Onishi (2012) investigates the convoluted nature of cultural and national belonging in the case study of Shiroma Ushi, an Okinawan who challenged the U.S. constitution for citizenship rights to remain in Hawai’i. Shiroma’s defence hinged on not being an alien, given that the U.S. annexed the Ryuukuu Islands in 1952. Indigenous to Okinawa, which was in a state of limbo in the transfer of power from Japan to the U.S., Shiroma’s defence team unsuccessfully argued for his de facto American
citizenship. In a well-considered discussion regarding the complexity of belonging and migration, Onishi draws attention to the motility of Shiroma’s identity in Hawai‘i as Japanese, American, and Okinawan, traversing the identity borders of being Indigenous, non-Indigenous, doubly colonized, colonizer, and unsettled settler simultaneously. In Chapter One, I discussed how the white-washing of the term “settler” removes the precariousness of “impossible subjects,”\textsuperscript{24} from the political imaginary, those who are in a state of movement often under political and economic duress and who do not expect to settle permanently in the new host country. I will consider the collisions of different colonial, imperial, and nationalist experiences that are carried within the lives of people who intend to settle or intend to pass temporarily through Canada. A constructive deconstruction of the “settler” will open up space to contemplate the specificities and fluidity of being socially responsible while living in Canada on Turtle Island. The purpose of discussing those who might define their lives as being in a state of “permanent unsettlement” is not to exempt them from developing respectful relationships with those who are Indigenous to different territories across Turtle Island. Rather, it is to imagine a broader range of ways to enact relational responsibility brought about by being mindful of one’s state of capacity, history, and changeability. New ways of acknowledging and experiencing the presence of unexpected others are required for transforming social relationships that have become systemically and politically unequal under the guise of nation-building for the greater good in Canada.

One of the most recent attempts in Canada to recognize state history of actively working to annihilate Indigenous cultural, political, and physical presence is the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC). In the following section, I briefly introduce and discuss the work of the TRCC and some of the criticisms that have been launched against this federally instituted commission.

\textbf{2.1.1 Reconciliation in Canada}

Initially formed in 2008, between 2010-2014, the TRCC actively gathered statements of human rights abuses that took place in Indian Residential Schools, which functioned between the mid-1800s and 1996 (TRCC, 2010). The TRCC has functioned within the larger Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement, in which the mandate

for the Commission was reworked and approved (Nagy, 2014; TRCC, 2010). In the
mandate, the Parties agreed that the TRCC is to function as a victim-centred, open,
honourable, and comprehensive process, grounded on the belief that truth-telling leads
to healing (Nagy, 2014). The mandate also has a teleological goal of “rebuilding and
renewing Aboriginal relationships and the relationship between Aboriginal and non-
Aboriginal Canadians” (TRCC, 2010). In 2015, the TRCC released the final report of its
inquiry into the psychological, cultural, and socio-economic consequences of the
residential school legacy (TRCC, 2015b). Included in the 94 calls to action in the final
report is action point 83, which states:

We call upon Canada Council for the Arts to establish, as a funding priority, a
strategy for Indigenous and non-Indigenous artists to undertake collaborative
projects and produce works that contribute to the reconciliation process.

(TRCC 2015b, p. 335)

This action point reflects the TRCC’s exploration of how artists might contribute
to imagining and enacting reconciliation initiatives in ways that exceed formal
governmental implementation strategies and structures.26

Unlike many truth and reconciliation commissions, which have been established
in part to ensure the peaceful transition of war-torn nations into post-conflict, democratic
states, the TRCC operated within presumed stable socio-economic conditions (Nagy,
2012). Thus, the question arises as to the motives for conducting a truth and
reconciliation commission under the auspices of the previous Conservative government.
Debates have ensued regarding the hidden agendas of the past federal government
They have been accused of reducing the fiscal fall-out of the residential school legacy
through its time-restrictive Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (Green,
2012; Saul, 2009), attempting to project the image of Canada as a benevolent nation-
state in the international stage (Chrisjohn & Wasacase, 2009; Henderson & Wakeham,
2009; Regan, 2010), and of subduing Indigenous calls for self-determination against the
larger ongoing project of colonization (Alfred, 2005b; Castellano, Archibald, & DeGagné,

26In 2013, the TRCC, then called the TRC on Indian Residential Schools (TRC-IRS),
commissioned a report from authors Jonathan Dewar, David Gaertner, Ayumi Goto, Ashok
Mathur, and Sophie McCall, Practicing Reconciliation: A Collaborative Study of Aboriginal Art,
Resistance and Cultural Politics. The purpose of the report was not to sublimate artistic
explorations under the umbrella of the mandate of the TRC-IRS. Rather it was to consider ways
in which reconciliation was yet to be envisioned, as expressed through artistic critiques and
constructive challenges of reconciliation discourse.
Several critiques of the TRCC have arisen, of which two are explored in this section. First, I will present a procedural critique of public statement gathering events. Second, I will examine concerns that the mandate of the TRCC is too narrow in scope. From here, I will address broader disparagements of the ways in which reconciliation is used to understand and encourage Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships. I will look at each of these criticisms, in turn, to demonstrate how they: (1) yield political and epistemological challenges to knowledge; and (2) contribute to conversations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to invert power relations. I will identify some limitations and challenges that arise in attempts to upend these power relationships, and I will make concluding remarks on whether the TRCC, as well as other ongoing reconciliation projects, provide sufficient mechanisms for these dialogues and for breaking down systematized power differentials between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

2.1.1.a Procedural critique of the TRCC

A key procedural critique of the TRCC has arisen with regard to the gathering of survivor testimonies. Public statement gathering is based on the belief that truth-telling will heal and facilitate community-building (TRCC, 2010). While cases of residential school survivors who experience catharsis upon giving testimony have been recorded, many more instances of continued victimization of survivors have shown that complex and long-term strategies are necessary for setting survivors on a path to healing (Castellano, 2008; Chrisjohn & Wasacase, 2009; Corntassel, Chaw-win-is, & T’lakwadzi, 2009). In her research on the Aboriginal Healing Foundation’s accumulated knowledge of trauma and healing, Mohawk education scholar, Marlene Brant Castellano (2008) has found that one-to-one sessions with a therapist insufficiently address the deeply felt traumas that continue to reverberate through Aboriginal communities (p. 387). Further, she has found that while traditional Aboriginal healing circles have increased in popularity and attendance over time, they alone do not have the power to transform traumatized communities into healthy ones. Castellano argues that community healing strategies must be incorporated into larger social development initiatives in the areas of education, employment, and economic opportunities (pp. 390-391).

Castellano’s (2008) concerns about the long-term healing needs of survivors become more pressing when testimonies are given at large public gatherings. The assumption that testimonial disclosures will bring about healing and community building
is confronted with an equally urgent concern as to how survivor testimonies will be received and understood within the broader socio-political context. In *Unsettling the Settler Within*, settler political science scholar, Paulette Regan’s (2010) basic premise is that how people learn about historical injustices is as important as learning truths about what happened (p. 11). She argues that in Canada, the power of dominant-culture hegemony lies in its invisibility, such that violence (whether symbolic, structural, or spiritual) is disguised in neutral dispute resolution tactics to appease Indigenous calls for justice (p. 114). In such a politically unequal setting, Regan is apprehensive that settlers (non-Native people) will look upon Indigenous persons with colonial empathy (p. 174). In other words, the testimonial exchange may promote and fix Indigenous people as victims in relation to the benevolent peacemaker position of settlers.

From a psychoanalytic perspective, the expressed need to redress state-sanctioned collective injustices might lead to the centralizing and mapping of one’s notions of trauma, justice, and collective identity reformation onto new calls for justice brought forward by other communities. Scholarly studies on trauma and memory reveal that community members not present at defining cultural crisis points nonetheless experience intergenerational trauma, subsequently incorporating collective trauma narratives into individual stories of cultural belonging and identity formation (Apel, 2002; Argenti & Schramm, 2010; Hirsch, 2012; McDonald, 2007; Menzies, 2007; Wesley-Esquimaux & Smolewsky, 2004). Witnessing the TRCC and Indigenous/non-Indigenous relations is an ambivalent endeavour, particularly if one’s identity formation is established and reinforced primarily through collective trauma narratives.

However, by taking heed of Castellano’s (2008) and Regan’s (2010) concerns, and in response to criticisms raised by Indigenous scholars and community-based activists, new ways of framing Indigenous and non-Indigenous interactions might come to be known. Ojibwe writer, Richard Wagamese (2009), who attended an Indian residential school, presents a provocative journey of healing that melds together his newly restored Christian faith and Ojibwe beliefs. His experiences and presentation of finding peace through the intertwining of two spiritual worldviews, which had come to be understood in diametrically opposed ways, demands further attention. Likewise, in his own journey of healing, Anishinaabe community leader, Fred Kelly (2008) founded the Nokomis Healing Group, a consortium of traditional healers that aid in dealing with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder in Indian Residential School survivors. Wagamese’s and Kelly’s lives cannot be contained within a typical residential school narrative. In public
gatherings, their presence would be in danger of being flattened into the victim identity and collapsing into the totality of testimonies. Within this context, when others await to tell their stories, and the trauma load is heavy, one begins to wonder the difficulty with which the settler’s colonial empathetic gaze can be broken, given the constrictions of time, narrative, and political framing. Endless opportunities to reframe and expand one’s interactions abound beyond the formal structures of the TRCC. For instance, Inuit curator Heather Igloliorte (2009) writes about how artists are moving away from “traditional” representations of Inuit life, shifting techniques and politicizing their production in ways that resist settler expectations.

Realization of the limitations of TRCC public statement gatherings does not necessarily lead to the preclusion of attending regional or national events. Rather, Indigenous and non-Indigenous people are called to reach out to one another beyond TRCC-organized settings. Regan (2010) argues that settlers especially need to heal from their colonial legacy, which has come to sicken their regard of Indigenous “others.” The question arises: what does reaching out look like, and how can it be suppressed and/or encouraged within current socio-political conditions in Canada? At a personal level, and in presenting a newly arrived immigrant perspective, Rhose Harris-Galia (2011) attempts to bridge Inuit and her Filipina culture through her strong Catholic faith. Her account, which jars because of her apparently naïve reliance on Catholicism, leads to a redoubling of the ways in which the circulation of “reconciliation” on Indian Residential Schools might narrow perceptions of settler-Indigenous engagements in the everyday.

In the visual arts, Jamelie Hassan, a visual artist of Arabic heritage, and Miriam Jordan, a First Nations multi-media artist, collaborate to parallel their life/art experiences to contemplate that which sutures and separates one from the other (Hassan & Jordan, 2011). Although this collaboration can seem like a random engagement, Hassan and Jordan’s work exists within a larger socio-historical context of building upon Indigenous and racialized artists. In Other Conundrums: Race, Culture, and Canadian Art, communications scholar and activist, Monika Kin Gagnon (2000) presents three momentous cultural initiatives that were organized by people of colour and First Nations artist-activists: About Face, About Frame; It’s a Cultural Thing/Minquon Panchayat; and Writing Thru Race. More information on these events can be found in Gagnon’s (2000) essay, “Building
racism and cultural inequity in national cultural organizations. According to Gagnon, through these events, the participants came to realize that while Aboriginal and people of colour communities shared similar positions in relation to the dominant culture, they nevertheless occupied diverse ideological positions in relation to one another. Instead of despairing over their differences they found that the task set before them was to find radically transformative strategies to catalyze more effective crises of representation (Gagnon, 2000, p. 71). These gatherings have laid the foundation for continued collaborations between Indigenous and artists of colour.  

In the optimism of both participating in and creating new opportunities for Indigenous and non-Indigenous interactions, it is easy to overlook other kinds of social-structural constraints that regulate and limit cross-cultural contact. In the next section, I will critically examine the scope of the TRCC’s mandate, which will shed insights on how Canadian social institutions themselves can be appraised and reimagined.

2.1.1.b Systemic critiques of the TRCC

One of the major criticisms of the TRCC is that in narrowing the scope of its mandate to only examine residential schools, it fails to address the broader legacy of colonialism in Canada (Alfred, 2009; Chrisjohn & Wasacase, 2009; Waziyatawin, Blocks: Anti-Racism Initiatives in the Arts."

Ashok Mathur, Chris Creighton-Kelly, and France Trépanier are among some of the key organizers who have long been interwoven into Indigenous-racialized artist initiatives. Since the 1980s, Indo-Canadian writer, scholar, and cultural organizer, and my heart/life partner, Ashok Mathur has been involved in organizing gatherings to build alliances between Indigenous and racialized artists. He has set up several artistic residencies, including: the upcoming artist residency, Groundworks, in collaboration with Haida-English artist Stephen Foster at UBCO, Kelowna, Traditional Syilx Territories, July 1-Aug. 15, 2018; O k’inādās // complicated reconciliations: an artist residency, UBCO, Kelowna, Traditional Syilx Territories, July 1-15, 2016, in a collective collaboration with Peter Morin and myself; Reconsidering Reconciliation at Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, Traditional Secwepemc Territories, July 15 – Aug. 15, 2013; Reconciliation: Works in Progress at the Shingwauk Residential School Centre, Algoma University, Sault Ste. Marie, Traditional Anishinaabeg Territories, October 27 – 31, 2012. While Mathur’s most recent initiatives have taken place within an institutional academic setting, Indo-Canadian multi-media and performance artist Chris Creighton-Kelly and Kanien'kéha:ka and French visual and installation artist France Trepanier have been gathering Indigenous and racialized artists in community spaces and artistic institutions. They have established Primary Colours/Couleurs primaires, an artistic movement that centralizes Indigenous self-determination and creative sovereignty while recognizing the role of artists of colour in shifting artistic practice and presentation across the Canadian landscape. So far, they have organized a large initial gathering in Victoria, Traditional Territories of the Lekwungen Peoples, at the Songhees Wellness Centre, Sept. 23 – 26, 2017; Artistic residency at the Banff Centre, Treaty 7, April 15 – May 14, 2018. For more information on all of these initiatives, please visit these websites: rmooc.ca and primary-colours.ca.
There are two major ways in which this criticism affords further engagement. First, it leads to the examination of other institutions that are imbued with colonialism’s legacy, and second, it facilitates a critical discussion with regard to the preservation of colonialism that continues to impose itself upon and through Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

First, a systemic critique of the TRCC’s narrow mandate has led to the examination of other institutions where colonialist values work to fashion the everyday. In the anthology, *From Truth to Reconciliation* (Castellano, Archibald, and DeGagné, 2008), several contributors interrogate the current structuring of religious institutions, social welfare services, and legal and juridical practices. The United Church special advisor on residential schools, David MacDonald (2008) provides concrete ways in which Catholic, United, Presbyterian, and Anglican churches can unite to aid in the transformation of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal relationships. He suggests that churches organize a “national day of repentance” in which the media would play a key role in documenting and televising the event. In effect, MacDonald is asking that the roles of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in reconciliation be reversed, so that settlers too are placed under the public scrutiny of Aboriginal people. In terms of revisions in social services, Gitxsan child welfare activist and social work scholar, Cindy Blackstock (2008) discusses current inequities in the child welfare system in Canada. In her discussion of Jordan’s Principle, which places priority on the child above the need to solve

---

29 Since before the work of the TRCC, Indigenous scholars, activists, and communities have been working to expose the full scope of colonial structuring of Canadian society, which continues to discriminate against Indigenous peoples. Ongoing challenges to the nation-state that have garnered greater media and public awareness include: (1) Métis Nation land claim rights (mmf.mb.ca); (2) The Sixties Scoop Class Action Lawsuit (sixtiesscoopclaim.ca); (3) the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (mwiw-gffada.ca). An unexhausted list, these are examples of the many organizations challenging the legal parameters of Canadian governance at provincial and federal levels.

30 Blackstock (2008) recounts the story of a First Nations toddler named Jordan who was born with complex medical disorders. His family decided to place Jordan into the care of a child welfare agency, since it was the only way he would receive adequate governmental support. The child welfare agency placed Jordan in a hospital where he resided for two years, because bureaucratic disputes between the Manitoba and Federal governments arose regarding payments for Jordan’s at-home care. In the meantime, a medically trained foster family was awaiting Jordan’s arrival. Jordan passed away in hospital before the dispute could be resolved. Thereafter, First Nations developed Jordan’s Principle, which prioritized the child’s wellbeing in the resolution of jurisdictional disputes. For further information see Cindy Blackstock’s (2008) text, “Reconciliation Means Not Saying Sorry Twice: Lessons from Child Welfare in Canada.
jurisdictional issues of care coverage, Blackstock seriously questions the federal government’s capacity to enact reconciliation given the lackluster approaches that it continues to take in child welfare services. Kanienkehaka activist, Beverley Jacobs and Sandy Lake First Nation activist and policy analyst, Andrea Williams (2008) are just as critical of the legal system that continues to demonstrate a strong gender bias that leads to structural, symbolic, and physical violence against Aboriginal women. They trace contemporary recurrences of missing and murdered Aboriginal women to the Indian Act, which legally and systemically limited their rights to movement and community membership. Jacobs and Williams argue that present-day discrimination against Aboriginal women is continually generated by the Indian Act and from Bill C-31, which attempted to redress Aboriginal women’s rights.

Each of these areas can be greatly expanded as institutional critiques have proliferated in response to the narrow mandate of the TRCC (Castellano, Archibald, and DeGagné, 2008; James, 2012; Loft, 2012; Robinson & Martin, 2016). Blackstock and Williams (2008) foreground the epistemological issues of the spectacular, bureaucratic, and gendered relations that affect contemporary life, and may even be entrenched within the TRCC itself. Their analyses alongside MacDonald (2008) and Blackstock (2008) collectively show that the legacy of Indian Residential Schools was not a historical aberration within an otherwise just history of nation-building. Rather, their critiques reveal that the educational system is but one of many institutions, which have been grossly impacted by colonial and racist practices. In turn, they encourage more intensive scrutiny of current educational institutions that also reinstate European and other settler epistemological and pedagogical priorities over Indigenous knowledges.

In the 94 recommendations delivered to the federal government in 2015, it is clear that the TRCC is actively attempting to address the criticisms raised and to broaden the scope of its initial mandate to investigate the residential school legacy (TRCC, 2015a). Likewise, attempts appear to have been made by Prime Minister Trudeau to honour the TRCC report findings and action points. On June 2, 2015, Trudeau pledged unwavering support for all of the recommendations that the TRCC had made. 31 Trudeau’s unreserved endorsement, going so far as to invoke the Kelowna

Accord, became a notable part of his campaign strategy in his successful bid to become Prime Minister (Hyslop, 2015). Since then, concerns have been raised, primarily by politically conservative pundits, as to the economic and procedural feasibility of implementing all 94 action points (Galloway, 2015; McParland, 2015). Indeed, many questions arise regarding the TRCC’s ambitious reach to demand changes from within federal and provincial governmental structures that are deemed to continue systemic racial discrimination against First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people in Canadian society. To what extent should and can social institutions change from within?

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) links research and educational institutions to European imperialism and colonialism. Smith argues that Western ideas of time and space are encoded in philosophy, language and science, specifying that Western classifications of space lead to the colonization of Indigenous spaces (52-53). Often referred to as “modernity,” the Enlightenment catalyzed the industrial revolution which produced the philosophy of liberalism, the development of scientific disciplines, and public education (Smith, 1999, p. 61). In effect, Smith presents the ways in which different institutions are bound by Euro-imperialist valuations and organization of knowledge. Therefore, the challenge is to find new ways of building upon Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities that are to be understood within Indigenous frames.

In her essay, “Literature of the Land,” Okanagan scholar and knowledge keeper, Jeannette Armstrong (2012) examines how oral literature arises out of experiences of the land. She maps out a theory of Syilx orality to reflect long-term knowledge of human-earth interrelatedness. According to Armstrong, Syilx oral storytelling is predominantly a literary expression of ethics, which guides behaviour and interactions with the environment (pp. 347-348). Armstrong’s explanation of syilx storytelling contests

---

32 Between 2004 and 2005 an “unprecedented national process of Aboriginal policy negotiations” took place between Paul Martin’s Liberal federal government, First ministers, and Aboriginal leaders. The aim of these meetings, which culminated in a two-day First Ministers’ meeting in Kelowna, B.C., was to produce a ten-year plan to narrow the socio-economic gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. At the time of signing, approximately $5 billion was pledged to improve the standard of living of Aboriginal people. For a more in-depth summary, please see Lisa Patterson’s report (2006), Aboriginal Roundtable to Kelowna Accord: Aboriginal Policy Negotiations.

33 Syilx refers to “people of the Okanagan”, which distinguishes this community from other Salish peoples. The term syilx translates to “an action turning into a thing”. Armstrong (2012) describes the nsyilxcen is an orality-based language that is experienced closer to visualization rather than signification.
the academic compulsion to categorize, divide, and prioritize written over oral knowledge. Armstrong presents a different frame of reference for the shaping of language itself, and how it cannot be separate from living on the land. She strategically supplants the fixed habits of knowledge accrual and suggests ways of replacing the “old order” with methods that respect rather than subjugate and objectify Indigenous knowledges.

Critiquing the narrow mandate of the TRCC necessarily advances a substantial analysis of the colonially laden structuring of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships. However, while this type of critique addresses how land has been reappropriated for settler gain, it does not yet address that Indigenous lands were taken and not returned. Kanienkehaka activist and political science scholar, Taiaiake Alfred (2009) clearly states, “restitution is the real pathway to justice for Indigenous People…Something has been stolen, lies were told and they have never been made right” (pp. 165-166). With these strong statements, Alfred politically challenges Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to tackle the second systemic critique of the TRCC, that is, how the land itself is occupied, instrumentalized, and unfairly divided. He obligates all to engage in a restitution-reconciliation process of peacebuilding (p. 167). Rather than prescribing the manner in which such restitutions are to be put into practice, he leaves others to design processes that elevate the status of Indigenous people in Canadian society.

Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike have answered Alfred’s call. In the past, Smith (1999) was a pivotal Indigenous scholar who drew upon collaborative resistance movements in New Zealand and Australia to suggest ways in which sovereignty rights could be restored to Aboriginal people. Put into practice today, demands for the restitution of Indigenous land and social rights may benefit from building upon knowledge gained from past redresses made by other cultural and political groups in Canada. Law professor, Bradford Morse (2008) provides a broad summary of the reparations and apologies made by federal and provincial governments in response to community demands from Japanese-Canadians, Chinese-Canadians, and African-Canadians. Morse also identifies other groups that have not been satisfactorily compensated for their experiences of collective discrimination, which opens up possibilities for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal collaboration in petitioning for land rights and political recognition, respectively. Indo-Canadian cultural studies scholar, Robinder Kaur Sehdev (2011) urges people of colour activists to confront the systemic ways in
which racism codes communities, space, and land (p. 265). She specifically requests that treaty negotiations serve as a space of solidarity, to bring together Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal activists in challenge of colonial treaty agreements that were devised and continue to be imposed by the Crown. Sehdev’s request is distinct from Nandita Sharma’s (2013) position, in which the political roles of newly arrived people and those passing through are not outlined with respect to established Indigenous and settler communities. Instead, Sehdev centralizes Indigenous sovereignty as a starting point for Indigenous and people of colour alliance-building.

Ideally, the inversion of power to prioritize Indigenous rights over settler demands would serve to equalize relations between the two. However, concerns that Mahmood Mamdani (2001) has made with respect to the cycles of political violence between the Hutus and Tutsis might be a forewarning for Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationship-building in Canada. Mamdani argues that colonial and postcolonial violence in Rwanda was based on the politicizing of “indigenous” and “settler” identities, resulting in the polarization of diverse communities into one of two groups (p. 33). The colonial racialization of the Hutus as “indigenous” and Tutsis as “settler” continued to serve the grounds for post-colonial violence, in which both sides claimed victim identities as justification for ethnic cleansing of the other group. In the Canadian context, it is important to be mindful of the ways in which Indigenous and non-Indigenous people collaborate. Otherwise, joint activities aimed at effacing power of the perceived enemy (such as governments, corporations, the generalized white settler) may inadvertently reinstate the polarization of Indigenous and non-Indigenous identities, which in turn could lead to justifying future violations and violence between the two groups. In consideration of the multiple communities and languages that are circulating across the land, the creative deconstruction of the Indigenous-Settler binary will be further investigated in the course of this thesis. With this in mind, I will now turn to present a frequently raised general critique of reconciliation discourse in Canada.

2.1.1.c General critique of reconciliation in Canada

Since the inception of the TRCC, the word reconciliation has enjoyed increasing circulation in Canada. Often cast in terms of prescribing steps toward hopeful futures and political transformation (Dussault, 2009; Llewellyn, 2009; Saul, 2009), criticism of reconciliation discourse has also intensified during this time. Perhaps one of the strongest critiques of reconciliation is that it dresses nation-building in fancy post-colonial and restorative justice terms (Hayner, 2011; Henderson & Wakeham, 2009; Opotow,
The worry is that reconciliation could be the means through which Indigenous people, newly reunited in peaceful relations with non-Indigenous society, would then effectively be absorbed into the nation-state. While one solution is to maintain strict boundaries between settlers and Indigenous people and at the same time deconstruct the peacemaker myth of the nation-state (Regan, 2010), others are taking this opportunity to reconsider the politics of recognition.

Criticisms that point to the systemic colonization of Indigenous people speak to a wide-reaching political critique of the ways the Canadian nation-state reconstitutes itself socially and politically. Indeed, the 94 recommendations that the TRCC have presented to the federal government are calls for systemic overhauls across all institutions, including judicial, medical, social work, educational, and cultural (TRCC, 2015a). At the heart of these recommendations, and in conjunction with the denunciation of neocolonial strategies to maintain hegemonic control over Canadian society, is a multivocal Indigenous call for sovereignty over their own communities that spans a period from initial European contact to the present day. However, the term, sovereignty, is politically ambivalent, requiring further critical contemplation. In her essay, “For whom sovereignty matters,” Lenape scholar of American Indian Studies, Joanne Barker cites a 1979 essay by Standing Rock Sioux activist, historian, and political philosopher, Vine Deloria Jr., who traces back the adoption of the term “sovereignty” within Indigenous activist and scholarly communities to its East Asian and European theological roots (Barker, 2005, pp. 1-2). In so doing, Barker presents the complexities of embracing such a historically and politically loaded term, and endeavours to expand Indigenous utilization of sovereignty beyond its entwinements to European religious foundations. In Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles
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34In accordance with Steve Loft’s contention that nation-to-nation treaties have not be honoured, many monumental cases of land claim disputes bring into political focus the Canadian nation-state objective to procure traditional Indigenous territories. Please see: Don Monet and Skanu’u’s (1992) presentation of Delgamuukw v. the Queen in their book, Colonialism on Trial: Indigenous land rights and the Gitksan Wet’suwet’en Sovereignty Case; and Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner’s (2010) collection of essays, which offers Indigenous and non-Indigenous creative and critical reflections on the “Oka Crisis”, This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades: An Anthology. Currently, Indigenous communities are leading the protest against the Kinder Morgan proposal to expand the Trans Mountain pipeline. Please see: James Keller’s (2014) article, “B.C. First Nation launches legal challenge over Kinder Morgan pipeline” in The Canadian Press; Deborah Cohen and Shiri Pasternak’s (2018) critical piece, “Pipeline asserts jurisdiction over Indigenous lands” in the Toronto Star; the anonymously written (2017), “Winds of change” in Oilweek Magazine which discusses the heterogenous engagement of different Indigenous communities in the oil industry.

Indigenous political scholars such as Glen Coulthard and Jeff Corntassel demand sovereignty-based recognition rights (Coulthard, 2007, 2014) and restitutive justice (Alfred, 2005a, 2009; Alfred & Corntassel, 2005) beyond the legal boundaries established by the Canadian nation-state. Dene political science and First Nations scholar, Glen Coulthard (2007) criticizes a liberal democratic politics of recognition, which reproduces colonial power relations. Coulthard argues that current moves by First Nations to seek political recognition re-establish colonizer-colonized relationships, placing the state in a powerful position to determine and legitimate Indigenous identity in a liberalist nation (p. 438). He takes specific issue with political philosopher, Charles Taylor’s (1997) *The Politics of Recognition* because Taylor defends a variant of liberal thought which posits an understanding of recognition that would only nominally assure the recognition of Indigenous rights under state-controlled conditions. According to Coulthard, Taylor’s idea of recognition suggests granting Native groups a new form of jurisdiction in Canada, weaker than the provinces, and perhaps more in keeping with municipal powers (p. 442). To Coulthard, this allowance would pay mere lip service to Indigenous demands for sovereignty. Perhaps the political limit to Coulthard’s call for recognition rights is that it hinges upon an inescapable power dynamic between settlers and Indigenous people, described through a Fanonian psychologizing of Hegel’s master-slave dialectic. His uncritical cooptation of this well-trodden understanding of colonial power relations makes his arguments susceptible to criticisms of patriarchal bias in colonial resistance, which reverberates with the criticisms of homophobia and patriarchy against Fanon’s psychoanalyses of racism (Chancey, 2015; de Lauretis, 2002; Rocchi,
2015; Rowley, 2010). However, Coulthard’s essay paves the way for contemplating new conceptualizations of recognition that are not based upon legal demands on the prevailing nation-state.

In his essay, “The Rhetorics of Recognition,” Cherokee scholar, Daniel Heath Justice (2010) asks, “how, why, and in what ways do we attempt to recognize, identify, or articulate a Native subjectivity?” (p. 237). In response to this question, Justice delves into a thoughtful reflection on how colonization has shaped the manner in which Indigenous people have come to demand the recognition of “Indian identity.” His ultimate goal is to replace the language of identity because it often places too much emphasis on the individualistic search for self-definition, either in opposition to community or as an assumed bicultural/bipolar clash between “Indian and Eurowestern ways” (p. 245). In its place, Justice proposes defining recognition in terms of kinship, which embeds one’s behaviour in a local matrix of relationships and tends to circumvent large-scale national policy (p. 245). Justice’s kinship model of recognition is inclusive. Relational and action-based, recognition supports the idea that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people might break from binaristic, fixed relations and, depending on movements in time and space, may be recognized through kinship rather than blood quantum or national frames. Justice’s notion of recognition builds upon Indigenous and non-Indigenous efforts to subvert colonialisit measures of controlling the populace by taking steps to transform the very meaning of cultural and community belonging.

Concomitantly, Indigenous activists, curators and artists continuously have been making specific calls for land-based and cultural sovereignty. Multiple Indigenous communities have been presenting ecological restorative measures that are premised upon localized and culturally-specific practices. For example, Oji-Cree Elder from the Wawakapewin First Nation, Simon Frogg articulates food sovereignty in terms of stories and teachings that have been passed down from generation to generation (Frogg, 2017, 35

Feminist scholars in the late 1990s and early 2000s distanced themselves from Fanon’s writings, citing gender bias and misogyny through omission. In recent years, Fanon’s writings regarding the colonizer-colonized have enjoyed a resurgence in popularity in critical race studies. However, at the same time African and Caribbean feminist scholars have voiced their concerns regarding Fanon’s representation of the colonized woman of colour. See Myriam Chancey (2015), “Subjectivity in motion: Caribbean women’s (dis)articulations of being from Fanon/Capécia to the Wonderful Adventures of Mrs. Seacole in Many Lands,” and Michelle Rowley (2010), “Whose time is it? Gender and humanism in contemporary Caribbean feminist advocacy.” For further reading on the heteronormativity of Fanon’s writings, see Jean-Paul Rocchi’s (2015), “Literature and meta-psychoanalysis of race: After and with Fanon.”
He describes processes of food security, preparation, and storage as being interlinked with specific characters in legends (p. X). Similarly, the Okanagan Nation Alliance efforts to rehabilitate the salmon run up the Columbia River passageway into Okanagan Lake is grounded upon traditional Syilx teachings that inexorably link human culture and survival to salmon life (Okanagan Nation Alliance, n.d.b). In a final example, between 2003 and 2009, Josephine Mandamin, Anishinaabe Elder and water activist from Manitoulin Island, walked the perimeters of all of the Great Lakes, more than 25 000km, to raise awareness of pollution in these bodies of water (Danard, 2013, p. 115). According to Debby Wilson Danard, Anishinaabe activist and education scholar from the Rainy River First Nation, who accompanied Grandmother Mandamin on part of this journey, in Anishinaabe teachings, it is the role and right of women to protect the water (p. 116). In keeping of Anishinaabe laws of lived mino-bimaadiziwin or the “good life,” women are tasked with care-taking for the water, while the men are placed in the position of tending to fire (Danard, 2013, p. 116). As Danard explains, the interplay of water and fire, and the respective responsibilities of women and men, is meant to create a balance for future generations (p. 116).

In artistic circles, land/culture-based notions of sovereignty are similarly enmeshed with creative critiques of reconciliation, colonization, and the presentation of cultural sovereignty. Indigenous scholars, activists, and artists have contested the workings and scope of the TRCC from its inception to the present day. Métis artist and scholar David Garneau argues that the proceedings of the TRCC too eerily replicate Catholic confessionals, so as to sustain rather than replace colonial ways of being (Garneau, 2012, p. 35). In his essay, “Imaginary spaces of conciliation and reconciliation,” Garneau contends that given the historical and religious entwinement of the word “reconciliation” to Catholicism, the sharing circles at the TRCC contribute “to ongoing assimilationist strategies of the Canadian empire” (p. 35). He suggests presenting alternative spaces of storytelling that privilege visual and tactile forms over the TRCC’s overreliance on text and speech (p. 37). In this regard, Tahltan First Nation performance artist and object-maker Peter Morin’s performance, this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land, parts 1&2, creates a space for contemplating the intergenerational spiritual and cultural costs of Indian residential schools upon the Indigenous body (Morin, 2016). Performed between April 27 and 28, 2013, at the tail-end of the national gathering of the TRCC in Montreal, Morin relies upon Tahltan land-based epistemologies to reimagine the proceedings as the movements of the Stikine River.
(2016, p. 70). Just as Tahlitan land has been shaped by the flows of the Stikine, Morin reinterprets the TRCC gathering as water movement rather than institutional crowd control (p. 70). In his performance on April 27, Morin reverses the power relations between the observed (residential school survivors) and the observer (scholars and experts on reconciliation), requesting that the experts themselves are put on show (p. 77). In the essay that accompanies the performance, *this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land*, Morin (2016) describes the displayed objects as active participants in witnessing the workings of the TRCC event and the lives of those who exceed the epistemological and political structuring of the Montreal gathering. Morin presents one of the diversely creative ways of contesting the reconstitution of colonial dynamics inherent in the TRCC.

Mohawk-Jewish curator, activist, and arts administrator Steve Loft begins his essay, “Reconciliation…really? From MacDonald to Harper: A legacy of colonial violence,” with a quote from past Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, who infamously stated, “Canada has no history of colonialism” (Loft, 2012, p. 41). In this essay, Loft argues that Canada has a “decidedly devious colonial history”, which includes “ongoing aggressive assimilation policies, willful and purposeful neglect and systemic emotional, spiritual, cultural and physical violence” (p. 41). In examining the impetus for the signing of treaties, Loft argues that the treaties were intended for establishing the agreement of obligations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous sovereign states (p. 42). He further links the formation of the *Indian Act* to Canada’s first Prime Minister, John A. MacDonald, and his expressed objective to assimilate Indigenous people into the British dominion (Loft, 2012, p. 44). Central to Loft’s argument is the notion that land-based Indigenous sovereignty had never been recognized in its own right to establish equal nation-to-nation agreements with the nascent nation-state of Canada. Instead, the treaty system and the *Indian Act* were both mechanisms through which the Canadian nation-state sought and continues to seek control over Indigenous ways of being, including the political and cultural structuring of society.

Kanien’kéha:ka-French artist and curator France Trépanier, and Indo-Canadian performance artist and cultural organizer Chris Creighton-Kelly discuss cultural sovereignty within the context of Indigenous self-governance (Trépanier & Creighton-Kelly, 2011, p. 41). Bringing together the knowledge of American Indian legal scholar, Rebecca Tsosie, and Blackfoot-Cree curator, Gerald McMaster, Trépanier and Creighton-Kelly understand cultural sovereignty to be the enactments of Indigenous
people taking control over the intangible aspects of culture, objects, and ceremonies, which had been prohibited in the past due to colonially emplaced laws that were meant to enforce the assimilation of Indigenous life into the Canadian nation-state (2011, p. 42). Cree-Métis/French/German/Polish multimedia artist, curator, and scholar, Cheryl L’Hirondelle demonstrates the uncontainability of Indigenous people’s movements and cultural knowledge in the public performative intervention, *Uronnndnland* (L’Hirondelle, Jimmy, & Bose, 2012). In *Uronnndnland*, L’Hirondelle contemplates the interweaving of Indigenous languages to the land as she writes welcome signs in Cree syllabics using stones found upon the landscape (2012, p. 103). In a conversation with Secwepemc-N’laka pamux artist, Chris Bose, and Thunderbird First Nation curator and philosopher, Elwood Jimmy, L’Hirondelle voices her trepidation of writing in Cree syllabics as she passes through Ktunaxa territory (p. 103). Her expressed unease leads into a discussion of the different kinds of reconciliation that are at play in the nation-to-nation remembering of past conflicts between Indigenous peoples from different territories (L’Hirondelle, Jimmy, & Bose, 2012, p. 104).

Land-based and cultural sovereignty are often entwined as are the practices to articulate Indigenous claims to the land. In the discussions above, two kinds of nationhood are presented. Land-based nationhood and state-based nationhood are differences in kind. The former situates nationhood as an outcome of a sense of permanent territorial presence, while the latter establishes a sense of sociopolitical permanence through the inscription of British law to enforce how bodies must move within the borders of the Canadian nation-state. In this regard, I wish to point out the challenges of different First Nations to build respectful nation-to-nation conversations with the federal and provincial levels of Canadian governance. Within the historical context of broken treaty promises (Alfred, 2009; Coulthard, 2014; Loft, 2012; Manuel & Derrickon, 2015; Palmater, 2011) and the illegalization of traditional cultural practices (Battiste & Henderson, 2000; First Peoples’ Cultural Council, 2014; Trépanier & Creighton-Kelly, 2011), Indigenous nation-building and the development of land-based nationalism often seem to be outcomes of multi-pronged confrontations against Canadian nationhood. This nationalism is further complicated by supra-national bodies such as the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), whose purpose is to represent the demands and lives of different First Nations in the consolidation of nation-to-nation conversations with the federal government. Yet the AFN has come under fire for acquiescing to federal policies due to its economic dependence upon the federal
government for its continued existence (Assembly of First Nations Renewal Commission, 2005; Manuel & Derrickson, 2015; Tomiak, 2016).

At the same time, in Canada, the potential for increased xenophobic violence against racialized groups and exacerbated systemic discrimination against Indigenous communities is of pressing concern. The uncritical conceptualization of colonization as statically “Western” and White fails to take into consideration how state apparatu ses of nation-building and identity formation sustain unwitting or intentional bifurcations of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. In her essay, “Migrants and Indigenous Nationalism,” human migrant studies scholar, Nandita Sharma (2013) argues that Indigenous calls for sovereignty are premised upon thereby reify state-sanctioned notions of national identity and belonging. Expressing concern that “autochthonous” or Indigenous calls for national liberation simultaneously homogenize and pit Indigenous people against non-Indigenous others (p. 229), Sharma calls into question the blanket complicity with which racialized and specifically migrant people are collapsed into the “settler identity” within ongoing Canadian-state colonization (Sharma, 2013; Sharma & Wright, 2008). She argues that “indigenous nationalism” is premised upon a “territorialized understanding of colonization and imperialism” (p. 225), which creates strong boundaries between us (indigenous) and them (all others). In her analysis, Sharma attempts to show that “indigenous nationalism” land-based nationalism and calls for self-determination replicate neo-liberal strategies to make territorial claims to the land in the form of border politics (p. 230). In strong contestations of nation-state attempts to acquire and retain control over the land, Sharma fears that those identified as “indigenous” will cast all migrants into the role of colonizing settler. Building upon her previous and ongoing research in migrant and diasporic studies, Sharma develops her defence of migrant workers in response to Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua’s provocative essay, “Decolonizing Antiracism”, (2005) in which they declare that “people of colour are settlers” (p. 134).

I share Sharma’s concerns about how those who are passing through might become immobilized into a static political position or identity vis-à-vis in strong articulations of Indigenous sovereignty. However, I am also cautious about her presented perspective. First, in her critiques of ‘indigenous nationalism,” Sharma

36I have put quotations marks around the term indigenous to point out Sharma’s usage. Throughout the rest of the thesis, Indigenous has been capitalized out of linguistic respect.
implicates all Indigenous people as holding a singular pronouncement of nationhood, one that excludes non-Native people. Second, along the same lines, Sharma collapses “indigenous nationalism” into “indigenous” sovereignty, not recognizing political scepticisms expressed by Indigenous scholars like Taiaiake Alfred, Vine Deloria Jr., and Joanne Barker, as discussed above. Third, Sharma does not consider why Indigenous political scientists might be compelled to present a strong stance on Indigenous recognition rights that exceed the nation-state frame. If only she would examine research that shows the continued and systemic discrimination against Indigenous people within nation-state structures (health, social and child welfare, education, etc.), then she might be more amenable to the idea that the expression of Indigenous nationalism might be a cumulative response to everyday experiences of racial and colonial regard.

Despite these criticisms, I am nonetheless grateful for Sharma’s explorations of transnational movements that exceed the national frame. She both inadvertently and deliberately opens discussions on multiple definitions and enactments of the terms: colonization, nationalism, and sovereignty. No singular account can adequately encapsulate how the one and the many attempt to negotiate within and live outside these highly contested political frames. In their collaboration, *Putting the Wild Back into the West*, Cree-Métis performance artist Lori Blondeau, and Siksika performance and installation artist, and painter Adrian Stimson move between different legal, educational, and arts institutions to play political dress-up. In these interventions, they invite attendees to snap a photo with them in “Cowboys and Indians” drag to generate discussions about the misrepresentations, attempted assimilations of Indigenous peoples, and forced ceding of territory within the colonially grounded nation-state (Nanibush, 2014, p. 46). Blondeau and Stimson’s series of performances is politically scathing through the playful invitation for audience participation. And the audiences are mixed: Indigenous, non-Indigenous, long-established settlers, newcomers. This work calls into question Sharma’s stance that a nation-based notion of Indigenous sovereignty necessarily pits Indigenous against non-Indigenous people. Sharma, in raising her concerns, along with Blondeau and Stimson, who present alternative spaces for engaging with these difficult conversations, together open up the imaginary to have others to reflect more deeply upon what it might mean to pass through with respect to Indigenous communities, histories, and cosmologies.

The ever-changing nature of community belonging invigorates more creative ways of inverting power relationships that have been structured through European
colonialism in Canada. English studies scholar, David Jefferess (2008) suggests that political resistance need not be limited to a reactive and oppositional understanding. Just as Justice (2010) transforms the meaning of recognition, so too can ruminations of *appositional* resistance shed light on the potential of reconciliation to transform Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations in Canada. That is, resistance can be an outcome of different communities leaning in and recognizing commonalities that may serve to establish new collective formations. Jefferess argues that in S. Africa, reconciliation provided a new narrative for shaping identity and power which did not rely upon the interdependence and co-reconstruction of the colonizer-colonized relationship (p. 17). In Canada, in critical discussions regarding Indigenous demands for recognition in response to reconciliation discourses, spaces are created for engaging in much needed debate on the presuppositions and limitations of retaining strict boundaries between colonizer/colonized, Indigenous/settler, Indigenous/non-Indigenous, Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal, self/other. These discussions are crucial for breaking away from social and political habits and oppositional strategies employed by activists, community groups, and intellectuals that paradoxically reinforce the same system of colonial power.

Analyses of past redress initiatives by different cultural communities in Canada may shed further insights on the ways in which they may inadvertently contribute both to the maintenance of the Indigenous/settler binary and to its dissolution. Reflection upon past redress movements may illuminate the social habituations that shape the structuring and maintenance of ethno-nationally organized communities within the nation-state.

2.1.1.d Contextualizing the TRCC within the history of redress movements in Canada

The TRCC is framed within relatively recent historical and political contexts in which conservative governments have formally apologized for the oppression of politically racialized minority groups in Canada. Critics of the previous Conservative administration have argued that such gestures are antithetical to Prime Minister Harper’s denial that Canada has a colonial legacy (Henderson & Wakeham, 2009; Rice & Snyder, 2008). English and literature scholar, Jennifer Henderson and English and writing studies scholar, Pauline Wakeham (2009), who have written extensively on reconciliation in relation to political redress in Canada, argue that these apologies are rhetorical strategies to reinstate Canada as a benevolent and stable nation on the international
stage, in the hopes of securing political and economic investments from other nation-states (p. 3). Derek Rasmussen (2001), peace eco-activist and former policy advisor for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, argues that Harper’s wish to “close a sad chapter” in Canadian history signifies forgiveness as a mode of forgetting the past, to remove facts from an otherwise unembellished history. According to Rasmussen, the will to forget comes in the form of a fiscally cautious apology and negotiated minimal compensation. He argues that reconciliation to forget is a tactic by Europeans to assert colonialist claims on land that is not theirs. In accepting Rasmussen’s thesis on forgiving as a form of forgetting, it becomes important to analyze how demands for apologies sought by other cultural communities might unintentionally establish adversarial relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

In Canada, how might present reconciliation initiatives between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people divide potential solidarities between Indigenous and other cultural communities, based on past and present immigrant claims against the nation-state? Briefly, I argue that the redress movement of Japanese-Canadians in the 1980s, and the Chinese-Canadian call for a formal apology for the Head Tax, create collective identity formations that might inadvertently contradict Indigenous movements for sovereignty. The Japanese-Canadian redress is politically significant in that it was the first time that Canadian citizens were granted an official federal apology for race-based discrimination, setting legal and discursive precedence for others pursuing similar grievances (Henderson & Wakeham, 2013, pp. 5-6). According to post-colonial scholar Lily Cho (2013), the Chinese-Canadian Head Tax redress is distinct from other movements in its future as well as past-oriented focus on addressing historical wrongs committed against an identified minority group (p. 88). Both the Japanese and Chinese redress movements centralize the importance of equal citizenship in seeking reparations from the federal government (Cho, 2013; Miki, 2004). Within a transnational context, current political tensions between Japan and China are based in part on Japan’s refusal to redress past atrocities committed in the name of Japanese imperialism across Asia up to and during the Second Sino-Japanese War (Cabri, 2013). These tensions serve as a significant backdrop in reflecting upon the possible inter-relational consequences of making culturally homogenized calls for justice and equal regard within the Canadian context. I will return to this final point after discussing briefly the Japanese- and Chinese-
Canadian redress movements, respectively.\(^{37}\)

In *Redress: Inside the Japanese Canadian Call for Justice*, Japanese-Canadian poet and English studies professor-Emeritus, Roy Miki (2004) describes the challenges of mobilizing Japanese-Canadians to make demands on the federal government to redress the abrogation of their citizenship rights during World War II in Canada. Miki talks about the complicated intergenerational effects of the Canadian Government’s racist policies, which divided identity formation between first- (issei), second- (nisei), and third-generation (sansei) Japanese-Canadians. He states that identity became a trap during internment through the racialization of Japanese-Canadians as “enemy aliens” in Canada and “Canadian foreigner” in Japan (p. 102). The nisei began to redefine themselves by putting emphasis on being Canadian over Japanese (Miki, 2004, p. 106), while the sansei grew up in the silence and shame of their nisei parents, vowing to resolve past injustices (Miki, 2004, p. 149).

As a key organizer of the redress movement, Miki (2004) discusses at length the increasing need to develop a new kind of collective identity that would hinge upon rights to citizenship rather than shared victimization (p. 236). Redress had the potential to “disturb complacency and rechannel traumatic memories” of property confiscation and internment in the Japanese-Canadian imaginary (Miki, 2004, p. 253). He argues that the success of the redress movement to negotiate a settlement and receive a formal apology in the House of Commons was built upon the premise that Japanese-Canadians were citizens situated within the nation. As citizens, they were entitled to make demands for changes to the democratic system in order to prevent further instances of racially
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motivated harms in contravention of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Miki, 2004, p. 235). In post-colonial terms, redress was a collective movement by Japanese-Canadians to resist political erasure. It disturbed the federal governments’ (both Liberal and Conservative administrations) calculation of power and produced new spaces of subaltern signification (Bhabha, 1994). In so doing, however, Miki (2011) speculates that the success of the movement led to the swallowing up of Japanese-Canadian identity into the nation-state, through the gains that were made in the name of citizenship rights.

In the current climate of reconciliation in Canada, concerns are raised as to the ways in which the redress of Japanese-Canadians and the collectivization of identity produce a sense of cultural nihilism and closure, which potentially strike up against Indigenous calls for sovereignty. As Anishinaabe activist, Garnet Angeconeb and Anishinaabe writer, Kateri Akiwenzie-Damn (2008) argue, the parameters set by the TRCC to address only residential school experiences fail to take into consideration the larger project of assimilation that continues to preoccupy the nation-state. Thus, the call for Indigenous sovereignty rights is a demand to exist outside and in equal measure to the Canadian nation (Justice, 2010). Miki (2011) suggests that the redress movement can point away from static notions of a historically framed Japanese-Canadian identity toward a more spiritual contemplation of how redress can inform future transformations of intra-state and new-state relationships that extend beyond cultural lines.

Sociology scholar, Renisa Mawani (2009) investigates the colonial proximities between Indigenous and Chinese migrants at the turn of the 19th Century in British Columbia. Her key objective is “to determine what these crossracial encounters and legal and non-legal efforts to suppress Indigenous and Chinese contact might reveal about the inconsistent, contradictory, and ambiguous racial truths that colonial bureaucracies produced and on which colonialism flourished” (p. 9). Mawani argues that during the periods between 1871-1921, the Canadian government, and White settler society at large, was dealing with two sets of racial anxieties: internal anxieties against Indigenous people and external anxieties against Chinese migrants. Drawing upon Homi Bhabha’s (1994) notion of colonial contact zones, Mawani argues that colonial epistemologies were built upon contingencies and conflicts imbedded in knowledge making (p. 27). She argues that within a colonialist political discourse, insiders – Indigenous people – were deemed capable of being assimilated; whereas, outsiders – Chinese migrants – posed a threat to the racial integrity of European-based nation-building. Mawani goes on to show that despite efforts by White citizens and the
provincial government to separate mixing between Indigenous and Chinese people, there existed contact zones where all three groups interacted.

Mawani’s (2009) research provides insight into the historical context of Harper’s apology to Chinese Canadians in 2006 for past Head Tax legislations and the Chinese Exclusion Act, which effectively terminated migration from China into Canada during the mid-1900s until the late 1960s (Dyzenhaus & Moran, 2005). While separated by only two years, Harper’s respective apologies for the Head Tax and for the legacy of Indian Residential Schools might prima facie appear to create a sense of sameness in terms of the government’s benevolent regard toward its current citizenry. Yet, Mawani’s comprehensive analysis demands deeper contemplation of the legal and social regulation of bodies within prescribed geopolitical spaces that may reinvigorate the separation of Chinese and Indigenous interrelationships, brought about through years of social habituation. In short, processes of redressing past collective wrongs against differently racialized groups in Canada may actually reinscribe nation-state policies and unexpected incidences of controlling its population.

It is important to keep in mind that in examining the separate Japanese and Chinese calls for justice within the Canadian context, political interrelationships between members of these ethnic communities both exceed and inflect current calls for reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. In the spirit of the forthcoming national gathering of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Indian Residential Schools in Vancouver in September 2013, on December 09, 2012, the Joy Kogawa House hosted a 75th year anniversary commemoration of the atrocities committed by the Japanese imperialist army in Nanjing during the Second World War (Norimatsu, 2013). Satoko Norimatsu (2013), Director of the Peace Philosophy Centre in Vancouver, B.C., lauds the gathering as a step toward addressing ongoing political tensions between China and Japan. At the Kogawa House gathering, reconciliation discourse from the TRCC was used as an impetus for bridging China-Japan relations within a Canadian context, and to set an example for Japanese nationals to take proper responsibility for war crimes perpetrated against other Asian peoples (Campbell, 2012; Chu, 2013). The commemoration of the Nanjing massacre in Vancouver, B.C., reinforces the nation-state foundations upon which reconciliatory efforts are negotiated and enacted, validating Canada as neutral and peaceful grounds upon which such negotiations can take place (Chu, 2013; Norimatsu, 2013). It also demonstrates that cultural-political collective memories traverse Canada’s national borders. Ongoing
political tensions between China and Japan bring to the fore the complexity of interactions that concurrently take place in Canada: shared yet separate experiences of racist legislation that creates a homogenized sense of the cultural other; collective calls to redress past wrongs that build upon as well as estrange one group from the other; intergenerational enmity between Chinese and Japanese people; everyday interactions between these communities that exceed political and cultural affiliations. In one’s occupation with the morass of history and interrelations, what kind of witnesses do members of these communities become in relationship to Indigenous and non-Indigenous interactions? I will respond to this question at length throughout the thesis.

First, I wish to present examples of antiracism activist collaborations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people that reach beyond the particularities of ethnic homogeneity. In one’s occupation with the morass of history and interrelations, what kind of witnesses do members of these communities become in relationship to Indigenous and non-Indigenous people that reach beyond the particularities of ethnic homogeneity.

In Canada, collective demands for recognition do not necessarily divide different communities of colour. Inversely, longstanding discrimination against Indigenous people and people of colour have compelled them to work together. Activist groups such as No One Is Illegal\(^38\) (NOII) and Idle No More\(^39\) (INM) are among contemporary examples of collaborations that take place across cultural and national affiliations. These movements bring to the public imaginary strong platforms for espousing inclusive politics, heterotopic approaches to resisting nation-state-based control of human relations, and mobilizing at the grassroots level (Barker, 2015; Coates, 2015; Kino-nda-niimi Collective, 2014; Morris, 2013; Nyers, 2010; Stierl, 2012; Wotherspoon & Hansen, 2013). While I do not have the space to provide a comprehensive comparison between these movements, I wish to emphasize both their respective strengths and limitations. The NOII movement has been lauded in its longevity to fight for the rights of refugees, migrant workers, and diasporic communities across the globe (Nyers, 2010). Founded in Germany in 1997, NOII movements located primarily across Europe and North America have continued their anti-racist, no-border platform to raise public knowledge of the plights of migrants, those forcibly dispersed for political and/or environmental reasons and seeking asylum in a new country (Stierl, 2012). The overall mandate of NOII is to represent the voices and

\(^{38}\)For the original No One is Illegal International manifesto (No One Is Illegal UK, 2003), please see: http://www.noii.org.uk/no-one-is-illegal-manifesto/. Since then regional NOII chapters have also established place-specific mandates. In Canada, NOII chapters are found in Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver.

subjectivity of those whose presence in the landing country is precarious and prone to removal simply for not having landed status (Nyers, 2010, p. 131). Interestingly, from the success of the longevity of NOII movement arise key limitations. While the representations of needs of migrant workers, new immigrants, and refugee-status seeking communities are meant to democratically counter top-down statist measures for population control, the NOII manifesto’s declarative and prescriptive stances and methodologies for challenging immigration and border surveillance tend to situate power in the hands of key organizing players. Furthermore, although organizers may have a longstanding commitment to the NOII movement, migration issues tend to be focused on acute emergencies and immediacy of border politics in concentrated urban centres. Concerns that arise with regard to the dispersal of migrants from densely urbanized into suburban and rural environments are not adequately addressed in urban-centric movements such as NOII. As a result, what Mississauga Nishnaabeg writer and independent scholar, Leanne Simpson (2011) critically identifies as a “western theoretically constructed notions of resistance, mobilization, and social movements” fail to fully appreciate the complexity for declaring such resurgences (pp. 15-16).

The Idle No More (INM) movement contrasts with NOII primarily through its adherence to politically site-specific and non-hierarchical approaches to contesting federal policies on the environment, to improving the welfare of vulnerable Indigenous communities, and to building a nation-to-nation relationship with Canada (Kino-nda-niimi Collective, 2014, p. 22). Initially mobilized in late 2012 by four women in Saskatchewan, INM has become a global phenomenon, drawing upon ancient, ancestral traditions of the local area alongside raising issues that speak across language, histories, and national borders such as: environmental guardianship, resisting ongoing colonialism, and Indigenous sovereignty rights (Kino-nda-niimi Collective, 2014; Wotherspoon & Hansen, 2013). The focus is on developing stronger kinship relations in the local sphere and
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40For example, in the mid-1990s, anthropological research of Vietnamese refugees in Canada attested to the complexity and ethnic heterogeneity of those who settled in smaller urban and rural areas of the country. The long-term issues that arose are not adequately considered in NOII mandates (Stephenson, 1995). Another informative comparative mental health study of Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian refugees reveals the long-term psychological effects on mental health from the experiences of forced evacuation and life in refugee camps (Chung & Kagawa-Singer, 1993). For a comprehensive overview of the mental health assessment of Southeast Asian landed immigrants, please see Morton Beiser’s (2009) longitudinal study, “Resettling refugees and safeguarding their mental health: Lessons learned from the Canadian Refugee Resettlement Project.”
recognizing when such kinships resonate with similar collectivizations elsewhere. Secondly, in contrast to the urban centrism of NOII, INM gatherings have taken place from the smallest towns to the largest city centres throughout Turtle Island (Kino-ndaniimi Collective, 2014; Wood, 2015). Third, the movement has been lauded for the use of social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook to organize and engage a wider public, which reveals the geo-political scatter of the movement, from highly urbanized environments to remote communities (Barker, 2015; Coates, 2015; Wood, 2015).

Similar to NOII, the strengths of INM are its limitations. INM has been criticized for its heterotopic approaches and mandates that could at times come into conflict. For example, INM tactics such as the use of blockades at the Canada-US border were called into question publicly by other organizers who were located elsewhere (Barker, 2015). Independent scholar Adam Barker (2015) suggests that such strategies were oppositional to more community-based approaches to challenging systemic oppression of Indigenous people (p. 49). By late 2013, INM momentum seemed to have withered, compelling Taiaiake Alfred to declare that the movement did not do enough to make demands for Indigenous sovereignty and building kinship with the land (Morris, 2013, p. 255). Another common critique of INM comes from Indigenous activists and scholars who counter the very notion that Indigenous people had been idle until the formation of the movement. L. Jane McMillan, Janelle Young, and Molly Peters (2013) state that the Mi’kmaq, Maliseet, and other Indigenous nations in Atlantic Canada had constantly been resisting colonial oppression for hundreds of years (McMillan, Young, & Peters, 2013, p. 429). In a creative commentary on Indigenous activism and subsequently INM, the exhibit, *Ghost Dance*, curated by Mohawk-Jewish intellectual and organizer, Steve Loft (2013), presents INM in the context of a historical legacy of resistance against colonization, assimilation, and erasure of Indigenous people across Canada and the U.S. 41

The shortcomings of NOII and INM can be understood in a constructive rather than obstructive manner. That NOII does not move beyond the language of acute emergency and urban-centrism, and that INM’s bottom-up grassroots methodologies might be the source of its political deceleration, point toward the need to shift foci and practices. In this vein, Alfred’s declaration that INM did not go far enough to address
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41 *Ghost Dance: Activism. Resistance. Art.* (Loft, 2013) was shown at the Ryerson Image Centre from September 18 - December 15, 2013. For more information, please see http://www.ryerson.ca/ric/exhibitions/GhostDance.html.
Indigenous issues (Morris, 2013, p. 255) is meant to provoke greater, more thoroughly investigated and sustainable actions rather than to foreclose expanding the scope and reach of the respective mandates of both movements.

How can such profound political transformations take place so that the one group does not become absorbed into the other? Although the TRCC and other reconciliation initiatives between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities are sufficient in their critical mass and attention to these matters, I believe that there is still a need for envisioning a new state of affairs in understanding and effectively complicating these binaristic interactions. In the ensuing discussion, I will answer this question by looking to the language of witnessing, because through witnessing one might be motivated to not just thoughtlessly follow, but to experience with new sights, sounds, movement, and taste, innovative ways of respecting the multiplicity of self and other. At this point, I hope to have demonstrated the importance of constructively critiquing the concept of reconciliation in Canada, rather than opting to immediately abandon the term. Abandonment would disrespect the lives of those who are deeply invested in reconciliation to narrativize their healing journeys from Indian Residential Schools, colonization, and institutionalized social inequities that persist in Canada today. The challenge now is to draw wisdom from these experiences to develop appositional strategies that will transform relationships to create ruptures in the enduring legacies of European colonial rule.

2.2 Witnessing

I argue that the language of witnessing generates new perspectives for reimagining Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations that necessarily complicate political and culturally solipsistic calls for justice. In obfuscating cultural membership and political alliance building through the multifarious possibilities of witnessing, I hope to reveal the socio-political habits, assumptions, expectations, sedimented conceptualizations, and prejudices involved in sustaining strict divisions between culturally determined notions of self and other.

An exploration of witnessing is invaluable in critiquing the parameters of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Indian Residential Schools and the institutionalization of reconciliation initiatives in Canada. In light of the cultural collectivization of trauma, which may give rise to apathy, overmapping of empathy, and/or the revictimization of Indigenous communities, it is important to investigate in greater critical and creative depth the conditions and methods of witnessing that occur between those who
respectively identify as Indigenous and non-Indigenous. A more sophisticated understanding of witnessing will provide profound insights into the ways the TRCC frames and regulates the manner in which communities attempt to grapple with this legacy. As well, it will provide novel ways of expressing intercultural and social engagements that depart from the conceptualized binaries of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships.

2.2.1 TRCC and the role of witnessing

As part of the Indian Residential School (IRS) Settlement Agreement, the TRCC has built into its mandate the appointment and presence of honorary witnesses during reconciliation gatherings. Accordingly, the role of the honorary witness is to “witness, support, promote and facilitate truth and reconciliation events at both the national and community levels” (TRCC, n.d.). Derived from various Indigenous notions of witnessing, honorary witnesses have the responsibility of reporting back to their own communities that which was witnessed during TRCC national gatherings and events.

Whether expressed as naïve empathy or a refusal to participate, the witnessing of TRCC proceedings highlights the complex and ambivalent relationships that exist between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada. Former Director of Research for the TRCC, Paulette Regan (2010) suggests that the “empathetic witness,” far from being emplaced in the desired morally virtuous position from which the suffering other is viewed, is in danger of reestablishing unequal power relationships and political binaries between self and other (p. 172). Regan argues that in Canada, the power of dominant-culture hegemony lies in its invisibility such that violence (whether symbolic, structural, or spiritual) is disguised in seemingly neutral dispute resolution tactics that are meant to appease Aboriginal calls for justice (p. 114). In such a politically unequal setting, Regan is apprehensive that settlers (non-Aboriginal people) will look upon Aboriginal persons with what she describes as “colonial empathy” (p. 174). In other words, the testimonial exchange may promote and fix Aboriginal people as victims in relation to the assumed benevolent peacemaker position of the settler state. Meanwhile, social scientists Ravi de Costa and Tom Clark’s (2011) investigation of multigenerational immigrant community responses to the TRCC reconciliation gatherings has revealed prejudices and hesitancy in participating at national and regional events and informal

initiatives. More research is needed to understand why and how responses of apathy, hostility, reluctance, and instances of distanced empathy, which extend beyond Regan’s critique of the “empathetic witness,” are shaped.

2.2.2 Human Rights Frameworks of Witnessing

A human rights approach to witnessing is premised upon a cognitive framework of knowledge (Frosh & Pinchevski, 2009; Hesford, 2004). It describes the world as it is knowable and reasoned through one’s normative and narrative framing. Knowledge sits within the individual and is ready for use when one is called to action. Amnesty International commercials on television speak specifically to each viewer, demanding personal responses to be engaged, enraged, and active in the fight against human rights abuses worldwide (www.amnesty.org/).

Critics of this approach question the cognitive and individual biases that are embedded in human rights discourses on witnessing. First, they counter-argue that the body also serves as a vital site of knowledge and memory. British art historian and scholar, Annie Coombes (2011) discusses how women of colour in South Africa, who were incarcerated for crimes committed against the apartheid state, demonstrated how memory-making focused on relational over fixed notions of bodies in space (p. S98).

Likewise, English professor, Sarah Brophy (2004) describes her friend, artist Derek Jarman’s creative efforts to deal with the shock of changes to his body as it was painfully transformed by the HIV virus. In his chronicling, Jarman witnessed the conflicting experiences of a weakening, wasting body and his heightened perceptions of pain, taste, and a sense of tactile connectedness with other men living with AIDS (Brophy, 2004, pp. 56-58). Jarman’s testimony also pointed towards the collective and intersubjective nature of knowledge.
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Coombes (2011) discusses at length a curated show at the Women’s Jail in Johannesburg, SA that expressed how women’s life plans were not met because of the apartheid regime. Women who had at one time been incarcerated at the jail for apartheid related ‘crimes’ were asked to return to the site and install their memories. What was striking about their installations was that their memories were not linked to the space itself but to their imagination of what might have been had they not been incarcerated. For more information please see Coombes’ (2011), “Witnessing History/Embodying Testimony: Gender and Memory in Post-Apartheid South Africa.”
asserts that collective memory does not exist (p. 85). She argues that all memory is individual and irreproducible; it dies with each person (p. 85). For Sontag, remembering is, therefore, an individually experienced ethical act of witnessing that creates one’s only relation to the dead (p. 115). In contrast, communications scholar Barbie Zelizer (1998) argues that unlike personal memories that fade, collective memories increase with time, taking on new complications, nuances, and interests. They allow for the fabrication, rearrangement, elaboration, and omission of details about the past, often casting aside accuracy and authenticity in order to accommodate broader issues of identity formation, power and authority, and political affiliation. English studies scholar, Ana Douglass and American and comparative literature scholar, Thomas Vogler (2003) also insist that collective memory is more metaphysical than personal (p. 16). It is an intensely shared communal experience, which they warn can lead to the sedimentation of values and adherence to inflexible identities that hinder living in the present (Douglass & Vogler, 2003, pp. 18-19).

Collective and individual memories, and knowledges in general, are expressed as differences in kind rather than scope (Kennedy, 2008). Individual experiences cannot simply be collated in order to explain collective knowledges (Blocker, 2009; Douglass & Vogler, 2003, Feldman, 2004; Weine, 1996). The consideration of bodily and collective knowledge creates new perspectives on how human rights approaches to addressing gross violations and disasters have been restrictively framed; they tend to oversimplify the socio-political contexts of both the witness and the sufferer. The issue remains, however, whether the concept of witnessing, which has greatly expanded in the critical investigation of knowledge about the historical past, can have any effect on traditional notions that are strenuously linked to religious and legal heritages.

A persistent definition of witnessing is that it is comprised of active and passive elements and heavily imbued with strong religious and legal connotations. In current law practices in Western Europe and North America, witnesses are expected to provide objective and disinterested reporting of an event under the court of law (Frisch, 2004; Heaton-Armstrong, 2006). The reliability of their testimony hinges upon the presentation of facts over their moral character and social standing (Frisch, 2004). Within religious settings, witnessing is a complex term that contains both passive and active elements, which allude to testimony and martyr, respectively (Whitman, 2008; Frisch, 2004). The passive elements include the intake of an event, either through seeing or listening, and one’s participation in the form of intimate or direct presence. The active aspect of
witnessing refers to the actions, including suffering, that follows from the observations that have been made (Whitman, 2008; Peters, 2001).

Religious, legal, and quasi-legal conceptions of witnessing can inform, and be informed, by an expanded understanding of its practice. The religious conception of witnessing provides a surprisingly useful message in our present responses to the distant suffering of others. During the Middle Ages, witnesses in Europe were threatened under the pain of death of the Judicial Ordeal. Briefly, those who were called forward to testify were subject to the wrath of God in the event that their testimonies were proven false (Whitman, 2008, pp. 53-55). Interestingly this “pain of death” serves as a potent reminder to slow down one’s judgments on human rights violations, gross atrocities, and disasters that take place elsewhere. In placing the real and factual in doubt, witnesses who are far removed from the suffering of others would be remiss not to take heed of these warnings. English studies scholar, Arabella Lyon and Communication Studies scholar, Lester Olson’s (2011) thorough analysis of human rights rhetoric, concerns are raised as to the delusions of moral grandeur that mire the spectator’s capacities to act ethically and meaningfully in collaboration with the identified sufferer (p. 206). Although the “wrath of the Lord” may not fall upon spectating witnesses themselves, in their intentions to react and act swiftly – that is, enact the active aspect of witnessing – they are in danger of adding to rather than reducing the suffering of distant others.

The legal understanding of witnessing itself has evolved over time. According to historian, Andrea Frisch (2004), in feudal France, ethical witnessing was prioritized over epistemic witnessing (pp. 15-16). The social standing of the witness, rather than the facticity of the presented information, served as grounds to justify the veracity of the testimony. In this sense, the ethical witness was entrenched in society and inextricably linked to the addressee. In turn, the addressee was a co-author, and not merely the eventual recipient of the discourse (Frisch, 2004, pp. 32-33). Testimony at that time was not considered a monological concept but a dialogical and social one. Frisch states that at present, Holocaust Studies has had a profound impact on emphasizing the first-
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44 The Judicial Ordeal is the judgment of God. Witnesses were put to physical tests of their moral and epistemic integrity; survival was a testament to their moral and spiritual purity. Judicial ordeals included trials such as: “swallowing tests” of the Eucharist (materials, stones) without choking; arms outstretched before the cross until one could no longer maintain the pose; forcing the accused to walk on the hand of the corpse and if the hand bled the accused was proven guilty; trial by combat usually with high status persons. These ordeals have come to be known as prime examples of barbarism in medieval times (Whitman, 2008).
person nature of testimony. On the contrary, in medieval France, the witness often provided a second-person perspective and did not have to be present at the event in order to qualify to give testimony (Frisch, 2004, p. 62). In privileging ethical over epistemic witnessing, testimony was transmitted primarily as hearsay, presupposing human mediators in intersubjective dialogue (Frisch, 2004, p. 75).

Today, juridical recognition of collective testimonies and consequently the increasing importance of the traditional valuation of hearsay might lead to a reversal in the current prioritizing of epistemic over ethical witnessing. In Canada, the case of Delgamuukw v. the Queen (Napoleon, 2005) brought to national attention the need to recognize Indigenous oral testimonies as a valid form of knowledge. Specifically, in Delgamuukw v. the Queen, the Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en Nations argued for adherence to the adaawk as an official form of providing testimony in European-devised courts of law. According to Saulteau First Nations law scholar, Val Napoleon (2005), the greatest hurdle in the trial for the Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en people was the evidence rule against hearsay. Initially, in the British Columbian court, Chief Justice Allan McEachern discounted oral testimony of the adaawk, citing it as an insufficient accounting for the Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en peoples’ claims to the land. However, the Supreme Court overruled McEachern’s decision to exclude the adaawk, setting a legal precedent for acknowledging Indigenous legal structures and oral testimony within Canadian judicial proceedings (Napolean, 2005). This case study is important for the current discussion because community-based and collective witnessing brings to bear the over-individuated paths to disclosing truths, which dominate proceedings in Canadian courts of law. The Supreme Court decision to include the adaawk is one step toward recognizing the social and dialogical aspects of witnessing that have been treated with suspicion and lay hidden in modern legal practices in Canada.

Finally, in quasi-legal settings such as the South African Truth and Reconciliation
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45 In Delgamuukw v. the Queen, the Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en peoples were fighting for treaty rights to their traditional lands in the British Columbian interior (Napolean, 2005). For more information, please see Napolean’s (2005) essay, “Delgamuukw: A Legal Straightjacket for Oral Histories?”.

46 Oral testimonies of the adaawk were used as the primary means of providing evidence for Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en claims to rightful occupation of the land. The adaawk is the legal structure, which preserves the identification and the conceptual foundation of the House of Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en Nations. The adaawk links Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en people and their histories through the designation of cultural representatives who are tasked with protecting and passing the knowledge to forthcoming generations (Napolean, 2005).
Commission, new articulations of witnessing trouble the definitive split between its passive and active elements. Anthropologist and communication studies scholar, Allen Feldman (2004) describes the antiphonic nature of witnessing during community hearings across South Africa. According to Feldman, antiphonic witnessing involves a shudder as a form of a call and response. He argues that women of colour took to the stand not as traumatized individuals but as representatives of extensive networks of filiation and symbolic kinship (p. 176). Their presence in the courts as listeners completed the act of witnessing. In traditional European conceptualizations, listening is considered the passive uptake of knowledge. However, this example, like the case of Delgamuukw vs. the Queen (Napoleon, 2005), shows that collective witnessing includes a series of acts committed by a group of people. It also establishes mourning as a collective event rather than an individual psychological experience. While the court-like structures of the community hearings initially imposed a European legalistic framework, the way South Africans participated and performed in those spaces diminished the structural constraints, creating new sites for remembering and honouring the dead (Feldman, 2004).

What are the political implications of disconnecting witnessing from acting? If we adhere to the passive/active decoupling of witnessing, then within a human rights framework, witnessing raises continuous albeit important issues of voyeurism, apathy, and over-empathizing with the distant suffering other. Human rights activists then have legitimate grounds for accusing witnesses of sitting on knowledge, and not following through by taking immediate action. Politically and ethically, witnessing the distanced, distressed other can be so overwhelming as to create the other as an unreality, some place or person too foreign to fall within the scope of one’s understanding.

Alternatively, if witnessing is understood as a series of complex actions that involves many different kinds of participation, then a human rights framework itself can be critically analyzed from multiple states of being. In recognizing that witnessing includes constructions of reality, mediations of knowledge, and the limits of representations, it is important to examine thoroughly the apparent clarity and narrative simplicity of human rights agendas. The political implication of raising these questions is to instill a sense of response-ability (or the ability to respond) in those who are either interested or uninterested in intervening in distant human rights violations and catastrophes. What abilities do individuals and groups have to respond with ethical regard for others, knowing full well that distant sufferers can never be wholly
epistemically and existentially contained through politicized media representations? Perhaps other traditions and practices will provide insight into the limitations and scope of human rights frameworks of witnessing.

2.2.3 Indigenous acts of witnessing: Fostering relationships

Witnessing has long been practiced in West Coast Salish communities in the land currently named British Columbia (Bleck, Dodds, & Williams, 2014; Christian, 1998; Thompson, 2002). In the Squamish First Nation, witnessing is a legally binding ceremony and sacred honour in which the appointed witness has the responsibility for speaking upon request as a historical record of past events (Bleck, Dodds, & Williams, 2014; Christian, 1998; Koptie, 2009). For the Squamish peoples, the witness ceremony has been in practice for over 8000 years, creating enduring oral histories that are passed from generation to generation (Thompson, 2002).

My interest in West Coast Salish protocols on witnessing has arisen, in part, in response to Indigenous demands for a systemic overhaul of how research is conducted on and with Indigenous people (Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008). Recall Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) contention that Western ideas of time and space are encoded in philosophy, language, and science, stating further that Western classifications of space have led to the colonization of Indigenous spaces (pp. 52-53). Smith argues that educational institutions are inextricably linked to European imperialist valuations and organization of knowledge. Therefore, the challenge is to find new ways of engaging Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities that are grounded in Indigenous frameworks.

Blackfoot scholar Leroy Little Bear (2012) goes further to differentiate Western

47Coast Salish protocols and witnessing are distinct from testimonios. Testimonios comprise a genre of truth-telling narratives, which have emerged from Latin America. Usually told in the first-person, they are often presented as a means to represent voices that are otherwise oppressed within a society. These narratives tend to be infused with specific political and activist mandates that aim to change the authority of oral over written testimony. Testimonios originated from Mestiza Indigenous actors in Latin America, who often raise issues regarding forced removal from and the expropriation of land, colonial and ongoing political violence. For more information, please see: C. Susana Caxaj’s (2015) essay, “Indigenous storytelling and PAR: Allies toward decolonization? Reflections from the Peoples’ International Health Tribunal”; Linda Maier & Isabel Dulfano’s anthology (2004), Woman as Witness: Essays on Testimonial Literature by Latin American Women; Mario T. García (2015), The Chicano Generation: Testimonios of the Movement; Luis I. Prádanos & Leonardo E. Figueroa Helland’s (2015) essay, “How to listen to Pachamama’s testimonio: Lessons from Indigenous voices”; Michelle Téllez’s (2016) essay, “Arizona: A reflection and conversation on the migrant rights movement, 2015”.
and traditional Indigenous knowledge in terms of their respective relationships to space and time. He contends that Western forms of knowledge production prioritize time, whereas Indigenous knowing is spatially oriented and action-based (pp. 522-523). According to Little Bear, the Western conception of time is linear and can be broken up into even parts that extend ad infinitum into the past and future. He contrasts this understanding of time with Indigenous notions of non-causality, cyclicality, and holism, drawing upon Hopi and Blackfoot knowledges (p. 523). The political and epistemic significance of creating a binary between Indigenous and Western thinking will be explored throughout this thesis in theorizing about witnessing from a position that is wholly situated neither in Western nor Indigenous worldviews.

In this vein, Cree scholar Shawn Wilson’s (2008) notion of an “indigenist” research paradigm aids in imagining how research can be reshaped and refocused. While Wilson remains open-ended as to the processes and definitive parameters of indigenist research, he centralizes relational accountability of researchers who are interested in working with Indigenous communities. Wilson argues that building relationships as a researcher is interwoven with building relationships with the environment, family, ancestors, and the cosmos (p. 194). The key aspects of doing indigenist research include: (1) bringing benefit to the Indigenous communities involved; (2) being process-oriented with the researcher being part of a group; (3) being grounded in Indigenous epistemologies and supported by the Elders and community members who are living in those epistemologies; (4) recognizing that Indigenous languages and cultures are living processes, thus knowledge discoveries are ongoing functions of thinkers and scholars of Indigenous groups (Wilson, 2008, p. 195). Finally, Wilson states that indigenist researchers include both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people whose investigations propagate Indigenous ways of knowing (p. 193). In presenting an indigenist research paradigm shift, Wilson is careful not to lay out a step-by-step method for engaging in Indigenous grounded research. Rather, he characterizes indigenist research using starting principles as a means to redirect the ways that one comes to know.

The challenge for a researcher such as myself is to meditate upon and think of approaches that move carefully toward an indigenist research framework. I am very much compelled by an indigenist paradigm because, in review of the literature on reconciliation, it has become abundantly clear that Indigenous communities continually confront systemic discrimination across different systems of social organization in the
Canadain nation-state. In the area of education, an indigenist framework inspires evaluating the temporal and spatial configuration of “ethical” research as it takes place within a Canadian university setting. At this point, I hesitate to rush into labeling this current study as indigenist for several reasons. First, I am too new in considering this framework to be able to declare that my research will bring benefit to Indigenous communities involved. If such an outcome occurs, it will come as auxiliary to engaging my own historical and cultural commitments, as I try to compel myself and others of similar heritage and experiences to engage more respectfully with Indigenous people. An ongoing concern is that when Wilson talks about indigenist research, he is addressing ethno-culturally and historically homogeneous Indigenous communities, whereas, for myself, “community” refers to ethno-culturally diverse gatherings of people. Second, I am concerned that an uncritical uptake of indigenist research might lead to cultural appropriation of established Indigenous knowledges. The fear of cultural appropriation stems from my own familial involvement in Japan’s imperialist project to colonize Asia. In moving toward an indigenist paradigm, this concern will be explored in greater depth. Third, culturally instilled body and social habits would have me question how best to approach Elders in Indigenous communities without imposing a presence that would demand their response and approval. In working with artists coming from diverse Indigenous backgrounds, and who also interact in art worlds and social realms that exceed their traditional territories, it is unclear how community is defined, who is identified as an Elder, and how to determine who of the Elders are living within their Indigenous epistemologies. Only at the end of this investigation, will others be able to determine whether or not the research is indigenist. At present, my attention is drawn to imagining ways in which more respectful relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people can be developed, step-by-step, both within and in excess of university research intentions.

Professor Emeritus of social work and principal researcher on the SSHRC Tri-Council Policy on conducting research on Indigenous peoples Marlene Brant Castellano (2004) argues that research with Indigenous communities framed within Aboriginal epistemologies promotes self-determination and wellness. Cultural geographers Sarah de Leeuw, Emilie Cameron, and Margot Greenwood (2012) support Castellano’s thesis, problematizing community-based research, which often fails to consider the ongoing spatial colonization of Indigenous peoples. They suggest that “situated outside research relationships” and friendships are possible means to decolonize current methodologies
(p. 180). Use of the term “friendship” requires some clarification. Current research on friendship tends to centre on interpersonal relations in the areas of psychology and social psychology (Bukowski & Lisboa, 2005; Chasin & Radtke, 2013; Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009; Turner & Feddes, 2011). Psychology scholars Deluzio Chasin and Lorraine Radtke (2013) discuss the relational performance of friendship, suggesting that individual identity is stabilized through “friend moments” (p. 291). In “friend moments,” the friendship dyad is expressed in violation of or external to the formal parameters of the research process. Those who identified as friends established conversations that at times excluded the researcher interviewer, creating a relational moment that creates insiders and outsiders (Chasin & Radtke, 2013, p. 292). Chasin & Radtke conclude that friendship is a kind of interrelational performance rather than a stable characteristic of one’s normative identity (p. 293).

Friendships can also be used to prescribe political agreements that potentially bind one group of people to another. For instance, in her essay, “The two ‘mystery’ belts of Grand River,” historian, Kathryn Muller (2007) describes the declaration of political friendship between Indigenous people and European settlers as bound by the friendship belt and the Two Row Wampum. The earliest known offering of the Two Row Wampum took place in the early the 1600s, in the attempt to guarantee peace between Haudenosaunee and Dutch settlers (Muller, 2007; Parmenter, 2013). The Two Row Wampum, comprised of two parallel rows of purple beads on a white beaded backdrop, was considered to be the oldest treaty to establish respectful and structurally independent relations between Indigenous and European people (Muller, 2007). The Friendship belt, on the other hand, represented the Covenant Chain Alliance, the nation-to-nation agreement between the British Crown and Haudenosaunee Alliance in a commitment to strategic friendship (Muller, 2007, pp. 132-133). Muller (2007) contends that the political stringency of the act of exchange was overlooked by European settlers, who prioritized the verbal agreements between representatives of the British Crown and the Onanda Nation (p. 133). Muller argues that the Belts, in the very colours and images, had already spoken before the Onanda spokesperson communicated the agreement orally (p. 134). Historian Jon Parmenter (2013) goes into considerable historical detail over a 400-year period to meditate on points of cultural and socio-political disjunctures that led to breaking of the Covenant Chain and retracting the treaty agreements that were implemented through the Two Row Wampum. In a comprehensive review of the vast literature written about the Two Row Wampum Belt by Indigenous and non-
Indigenous people, Parmenter comes to challenge Muller’s thesis that the concept of *kaswentha* should not be recognized as a historically valid expression of Haudenosaunee sovereignty in relation to European settlers (p. 88). Parmenter suggests that Muller did not trace the history of the Two Row Wampum interactions and material presence in her analysis far back enough, focusing instead on European and Indigenous relations from the 1870s to the present time.

A large practice-based chasm apparently exists between interpersonal articulations and political gestures of nation-to-nation relationship-building. The challenge is to interweave the two and to bridge the private intimacies of individual friendships with public and politicized engagement between two or more groups of people. Indeed, many studies on intercultural communication and the building of relationships support the thesis that private and public realms are equally crucial for understanding how political and systemic paradigm shifts can take place (Chang, 2013; Denis, 2015; Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009; Menzies, 2013; Styres, 2009; Wallace, 2011). Social anthropologist, Charles Menzies (2013) writes about the three central concepts of the aadawk for Gitxaala people that centralize social relationships through interrelationships (through the heart and inclusive of other than human beings) and continuity (in terms of reincarnation) (p. 180). He relays the story of Sabaan, a Gitxaala chief who welcomed the White ghosts with a friendship feast. Through Sabaan and other Gitxaala interactions with outsiders, Menzies cautions researchers from overstating promises to the community, especially when interrelationships have not been thoroughly built through trust (pp. 181-182). He presents the ways in which research is conducted within a Gitxaala framework as an alternative to Eurocentrically devised anthropological research methods. Menzies argues that in attempting to build a “rapprochement” with Indigenous intellectual, and specifically Gitxaala traditions, outsiders can gain trust by expressing a deep self-knowledge of their own ancestries (p. 182). Sandra Styres (2008), an education scholar of Mohawk, English, and French descent, offers insights as to how trust-building can occur. Reflecting on her own research experience of being an outsider in an eight-week research trip to Aotearoa, Styres discusses at length the value of building a mentoring relationship. She draws upon her culturally complex heritage to

---

48 Parmenter (2013) explains kaswentha as the Haudenosaunee concept of an ongoing agreement between two groups of people to co-exist peacefully in the same space without interference. For further discussions on the concept of kaswentha please see page 15 of Mitchell et al.’s (2015) ebook available at http://www.akwesasne.ca/history-resources/a-cultural-portrait/ in which kaswentha is known as a sacred Two Row Wampum Belt.
articulate the mentoring relationship as coming from multiple social lineages. Common to all notions of mentoring is a strong sense of relational responsibility between the mentor and mentee (Styres, 2008, p. 297). Menzies and Styre’s research insights express the importance of taking the time to establish a rhythm of interactions to generate respectful relationships. They also show the uniqueness of each engagement, which is dependent upon the depth of one’s self-knowledge of history, culture, and the ability to recognize the limitations of one’s knowledge.

Such friendships extend beyond human-to-human interactions to include human-land and human-spirit relationships. Anthropologist of Stl'atl'ímx̱ heritage, Christine Elsey (2013) elegantly describes the interrelatedness of humans and the land as an enfoldment of the environment into the fabric of one’s “own” body such that the body is not an individual self but collective in nature, the interweaving of one’s experiences within the context of “terrestrial social action” (p. 9). Okanagan scholar and knowledge keeper Jeannette Armstrong (2012) examines how oral literature arises out of experiences of the land. She maps out a theory of Syilx orality to reflect long-term knowledge of human-earth interrelatedness. According to Armstrong, Syilx oral storytelling is predominantly a literary expression of ethics, which guides behaviour and interactions with the environment (pp. 347-348). Armstrong’s explanation of Syilx storytelling contests the academic compulsion to categorize, divide, and prioritize written over oral knowledge. Armstrong presents a different frame of reference for the shaping of language itself, and how it cannot be separate from living on the land. Elsey’s writing on the relationship between the land and people alongside Armstrong’s invitation to learn the language of the land will serve as grounds for reconsidering Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations through more creative means.

In this chapter, reconciliation and witnessing discourses have been presented. Within these conversations, it becomes increasingly clear that the mandate of the TRCC to address the residential school legacy is only a step toward attending to the multiple ways in which European forms of governance sustain colonial rule over Indigenous peoples across Canada. Indigenous calls for systemic revisions across different social organizations are of pressing concern, considering the systemic discriminations faced by Indigenous peoples in these colonially framed institutions. The question arises as to how

---

49Syilx refers to “people of the Okanagan,” which distinguishes this community from other Salish peoples (Armstrong, 2012).
individual researchers within a post-secondary, academic setting might respond to their calls. I wish to suggest that in prioritizing relationship- and friendship-building between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, the parameters and customary approaches set with regard to research within a European-based structuring of institutional learning can be extended, reorganized, and their ethical limits made known.

In the following chapters, I will explore the knowledges that emerge from centralizing relationships over methodological adherence. In placing a developing relationship as the foundation for advancing socio-political knowledge regarding reconciliation and witnessing, it is my contention that the examination of specific relationships will direct the methods through which one comes to know the other, hopefully in more respectful ways.

In the next chapter, I will look towards becoming better acquainted with the land. A gargantuan task, I wonder about the labour that goes in to acknowledging territories sincerely, and to move through territorial thinking so as to develop a more reverential regard for the land that sustains all one’s relations. In the course of this dissertation, I wish to bring into the discussion a heterogenous understanding of colonization, looking specifically at the Japanese colonization of Asia. I link Japanese colonization to its imperialist underpinnings to conquer the very cultures that had profoundly contributed to the formation of Japan as a culture and independent nation-state. It is my hope that by delving into my own political and social history, I might develop a more nuanced and conceptually flexible understanding in engaging with Indigenous calls for nation-to-nation conversations, sovereignty rights, and nationalism.
Chapter Three: In the embodiments of land and territorial acknowledgments

In the past two chapters, I have presented the complex multi-lingual, multi-lineaged socio-historical context within which the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada have made their 94 calls to action. Chapter Two ended with discussions about how Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities might begin to forge interpersonal friendships, and the need to recognize and prioritize relationality in the course of institutionalized research. In the present chapter, I wish to show the routes through which I have attempted to become better acquainted with the land, beyond perfunctory, public verbal land acknowledgments.

There are many reasons for wishing to build more personal land- and territory-ayumi relations. Growing up and hearing coverage night after night about the Oka Crisis, their concerns seem so far removed from the everyday labours and lives that passed through the mushroom farm. As I became older and followed the news regarding Indigenous calls for fishing and land rights, often against large corporations, I could cognitively, ethically, and politically comprehend these demands, yet my body and heart were left untouched. Initially, it was a source of Japanese national pride – perhaps to conceal a deeper shame based upon the racism that I and others experienced on a regular basis – to declare that despite being born in Canada, I had no emotional attachments to the land. Yet, day after day, as I ran, I started to wonder how it could be possible not to have a relationship with the very land which had caught hundreds of thousands of footfalls over the years. And in becoming acquainted with Cheryl, Adrian, Peter, and many other people whose ancestors had lived across various parts of the land for thousands of years, their stories gave me other ways to enter into a relationship with the multiple lands that I would pass through. In the present discussion, I wish to show that a seemingly highly personal and subjective irrelation with the land can in part be explained as an outcome of the embodiments of linguistic habits, cultural protocols, and socio-political structural constraints. At the same time, I wish to counter-demonstrate that these embodiments may equally serve to create interrelational spaces between Indigenous and non-Indigenous ways of knowing.

This chapter will address in-depth that which might hinder or encourage the capacity to respectfully acknowledge Indigenous territories, as well as to witness the land beyond political territorialization. I begin to wonder if my own sense of and concerns
about (Japanese) nationalism, colonization, and senses of belonging might foreclose a deeper appreciation for Indigenous ways of being, cosmologies, and identity-formation. Having passed through so many Indigenous territories, as I have lived across the Canadian nation-state, I deliberate upon the labour and the proximities required to think carefully through such diverse lands.

In the first section, I will examine Japanese honorific language use, the ambivalence of adhering to Indigenous cultural protocols as faced by Indigenous artists, and the challenges of decolonizing relations. In the next section, the possible blockages that one might face in trying to acknowledge traditional territories from a traumatized perspective will be discussed at length. In the third section, much consideration will go into acknowledging the transnational, cultural, and familial values that I have gathered through my specific upbringing and history. These values will inform the development of a witnessing performance practice, which will be presented in more detail in the subsequent chapters. The main purpose of this chapter is to slow down to think about the labour that goes into acknowledging territories in a meaningful and considered manner. What might inhibit honorific regard of the land? What alternatives could exist to verbally pronouncing one’s fixed political stance? These questions will be considered throughout the course of this chapter, and I will close with the proposition that land-human relations actively exceed human cognitive containments.

To explore these questions, I weave autoethnographical accounts with linguistic, social science qualitative and quantitative studies on trauma, and wide-ranging Indigenous epistemologies. In moving through these diverse areas, I reach the end of the chapter, deciding that a closer examination of personal relationships, which have been developing in my own social spheres, might aid in developing better skills at sincerely acknowledging Indigenous territories. I discuss being drawn to the artistic practices of Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Adrian Stimson, and Peter Morin, through years of witnessing their personal and political motivations as well as their creative processes. Speculations about becoming their shadows unexpectedly catalyzes the beginnings of a performance practice.

3.1 Acknowledging territory I: Honorifics, cultural protocols, and decolonizing relations

Over the past two decades, guest speakers have been encouraged to formally acknowledge their presence on the traditional territories of the hosting First Nations before commencing with their presentations and speeches at public gatherings in
Canadian educational and other institutions. In making the acknowledgment, speakers express respect and recognition of the First Nations that have lived on the territories for hundreds to thousands of years and their own presence as visitors in those spaces (Joseph, 2007). A long-honoured traditional protocol in the meeting of different First Nations along the west coast of the current state of Canada, increasingly, non-Indigenous people have come to adopt this practice.

After being present at many university lectures and other academic gatherings where such acknowledgments were made, for many years I was unable to say aloud the names of the hosting First Nations prior to my own presentations and speaking engagements. I felt rather hypocritical in saying aloud the name of the traditional territory when in fact, I knew so little about the history of the land prior to and following European colonial contact. In many cases, I also had no relational affiliation to those whose cultural and social heritages were embedded in those territories.

In my understanding of cultural respect, shaped from a Japanese and multi-Asian upbringing, naming and the use of names are well-considered and honorific expressions of relational proximity and knowledge. In the Japanese language, the suffixes –さん (–san), –ちゃん (–chan) and –さま (–sama) are affixed to a person’s name in order to establish the state of relations between the addressee and the addressee. –ちゃん is used to refer to someone younger or less experienced than oneself and often applied as a term of endearment. –さん is a suffix that designates the addressee as older or more experienced than the speaker, while –さま is a highly honorific term that holds the person addressed in the utmost regards, perhaps due to age, level of accomplishment, or social title. In the everyday, surnames or family names followed by –さん or –ちゃん are used to identify the person being addressed. The prefix お (o–) is also added to designate honorification of the subject (Namai, 2006). In public, rarely is a personal name used, and tends to be reserved for private conversations between those who are on intimate terms (Koyama, 2004).

The impetus for adhering to honorifics in the Japanese language has been an ongoing subject of heated debate in the areas of historical pragmatics50 and

50Historical pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that examines the use of language historically, primarily in its spoken form. Since the early 2000s, historical pragmatic methods have been used to study of Japanese honorific language in everyday and formal speech. For further information please see: Wataru Koyama’s (2004) article, “Honorifics in critical-historic pragmatics: The linguistic ideologies of modernity, the national standard, and modern Japanese honorifics”;
sociolinguistics (Hasegawa, 2012; Ide, 1989; Koyama, 2004; Okamoto, 2011; Shibamoto-Smith & Cook, 2011). However, what remains consistent is the emphasis placed upon relationships as they are presumed or established by the interlocutors. On her groundbreaking work on わきまえ (wakimae) or “discernment,” Professor Emeritus of Japanese linguistics, Ide Sachiko (1989) argues that the use of honorifics in Japanese speech is based not only on the dissuasion of aggressive disagreement but also on social contexts, which at times prescribe polite behavior in adherence to cultural norms (p. 242). Ide’s investigation of discernment has garnered much attention and fruitful contestation (Fukada & Asato, 2004; Geyer, 2013; Kádár & Mills, 2013), and has been factored into her research on “emancipatory pragmatics” (Hanks, Ide, & Katagiri, 2009). According to linguistic scholars, William Hanks, Ide Sachiko, and Katagiri Yasuhiro (2009), emancipatory pragmatics aims to investigate the transferability of linguistic practices from one culture to another, in contrast to assuming the existence and applicability of universal precepts, which in their experience tend to centralize Euro-American rules of linguistic engagement (p. 2). Building upon the criticism that Ide’s concept of わきまえ reifies the Western versus Eastern divide regarding language usage, the authors emphasize the non-dualistic practice of analyzing languages historically embedded in their cultural contexts (Hanks, Ide, & Katagiri, 2009; Kita & Ide, 2007). Hanks, Ide, and Katagiri (2009) suggest that such interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary study of languages, which takes into consideration the variability, unconsidered common sense, and inaccuracies of “native speakers as linguistic informants,” leads to a more complex and deeper engagement of cultural differences and similarities that overrules binaristic, contrastive thinking of insider/outsider and linguistic-cultural essentialism (p. 2). In emancipatory pragmatics, the emphasis is placed upon the social relationship of the interactants, and not upon the individual speaker as an idealized isolate (Hanks, Ide, & Katagiri, 2009, p. 5).

Conflicting articulations of expressing respect are known to occur within a particular cultural setting, leading linguists, sociologists, and anthropologists to reexamine the a priori agreements that ought to determine the proper course of interaction. Japanologist and linguistic philosopher, Florian Coulmas (2005) provides an extreme example of failure to adhere to linguistic honorific protocols in the case study of

also see Koyama’s (2003) earlier piece, “How to do historic pragmatics with Japanese honorifics.”
two Japanese salarymen in the same company who went out for drinks after work hours. According to news coverage, one of the men referred to the other as −くん (−kun), a male-gendered suffix equivalent to −ちん, which designates the addressee as socially subordinate to the speaker. The man addressed became enraged by this perceived insult and shoved his colleague against a railway station wall so as to cause fatal injury (Coulmas, 2005, p. 299). Coulmas uses this example to demonstrate the complexity of honorific language as it is threaded into the very grammar of speaking, writing, and embodied communication in Japanese, and the ambiguities of proper and improper usage that can separately result in establishing the status quo, humor, and at times, violence. Given that the two men came from the same or similar speech communities and were assumed to have a commanding grasp of the language and its attendant rules of respectful regard, expectations were high as to the appropriate use of honorifics. It could further be argued that in such a situation, the usage of −くん was, in fact, a deliberate affront to the addressee in a power struggle for status. Perhaps in a more linguistically heterogeneous setting, although expectations might be lower with regard to the communication of respect, the increased possibilities of miscommunicating and misunderstanding honorific intent need be further assessed. Emancipatory pragmatics provides a paradigmatic shift away from idealizing linguistic fluency within enclosed culturally homogeneous settings, and toward contemplating the fluidity of languages as they are used in the everyday.

In a multilingual setting, and in the transience of social knowledges passing through, how can gestures of honoring and the communication of respect come into conflict with one another? Sociolinguists have been investigating this question, examining how speech and gestures are used in linguistically, ethnically, and socio-economically diverse settings (Goebel, 2010; Kita, 2009). In the case above, my inability to name the traditional Indigenous territory was/is not intended as an act of disrespect; rather, the silence attests to the recognition of unfamiliarity with the place. Naming as acknowledgment of the traditional territory, in my linguistic estimation, was/is a brash overstatement of intimate knowledge that does not exist. However, the space in which the decision to not name was/is made is also not homogeneously linguistically Japanese, but the confluence of people coming from diverse backgrounds and life experiences. In such a setting, what counts as polite restraint can equally be read as a disrespectful act of cultural and historical erasure. In the Canadian context, where
European colonial values are systematically entrenched, the Japanese honorific practices of naming and not naming can unwittingly support the political machinery of devaluing and erasing Indigenous presence.

Each time I stood at the beginning of a talk, my heart would begin to beat rapidly, my breath would become shallow, my face would flush red, and I could feel heat rising along my forehead, ear tips, and up my esophagus. The decision to name or not name the traditional territory is a fully embodied, disconcerting experience, resulting in further private reflection upon whether or not the right choice has been made in that specific context. This bodily struggle to act respectfully speaks to the multiple collisions of social values from different cosmologies, as well as one’s confrontation with reaching the limits of protocols that are meant to communicate honor. In these moments of not knowing emerge a wide range of decisions one may make or actions one might pursue to come to a better understanding.

Not knowing moments can lead to a stronger adherence to a habituated action or expression of politeness, in order to keep with that which has been expected in past interactions. The entrenchment of such practices is concerning, not because they may be ethically and socially considerate in other (past) situations, but in the cases where the practices become rote to the point of imposing a particular order as unquestionably correct. In naming the traditional Indigenous territory, I am often left wondering if such proclamations might potentially hinder building a deeper relationship with the land beneath one’s feet, above one’s head, the air that surrounds, movements of animals, invisible life forms, and moreover, learning further names of the people and stories of that territory. If the name falls too easily off one’s tongue and melds quickly into the next point of business, can the performance of acknowledging territory actually deter a seismic shift in one’s way of moving, speaking, and being curious about what is left unknown? At the same time, there is a prospect that the decision to name the traditional territory serves as a fresh starting point to change one’s way of thinking or behaving, and the repetition of acknowledging, unknowingly and incrementally, becomes a new habit formation that creates a new state of affairs. Much like an acid-base titration, the addition of one droplet of experience into the pool of known experiences might at first not appear to have any significant effect. It is only when the concentration of one equals the other that the final drop indicates a relational shift. The question arises: what is the rate at which one must name the traditional territory so that the culmination of that experience exceeds not naming?
Not knowing moments can also lead to creative redirection of actions that break from cultural, social, political, and linguistic protocols. In movements toward the unexpected and unknown, uncertainties emerge in witnessing traditional protocols from unforeseen perspectives. The relationship between adherence to cultural protocols and the expression of new formations is of ongoing concern not just personally and interpersonally but also at the community level. In March 2014, the En’owkin Centre in Penticton, British Columbia hosted the Cultural Protocols and the Arts Forum to discuss the relationship between and conflicts that arise from adherence to tradition versus artistic innovation (First Peoples’ Cultural Council, 2014). Moving away from European definitions deemed as punitive in nature, cultural protocols within an Indigenous context, and in relation to the arts, were determined to be policies that guided people in making conscious decisions, which were grounded in Indigenous ways of being that would honour traditions and one another (First Peoples’ Cultural Council, 2014, p. 11).

The purpose of this gathering was to discuss, perform, and explore the following questions:

[How does an artist learn about protocols, especially if they live away from their family, community, Nation and territory? If you breach protocol and make a cultural misstep, how do you correct it? How can staff of a gallery or arts organization honour protocols, while also inviting innovative art practice into the community? Whose role is it to interpret and communicate protocols, and in what spirit can this best be done?]

(First Peoples’ Cultural Council, 2014, p. 11)

Indigenous artists, artist administrators, cultural organizers, and funding representatives gathered at the En’owkin Centre for the two-day forum, where Tahltan First Nation artist, Peter Morin was invited to give the keynote performative address, how an artist apologizes. In his performance, Peter explored how an artist might engage with a community in the event that protocols have been broken. In a voiceover recording played during the performance, Peter asked his audience to consider the fragility of the relationship that existed between the artist and the community, how it could easily be severed, and the work and tools required to rebuild trust (First Peoples’ Cultural Council, 2014, p. 17). In the situation that Peter recollected his knowledge of Tahltan cultural protocols was brought into question from members of another First Nation, who themselves were guests on the traditional territory where Peter’s collaborative performance took place. He compelled the audience to respect the artist’s position of
vulnerability and bravery to propose new ways of being in the world.

While it may be easier to situate the artist as innovative in binaristic contrast to community protocols as traditionalist, the purpose of the gathering was not to exaggerate this divide. Instead, it was to discuss ways that artists could be apprised of cultural protocols, and how the various components could work together to both respect and stretch the parameters of what counts as traditional cultural and community practice (First Peoples’ Cultural Council, 2014, p. 55). The observance of protocols in this sense can be seen as a protective element of creative practice, rather than set as a punitive measure against irrepressible artistic freedom. Mi’kmaq knowledge keeper and scholar Marie Battiste and Chikasaw Nation Cherokee legal scholar James Sa’ke’j Youngblood Henderson (2000) consider the protection of protocols no small matter, given the history of artistic and cultural appropriation of Indigenous practices (pp. 164-165). Battiste and Henderson assert that performance artists function to affirm cultural identity and mirror a people’s psychic make-up, displaying it in a manner that links ancestries to the present (p. 166). They advise artists to be attentive to the possibilities that their presentations can be popularized and distributed beyond the control and recognition of the specific Indigenous community from whence such knowledge has originated (p. 166). Artists are therefore asked to be critically engaged with their work, to be open to considering questions about their intentionality, knowledge accrual, and unintended consequences, because oftentimes they too are considered cultural knowledge keepers.

The relationship between the artist as innovator and cultural ambassador is one that is perhaps never meant to be definitively resolved. Gatherings like the Cultural Protocols and the Arts Forum in Penticton direct attention to the value of sustaining such an important discussion, especially as art practices and protocols themselves shift over time, experience, and political contexts. Whether they are present as guests, long-term visitors, longstanding community members, or party to an accidental encounter, those who witness the performance are privy to the embodiment of something: history, emotion, responsibility, action, and contestation. While that something is an endless possibility of what-ifs, and-ifs, and and-these, in witnessing performance art specifically, in no way is there an unspoken expectation that everyone unabashedly become performance artists themselves. But in remembering Battiste and Henderson’s (2000) valuation, the performance artist somehow reflects a person or community’s memories, spirit, and those parts that are yet to be acknowledged (p. 165).

Battiste and Henderson’s (2000) focus on cultural protection of Indigenous
knowledges from misappropriation and outright theft is premised in part on their consternation over the Eurocentric valuation and legislation of property rights. They contrast Indigenous and European knowledge, supporting the idea that the former stands apart from other knowledge systems, therefore requiring a different research methodology (p. 41). Although they are careful to point out that Indigenous knowledges cannot be homogenized into grand universals of values and traditions, they do suggest that some commonalities exist between far-flung Indigenous communities. Accordingly, one of the key aspects of Indigenous knowledge is its grounding in an ever-changing and interdependent ecosystem (Battiste & Henderson, 2000, p. 42). Battiste and Henderson reiterate Tewa scholar Gregory Cajete’s (2000) exposition that Indigenous ways of knowing sustain the holistic balancing of interrelationships, including the reconciling of opposing forces (Battiste and Henderson, 2000, pp. 42-43). Knowledge and beliefs about relationships of all living things are incorporated into this cumulative totality through the cultural transmission of sacred traditions and people specifically responsible for this knowledge and its dissemination (Battiste and Henderson, 2000, p. 42). Blackfoot scholar, Leroy Little Bear (2012) explains the relationship between constant flux and the holistic view:

If everything is forever moving and changing, one has to look at the whole of being to discern developing patterns. It is a way of thinking that looks at the forest and not the trees. The holistic view, in turn, gives rise to values that regard the group as more important than the individual. It values a ‘generalist’ more than the ‘specialist.’

(p. 523)

By presenting Indigenous knowledges in contrast to a homogenized European knowledge system, Battiste and Henderson (2000) are faced with the challenge of maintaining their stance that Indigenous ways of knowing cannot be consolidated while arguing for a different ordering of ideas, relationships, and processes of knowledge production, which effectively compete with the scope and systemization of Eurocentric thought. This contrastive approach to building both a case for and the contents of, Indigenous knowledges establishes a strong binary in which such ways of knowing are clearly delineated from what they are not, namely Eurocentric methodologies and organization of thinking. It would seem that two distinct systems of knowledge emerge, in which one is the negation or opposition of the other. As a result, the question arises as to whether or not Indigenous knowledges can continue to be presented as a difference
in kind, given the point-per-point meeting of being the not-other. It could be suggested that while the contents of European and Indigenous knowledges are radically different, the structuring of these differences creates the same kind of solid presence, the accumulation of declarative knowledge.

At the same time, if one is to adhere to Little Bear’s (2012) rationale on holism in consideration of Battiste and Henderson’s (2000) description of Indigenous knowledges as a totality, over time, arguably European knowledges can be combined with and become Indigenous ways of knowing. In other words, an intimate relationship has been developing through the ongoing contrastive, binaristic engagement of Indigenous and European knowledge systems potentially since times of initial contacts. In the least, the pattern of negation and opposition expresses an implicit and assumed intimate knowledge of both sides of the binary. “We do not believe this, instead we believe this” asserts a level of knowing enough to know what is not and what is, equally weighted while differentially chosen. European values and beliefs, or the idea of what they are, circulate in negative formative relation to Indigenous knowledges. If an Indigenous way of being is to identify patterns and to reconcile opposing forces, just as Battiste and Henderson have suggested above, then the accumulation of European v. Indigenous ways of knowing itself can be absorbed into Indigenous states of affairs. A pressing concern is that other knowledge systems and political identities might become collapsed into either European or Indigenous designations.

Upon determination of being not-Indigenous, in the ever-shifting landscape inhabited by groups coming from other historical, social, and political backgrounds, will those peoples nevertheless be imagined and/or forcibly shaped as European or Indigenous? At the same time, the complexity of being either of various European or Indigenous heritages is muted in the collectivized groupings of both categories. Does the category of “Euro-settlers” account for those coming from Eastern European countries such as Poland, the former Yugoslavia, as well as other states wrapped around either the Baltic or Black Seas? While many unknowingly might be assumed to fit into one of the two categories, it is possible that they may exempt themselves from that identity, because the position does not speak to their lived experiences of migration, returns, miscommunication through linguistic limitations, and living in isolation in the new country. The political identifiers of Euro-settler, settler, and settler-Canadians continue to mushroom, yet it is unclear whether the imaginings of any of those who are labelled accordingly have developed beyond representations of the original European settlers,
themselves whitewashed over time, who variably landed on the shores of Turtle Island (Goto & Morin, 2017). The slipperiness in examining the historiographies of European and Indigenous knowledges as they are often conflated with visual markers of political identity is cause for slowing down the march toward and abiding by one of the two assumed categories of knowledge formation.

It would be erroneous to assume that all Indigenous knowledges are presented in contrastive relation to European knowledge. For example, in Dancing on Our Turtle’s Back, Nishnaabe independent scholar and artist Leanne Simpson (2011) grounds Indigenous ways of knowing to specifically Nishnaabeg relations, and Elder and ancestral stories. Although she makes a passing reference to settler-Canadians in contrast to Indigenous people at the beginning of the monograph, she moves swiftly toward describing a “flourishment of the Indigenous inside” (p. 16). Simpson builds upon Taiaiake Alfred’s call for resurgence from Nishnaabeg political, intellectual, and creative traditions, presenting Anishnaabeg stories in connection to her personal experiences living on traditional territory (p. 25).

From another starting point, Cree poet and scholar Neal McLeod (2013) also complicates the relationship between Indigenous presence and European colonialism in Canada. He discusses the variability of contact and relationship development between different First Nations and European empires. McLeod specifically reflects upon Plains Cree relationships to European settlement, arguing that the time gap between initial contact to colonization was large (p. 81). According to McLeod, the eventual colonization of Plains Cree or nêhiyawak was deeply influenced by the longstanding relationship between nêhiyawak and European fur traders, upon which the processes of treaty-making were built (p. 82). McLeod’s culturally informed perspective raises questions regarding the different kinds of Indigenous and early European settler interactions that would culminate into colonially inscribed, systemic racial discrimination against Indigenous and other non-European people in Canada.

Further, it may be beneficial to consider why and how such contrastive knowledges might have been established in the first place. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, Battiste and Henderson’s works were contemporaneous with Maori education scholar, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), whose seminal book, Decolonizing Methodologies, was making a case for respecting Indigenous knowledges in an academic system built upon Ancient Greek, British, French, German, and American intellectual traditions, and political and cultural mores. Smith’s critical approach was to deconstruct the
philosophical underpinnings of what constituted Western thought, in keeping with
criticisms that had been raised in the 1980s and 1990s within the social sciences and
humanities, under the banners of post-realist, post-modernism, and post-structuralism
(Bhaskar, 1987; Delanty, 2002; Giddens, 1990; Habermas, 1988). She was also
influenced by post-colonialist theorists such as Gayatri Spivak, Homi Bhabha, Edward
Said, and Frantz Fanon, whose writings differentially troubled the bond between the
colonizer and colonized, as a means to disengage from longstanding, racially motivated,
unequal power relationships (Bhabha, 1994; Fanon, 1986; Landry & MacLean, 1996;
Said, 1978; Williams & Chrisman, 1994). While Smith’s (1999) remonstrations of
Western ideologies reflected the deconstructivist approaches utilized by other schools of
critical thought, she also popularized a fairly ‘new’ category to talk about old traditions
and belief systems: Indigenous knowledge. Thus, the term “decolonization” not only
adhered to a deconstructive critique of European intellectual imperialism and
consequent colonization of knowledge, but it also referred to the endorsement of
culturally and historically specific ways of being and knowing, particular to Indigenous
peoples (Smith, 1999).

The term “decolonization” has enjoyed wide circulation, generously applied to
describe post-colonial and Indigenous schools of thinking and methodologies. However,
it has developed into very different streams of meanings to compel wide-ranging actions,
which at times pit Indigenous and post-colonial thinkers against each other. Post-colonial
conceptualizations of decolonization are premised upon liberation movements, and
subsequently the legal dissolution of mainly European colonization in Africa, the
Caribbean, South America, and Asia (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2003; Duara, 2004; Le
Sueur, 2003; Rothermund, 2006). Indigenous political scholars, on the other hand,
frequently argue for the irrelevance of post-colonialist approaches, because countries
such as Canada, Australia, and other nations have flourished without having ever moved
beyond the colonization of Indigenous peoples. In other words, these nations continue to
benefit from ongoing, systemic discrimination against Indigenous communities (Alfred,
2005b; Castellano, Archibald, & DeGagné, 2008; Coulthard, 2014; Garneau, 2013). Of
Indigenous political scholars, Dene academic, Glen Coulthard (2014) is unusual in that
he draws upon post-colonial thinker, Frantz Fanon’s (1986) psychologistic and systemic
accounts of the colonizer-colonized relationship to describe Indigenous and non-
Indigenous relationships in the Canadian context. While issues have been raised
regarding Coulthard’s analysis in the previous chapter, it is important to consider how
Coulthard applies Fanon’s works to describe the Canadian nation-state, vis-à-vis Indigenous peoples. Coulthard draws upon Fanon to make a systemic critique against Canadian philosopher, Charles Taylor’s (1997) critical development of recognition rights within the context of multiculturalism and its effects upon Indigenous people. According to Coulthard, Taylor’s politics of recognition do not adequately upend the colonizer-colonized relationship between the settler-state and Indigenous nations, because it fails to criticize the structure of the Canadian legal system itself, which has been derived from British law and values and systematized to maintain colonial controls of Indigenous peoples and territory. It may be unfair to evaluate Coulthard’s implicit exclusions of other communities that have been racialized and deemed less than equal citizens under Canadian law in historical retrospect; his focus is specifically set on the self-determination of Indigenous people. However, Coulthard’s exclusions do create room to speculate that in reducing the colonized to Indigenous people, the experiences of those who have lived histories of colonialism elsewhere are naively subjected to greasing the machinery of the Canadian colonial state.

A common practice that has developed as a way for people to decolonize, and to reconnect with their Indigenous heritages is to become (re)acquainted with their traditional territories. Indigenous Elders, scholars, artists, and activists encourage those who have lived away to return to ancestral spaces, to learn from and through the land, and to reestablish links with their community (Bastien, 2009; Battiste, 2013; Bear, 2006; Simpson, 2011). What beautiful honorific acts of re-membering, building interconnections between generations, learning and unlearning. The context in which these personal and community explorations are conducted may provide important insights into the shaping of cultural and political belonging. One cannot help but take notice of the lack of cultural diversity that exists in these traditional spaces, which are often far removed from large cities. Smaller municipalities that are adjacent to these territories have a reduced visible minority population in comparison to urban centres.\(^5\) I am left speculating how the meaning and category of settler is imagined based upon those who have linked

---

\(^5\) There are certainly notable exceptions to this observation where the size of community does not correlate with the social impact of that minority group in the larger population. For example, Iqaluit, Nunavut hosts 25 Filipino families or 70 people, a significant membership in a population of approximately 6700 people, primarily of Indigenous (69%) and White (34%) descent. The actual number of Filipino people is small in relation to past migrations, yet their presence in terms of cultural distinction and relationship building with the broader community has been remarkable (Bennett, 2013; Harris-Ghalia, 2011).
traditional practices to these territories. Prior to relocating from Vancouver to Kelowna, I was more unsympathetic in my assessment that European and Indigenous knowledges were intimately entwined. I could not comprehend the conflation of West=Settler=Whiteness that is the standard against which Indigenous knowledges have flourished. By living in Kelowna, British Columbia for a period of three years, I have come to better appreciate the concretization of the settler-Indigenous binary. In Kelowna, visible minority groups have come and gone, often due to external political duress. At one time there had been a vibrant Chinese community, known as the “Chinatown Block,” in the heart of the downtown area in and around the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, between the late 1800s and early 1900s. In 1911, 15% of Kelowna’s population was Chinese (Curry & Bond, 2014). Up until recently, there has been little interest in commemorating the presence of Chinese in Kelowna, and traces of this history are all but erased (Curry & Bond, 2014). And in perusing the official tourist site for Kelowna, one is left presuming that only Indigenous and Europeans have ever resided on this land (Super, Natural British Columbia, n.d.). Currently, those identified as Chinese comprise less than 1% of the overall demographic make-up (Curry & Bond, 2014). It is surmised that drastic reductions in Chinese populations across Canada were caused largely by the introduction of the Chinese Immigration Acts of 1885 and 1923, which effectively halted immigration into Canada, with few exceptions, until such legal exclusions were repealed in 1947 (Mar, 2010; Mawani, 2009).

What happens to the community members that remain? And what about others who have experienced racial and socio-economic discriminations? Do they try to fit in and/or pass through unnoticed? Do they try to distinguish themselves from the history of disenfranchised similar others? What knowledges do they carry with them that might either alienate or align with those who have long settled in such communities? Since having lived in Kelowna, it has come to my attention that some people never permanently settle but continuously pass through; this passing-throughness itself becomes a type of permanence on the landscape, and even if unspoken or unrecognized, potentially shifts relationships between those who remain.

This chapter began with a discussion of the challenges to formally acknowledge territory. Conversations have moved from considering conflicting moments in different culturally grounded protocols, into measures to protect and review the vulnerabilities of Indigenous knowledges from becoming culturally appropriated. In describing the tension between artistic freedom and cultural protections, the binaristic formations of Indigenous
vs. Western/Eurocentric knowledge has been discussed, as well as notable attempts by post-colonial and Indigenous scholars to collaborate to decenter Eurocentric values and systems in the formation of knowledge. The analysis of this binary has led to voicing concerns over the potential for decolonization measures to further divide Indigenous and non-Indigenous lives.

Now, I wish to return to the beginning, and to move in another direction, in different narrative voices, in undulating levels of intimacy, to present other, non-formalized, not knowing moments of acknowledging territory. While possible encumbrances that could prevent more profound theoretical and political associations between Indigenous and post-colonial scholars have been considered briefly, I would like to deliberate upon memories of traumatizing lived experiences that may resonate between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, which might at times incapacitate or redirect one’s ability to witness another with respectful regard. I draw upon the arduous journey of actually coming to acknowledge territory, and in turn, speculate upon that which potentially disrupts one’s appreciation for the lives that exist beyond an individuated imagination and history.

3.2 Acknowledging territory II: Traumatized, traumatizing witness

Tiger’s Mushroom Farm was first built, brick by brick, between 1978-79. For twenty-five years, so many people – families, student visa workers, wayward teenagers – worked at the farm. Mostly Asians were hired, and over the years, Vietnamese, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Cambodian, Filipino, and Thai were employed for various lengths of time. Many came as refugees who were sponsored through the farm business; many came annually as university students from お父さん’s alma mater, 東京農業大学 (Tōkyō nōgyō daigaku), to obtain work experience credits before returning to Japan; many came to reunite with their families, those who had been separated due to economic and/or political reasons. Many came, many stayed, many others passed through. Parties were thrown for any and every occasion. Whenever someone arrived, everyone gathered for a party. Whenever someone departed either to return to their home country, move to another country, or to another part of Canada, everyone gathered for a party. My sister and I were responsible for making room-length banners to welcome, bid farewell, and wish happy new year (North American and Chinese celebrations). We were tasked with cleaning out houses before new arrivals moved into their quarters. For the most part, we were not privy to the stories of those who came to work at the farm; we were told that it was none of our business. Still, there are moments
that stand out. One family arrived in the middle of an Albertan winter, a particularly cold year with lots of snowfall. When they moved in, the whole family barricaded themselves into the house for a long time and covered all of the windows up with blankets, bedsheets, and towels, so that one could neither see in nor look out. I thought that they must have been very cold, and asked お父さん why they were behaving so oddly. I was soundly beaten for asking such an inappropriate question. Only much later, through watching films like The Killing Fields and documentaries about “the boat people” was I rudely shocked into imagining the stories and histories that many people carried with them before, during, and after they worked at the farm. Over time, some stories were told in trust, but it is not my place to relay them here.

Instead, I am trying to convey the fullness of living in and around the mushroom farm. Immigration was not experienced as a unidirectional, one-off, nuclear-family reunification affair, but perennial movements of multi-directional, multilingual, multi- statused and multicultural Asian people. I have vivid memories of お母さん run off of her feet, and of my sisters and myself being lectured interminably about our responsibilities to the new families, our duties to abide well by them. Thus, filial piety, a family-oriented social precept across Asian communities, was made to branch outwards, beyond one specific bloodline or culture to be enacted in an ever-growing circle of people, many of who did not expect to land where they landed. In retrospect, I believe that our family was ill-equipped in attempting to support the people who came through the farm doors. The town itself, with a population of less than 1600, was far removed from mental health and social services that might have better accommodated those coming from unimaginably traumatic and life-changing circumstances.

Mental health research into refugee communities have shown with varying ranges of reliability, that those who come as refugees suffer from mental illnesses such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depression due to pre- and post-migration factors (Bogic, Njoku, & Priebe, 2015; Chung & Kagawa-Singer, 1993; Fazel, Wheeler, 52)

52 Pre-migration factors for developing serious psychiatric disorders include: suffering greater degrees of family loss or separation; length of time in refugee camps; multiple traumatic experiences. Post-migration factors include: presently no employment; downward mobility of social status in the hosting country; level of education attainment; language proficiency in the host country; access to resources and materials for mental and physical health support (Chung & Kagawa-Singer, 1993; Maximova & Krahn, 2010). For comprehensive literature reviews see Hansson et al.’s (2012) “Rates of mental illness and suicidality in immigrant, refugee, ethnocultural, and racialized groups in Canada: A review of the literature.” For a review of refugees settled in western nations, see Mina Fazel, Jeremy Wheeler, and John Danesh’s (2005)
& Danesh, 2005; Hansson, Tuck, Lurie, & McKenzie, 2012; Lindert, von Ehrenstein, Priebe, Mielk, & Brähler, 2009; Maximova & Krahn, 2010). In attempting to assess the needs of migrants, public health scholar, Jutta Lindert et al. (2009) have found that prevalence rates of depression are nearly two times higher in refugees than labour immigrants, concluding that the mental health of these groups should be assessed separately for more context-specific interventions (p. 254-255).

Another issue that arises in the investigation of refugees is the presumed homogenization of the life experiences of refugees based on their nation of origin. Sociologist Stephen J. Gold (1992) recommends taking into consideration the historical context of Vietnamese refugees, mapping out the three waves of refugees that migrated to the United States: South Vietnamese military and government elite who arrived between 1975-1979; those designated as the “boat people” who arrived after the Vietnamese-Chinese conflict of 1978; and those who were primarily ethnically Chinese (p. 290). Gold warns of ongoing hostilities that exist between ethnically Vietnamese and Chinese-Vietnamese, which might hinder access to mental health services were the service provider to identify as one or the other (p. 291).

However, others have opted to combine refugees and economic migrant experiences due to geographical distribution. Mental health researchers, Hansson et al. (2012) suggest that more research is needed to assess the specific needs of those categorized as “IRER” or “Immigrant, Refugee, Ethnocultural, and Racialized” groups in Canada. Their review reveals that most of the data collected have come from just three of the ten provinces and three territories; of the three provinces included, the studies have been conducted in major cities only, despite significant IRER populations in rural areas (p. 118). While research into the mental health of refugees and labour migrants has been taking place for several decades in the areas of psychiatry, psychology, social psychology, and social work, it is still considered an area that is under-investigated and changing quickly as new migrations occur from different parts of the world due to ethnic or religious persecution, war, environmental disasters, and economic and social opportunity elsewhere.

Increasingly, academic and therapeutic attention has been placed on the study of trauma in refugee populations, bringing into question assumptions that have been made article, “Prevalence of serious mental disorder in 7000 refugees resettled in western countries: A systemic review.” For a comprehensive review of internationally resettled war refugees please see Bogic et al.’s (2015) “Long-term mental health of war refugees: A systemic literature review.”
from the reporting of past refugee migrations. Some researchers have begun to question the value of intergenerational trauma disclosures. In a systemic literature review on the relationship between disclosure and silence in various refugee communities, psychology scholar Nina Thorup Dalgaard and clinical psychologist, Edith Montgomery (2015) have found that in certain cultures, silence has served as a protective measure against intergenerational transmission of anxiety (p. 585). The results show the ambivalent effects of “affective communication,” where parents share memories, using language to verbally symbolize their emotional experiences (Dalgaard & Montgomery, 2015, p. 586). Dalgaard and Montgomery’s findings present a challenge to the therapeutic standard of encouraging disclosures, which has stemmed from the evidence of intergenerational trauma in Holocaust survivors who abided by a “conspiracy of silence” (p. 580). In alignment with other researchers who have been studying pre- and post-migration psycho-social effects on refugees, Dalgaard and Montgomery suggest taking more culturally sensitive approaches to understand communication of trauma in different waves of refugee migrations (p. 587). They reiterate that investigations into non-Western refugee experiences have revealed the diverse ideals and traditions that underpin intra-familial communication (p. 580).

The recent focus on resilience in refugees to buffer PTSD, depression, and other trauma-related disorders provides credence for conducting further studies to identify the historico-political, cultural, familial, and other social factors that might ease migrations into unexpected locations. For example, in a small sample case study of Cambodian refugee families settled in the United States, mental health scholars, Susan Wycoff, Rattanaklao Tinagon, and Shannon Dickson (2011) have found that psychological treatment hinges upon regarding the family rather than the individual as the basic unit of engagement. Their case studies reinforce earlier research findings that centralize the importance of maintaining traditional roles, in which Elders are held in the highest regard in a stratified and gender-specific system of organization, which protect against the tumult of forced migration (p. 166). Wycoff, Tinagon, and Dickson’s study supports an

---

53 Not all trauma-based coagulations of collective identity are necessarily protective. In a mixed quantitative and qualitative study of Somali refugee immigrants in Canada, Skye Jorden, Kimberly Matheson, and Hymie Anisman (2009) cite a positive correlation between collective resilience and collective trauma narratives. At the same time, they have found that the sharing of these dominant trauma narratives does not necessarily lead to in- or out-group support systems. Refugees have reported experiencing unsupportive interactions with other Somalis as well as non-Somalis in their settlement and unsettling experiences in Canada. Unsupportive interactions include intergenerational differences in adapting to the new culture; the younger generations tend
earlier investigation of intergenerational coping mechanisms of Cambodian refugees who had settled in Montreal, Quebec. Psychiatry scholars, Cécile Rousseau, Aline Drapeau, and Sadeq Rahimi (2003) report that the preservation of traditional values, in spite the Pol Pot regime’s attempts to erase them, served as a protective measure against trauma-related psycho-social disease.54

The study of PTSD in refugee and immigrant populations has also given rise to the investigation of the psychological effects on health and social care professionals in prolonged contact with these communities. Since the 1990s, psychology and social work scholars have directed attention toward the investigation of the wellbeing of mental health care workers who provide support for those who have encountered traumatic experiences (Figley, 1995, 2002; Hesse, 2002; Rzeszutek, Partyka, & Golab, 2015; Sabin-Farrell & Turpin, 2003). Traumatologist, Charles Figley (1989, 1995, 2002) conceptually developed the phenomena of secondary traumatic stress disorder (STSD) in families and compassion fatigue in health care professionals in 1982 and 1995, respectively (Peeples, 2000).55 Much of the literature has been focused on compassion

54 The researchers infer that the genocidal mandate of the Khmer Rouge to eradicate Buddhist identity and culture inadvertently entrenched a stronger sense of collective identity and self-esteem in the survivors. For more details, please see C. Rousseau, A. Drapeau, & S. Rahimi’s (2003) follow-up study, “The complexity of trauma response: a 4-year follow-up of adolescent Cambodian refugees.”

55 STSD is distinguished from compassion fatigue in terms of those who are affected. While both refer to symptoms that arise from indirectly experiencing trauma through the person(s) primarily affected, STSD currently is understood as affecting all of those who are in close proximity to the traumatized person, whereas compassion fatigue signifies specifically health care professionals who are tasked with helping the client who has experienced a traumatic event. Because STSD symptoms can be experienced by health care professionals, it is sometimes used interchangeably with compassion fatigue, leading to much debate regarding the definition of terms in the study of trauma. For an in-depth introduction to these debates, please see: L.S. Elwood, J. Mott, J.M. Lohr, & T.E. Galovski’s (2010) literature review, “Secondary trauma symptoms in clinicians: A critical review of the construct, specificity, and implications for trauma-focused treatment”; J. Kanter’s (2007) analysis, “Compassion fatigue and secondary
fatigue and the development of coping strategies for health care professionals who work closely, and for long periods of time, with traumatized clients (Elwood, Mott, Lohr, & Galovski, 2010; Hesse, 2002; Kanter, 2007; Rao & Kemper, 2016). Much less research has been conducted on the STSD effects on non-health care professionals, the everyday persons outside of familial relations, who are in close proximity to those who have survived traumatic events. A significant gap exists in the literature with regard to effects of STSD on co-workers, frequent acquaintances, and specifically, private refugee sponsors, whose lives are intertwined with those who have survived traumatic events.

As a layperson interested in this topic, I presume that there are profound differences in the accumulated experiences and mental health outcomes on health care workers whose task is to directly concentrate upon and find strategies to treat the traumatized survivor, versus the employer or friend who may or may not learn about the extent of the survivor’s suffering. I am left speculating, however, about the cumulative effects of multiply-lineaged traumatic histories when they come together socially, if not outspokenly. In reflecting back to the work dynamics at the mushroom farm, I cannot help but wonder if the informal normative imperative to not directly acknowledge the difficulties, endured by some of the employees, somehow shaped our senses of duty and care for everyone present. I wonder too about possible psychological effects on those of us who witnessed from the periphery, eyes cast away. Conversely, and simultaneously, it could be argued that decentralizing (and thereby diffusing) the focus from the traumatic event to centralizing the business of mushroom farming might have had a protective effect on the psychological wellbeing of those who had experienced such harrowing circumstances. At the farm, there were many who had survived what could be categorized as severe traumatic events in their homelands. Their presence at the farm, however, was not limited to that experientially constructed identity but was a small conversational or social aspect of their participation in the everyday. Those who had come as refugees and had not directly experienced an extreme violation worked alongside those who had. The admixture of refugees, casual farmhands, student visa
workers, newly arrived immigrant extended families, and Canadian citizens (first- and second-generation) interacted primarily outside of the employees’ isolated trauma narratives.

It is not my intention to idealize this workplace as a more respectful way of addressing a person, family, or culture’s traumas. Instead, it is to recognize the concurrent considerations at hand – such as the poor cultivation of mushrooms month after month, racism against Asians in a small southern Albertan community, the welcoming of new arrivals and the proper bidding of farewell to those leaving, adjustments to new languages and cultural expectations, etc., which would lead to the continued regrouping of social affiliations that exist outside of people’s trauma, borne out of gross human rights violations that had taken place elsewhere. From this multitudinous and shape-shifting nature of one’s social engagements, a further line of enquiry arises toward mental health workers and to those who live alongside: in centralizing a traumatic event in order to address the negative psychological and social effects of that event, does agency and one’s imagining of the identified survivor/client/victim become overly defined by that trauma? In turn, if the traumatized person locates a sense of self primarily based upon that trauma, what consequences emerge in terms of social engagements and relational responsibilities to others? One’s capacity to witness the land outside these human-to-human considerations may become severely diminished. All of these concerns rush into my mind upon learning about an incident that had taken place at the mushroom farm.

One day in 2007, over two years after お父さん and お母さん had sold Tiger Mushroom Farm, the newly hired manager of the farm was working on the “green machine,” the conveyor belt used to build the mushroom beds layer by layer. Perched on the very top of the machine, he lost his balance and fell onto the moving belt, where his shirt became caught in the rollers and he was crushed to death, much to the horror of those working alongside. Soon after, the rest of the employees refused to return to the farm, stating the place had become haunted. Business swiftly shut down, and the workers dispersed to other parts of the country to find employment elsewhere. When お母さん relayed the story, she also informed me that no one in our family had yet paid proper respects to the man who had died, so I quietly decided to visit the now abandoned property.

There is a present-tenseness in suddenly finding oneself in a place that seemed
interminably laborious in the past.

I am afraid to go there and have been afraid ever since I had heard that a man had died at the farm that お父さん  had painstakingly built, worked, and sold, a space that he could never release.

The smell of the air, the feeling on my skin, they are the first to greet me. The wind is not too cool and does not sting to the touch. Ashok, my loving partner, is recording this journey. I am relieved that he is sharing in this private moment, glad he is here. This video is not intended for public viewing; it is unrefined. I do not even know why I have decided to have Ashok record in the first place. This is not meant to be a performance.

We come to a stop in front of a worn yellow house, the grubby paint is weather-beaten and curling off the plywood walls, just as I remembered. I am perturbed with Ashok for suggesting that we seek permission to go into the farm. In my mind, it is still my family property. In my mind, I have every right to be there. Funny, I expect that the yellowing house where I had once lived to be completely empty anyway, no trace of human presence. I expect everything to be evacuated and that I would have the freedom to sift through decaying matter. I knock on the door. An older Asian woman answers, pokes her head at an angle to the door and looks anxiously at us. I fumble toward an introduction to explain my presence. She tells me that all of the doors in the farm have been locked down. Remembers that one small entry may be left open. She tells me that she cannot accompany us, with errands to run and all. Nobody wants to go back there.

I notice the pigeons. So many in the sky and on the rooftops of the farm. お父さん used to hate them so much. He would randomly shoot them with his 22 rifle.56 As I near the perimeter of the farm building I notice junk everywhere. I pick up a feather and place it into the Ziploc bag full of stuff that I have brought with me, for I have been planning to do a ritual ever since I began imagining returning to this space, when I found out about the man’s violent death.

In my mind, this man has died because of お父さん. Two years prior, before お父さん died, he talked extensively about not being able to grasp the idea that the farm would continue to exist long after his death. It was as though he were incapable of

56I learn only much later from my sister that お父さん did not actually hate the pigeons but was disturbed by the tens of thousands of dollars in damages that they would cause by roosting on mushroom farm rooftops.
imagining a world without him in it. He and I are so similar. During our conversations, I would reason with him that he should look upon the business as an artist to his art piece. After the artist had passed away, the art piece would continue to have a life in relation to other people. He nodded at the time, seemingly agreeing with this interpretation, and I thought that he had accepted the continuation of life beyond his control. When お母さん later rang me up to tell me about this fellow’s death, I found myself becoming overcome with grief, anger, and awe. Was it possible that お父さん had some type of posthumous power over the man’s life?

So now I am here to pay respect to this man on my family’s behalf. Honour his life and death at the site. I walk with purpose on the south side of the property down the gravel road. I am not expecting to see what awaits. All of the mushroom growing beds are stacked precariously and sitting in the dumpsite area. The green machine, the one that pulled the man in and crushed him to death, is cut up into bits and scattered. It is like the farm has been disemboweled of its contents, strewn aside, as if the act of cutting up and tearing apart would somehow break the haunting. Suddenly, I see the mushroom farm truck, so iconic with its bright blue façade and cartoon version of a tiger with a mushroom entwined in its tail. This truck, like everything else, is shredded, broken open, scattered. For parts? In shock, I cannot understand what my eyes witness. I realize that in some strange way that although I expected full evacuation of humans, the objects themselves would gently fade, covered in dust, preserved in their rightful shape. Thinking the space as having been violated, I burst out in tears, feeling equally naïve and distraught for having this romantic idea of a still-life dead space. Things don’t always fade quietly. Some acts of forgetting are willful and violently expressed.

I slowly approach the large shipping door at the back of the farm building. Placing my hands at the base, I exert as much force as possible to lift the door off the ground and am surprised that such little power is needed before it slides easily up toward the ceiling. The sunlight floods the large, dank hallway. I expect to be hit with a wave of deathly presence. But not so! For a few moments I am stunned by what I see, cannot believe my senses. A Buddhist shrine is placed in immediate view, positioned just below where the business phone used to hang. I walk toward it. A container holds dozens of incense sticks burnt down to their roots. In front, fresh fruit has been placed. I notice the freshness, undamaged surface of the supple skin, and am deeply relieved without knowing why at first.

Remembering that I have brought objects for a ritual, I dig into my coat pocket to
retrieve the plastic bag. Squatting back down in front of the shrine, I first take the pigeon feather that was collected from outside and poke it into the incense ash. I then gather the dried purple flowers that were taken from お母さん’s place and sprinkle it like salt around the fruit. Funny, the purple flowers to me represent お父さん’s wishes. お母さん had laid them in front of his commemorative photo at home. But sprinkled around the fruit, I am struck by the smallness of the petals. There may be traces of お父さん in relation to the man who has died here, but they do not overtake the prominence of the fresh orange and apples. Looking around for a lighter to light a fresh incense stick, I become frustrated in not being able to locate one. I crouch down again, my mind empty. Then it fills quickly with questions – who has set this up? Why is the fruit so fresh? Who has brought it here? These questions are comforting to me because in each asking I know that someone was and is always thinking of this man.

I walk down the long dark hallway, toward where I imagine the man must have died. I hear pigeons cooing in the pocket of a fan and see the shadows of their flutter. Guided by the sunlight streaming in, I see an abandoned car parked haphazardly in the centre of the room. Something catches my eye. More fruit on a plate, an incense stick stuck into the skin and burnt down to the end. This time, the fruit is molded over, must have been there for at least a couple of months, most likely longer. I realize that this had been my expectation all along – decay, traces, but mostly the abandonment of human company. I look over, another plate, covered in mold, incense. Time passes in different stages of remembering this man, different stages of decay. But the freshness of the fruit in front of the shrine at the entranceway bespeaks of present, active memories.

Ashok is at a distance from me, recording. I have been speaking without realizing it. I begin to wonder aloud if お父さん had less control over him, over others, my family, than what had been imagined for all of these years.

What do I know of the man that I am trying to remember? The farm looks at once familiar and unfamiliar. I wonder for the very first time in my life who else has passed through these lands long before the farm existed. I wonder for the first time, who will come to live on it from here on forward, and about the animals, plants, and errant objects that blow through.

Ashok has shut off the camera and cleverly has realized that the keys to the abandoned car are still in the ignition. He turns it on so that he can start up the lighter. He grabs an incense stick, finally lighting it, and hands it to me quietly. I walk around the
room, the smoke leaving traces of scent. I walk back down the long, dank hallway while entering some of the old picking rooms, waving the incense until it burns out. Feeling years lighter, I speculate that traumatic memories and unequal power relations – much like the shipping door – can be much more easily lifted than often imagined.

After much avoidance, I watch Ashok’s video recording of the commemorative visit for the first time, and I jump in my seat, frightened by the unexpected shadowy figure that flits across the sunlit window caught in the frames of the lens. It is alarming because in that moment it dawns upon me that I am the ghost in the abandoned building, the one carrying a haunting, which is mapped onto a space, onto a person that I do not know.

I begin to speculate how my past witnessing of this man and of others had more to do with a traumatic containment than about the persons who have stood before me. In commemorating this fellow solely within a frame of reference in which I centralized myself, he became a secondary character, instrumentalized to unwittingly and posthumously participate in a recovery narrative of a traumatized self. In a perverted nostalgia which makes violence in my own past a present memory, this man had become objectified to fit a narrative that is of my own making. Without this relation, this man did not exist in my space, my time, my consciousness. His life meant nothing to me. Such disrespect, profound disrespect.

Yet, the recognition of his substrative position is interwoven with acting beyond the initial intention. The acts both partially fulfill and exceed the original intention: to honour the life of this man on behalf of my family. Everything in that visit to the mushroom farm was beyond my expectations. In the unexpected, new stories came to the fore. That which initiated the movement toward receded, not forgotten, but muted in the bombardment of the unimaginable “in-the-experience.” In the variegated moments beyond expectations, the opportunity arises to return anew to the original intention. Who is the person who died on the farm property?

His name is Tuan Vu. He was 65 years old when the accident took place on April 13, 2007 (D’Aliesio, 2010). He had been hired by the new owner, one of his best friends, to become the manager of Tiger Mushroom Farm Ltd. and had arrived from British Columbia only six months prior. Mr. Vu’s death was included in a series of comprehensive reports published by the Calgary Herald regarding workplace-related fatalities in Alberta between 1999 and 2009 (Alberta Employment, Immigration &
Industry, 2007; Michener Awards Foundation, 2011). In this larger narrative, Mr. Vu was one among 1,285 workers who died between 1998 and 2007, compelling investigative journalists, through their publications, to push the Albertan Government to establish an online database for reporting safety violations in the workplace, and a promise to install more safety inspectors across the province (Michener Awards Foundation, 2011).

The reporters at the Calgary Herald raise a concern that had not existed in my imaginary: worker safety protocols. From this perspective, new questions are raised about the security and insecure states of affairs during お父さんの 25-year tenure as the boss of the farm. I am somewhat stupefied by the fact that neither major injuries nor fatalities occurred during that time period. And had they taken place, what legal and health recourses would have been available to those who were newly arrived or employed through a temporary work visa?

There are stories, moments, knowledges that I may never know unless someone opens something other, unless I open up to some other point of view. Like: who lived here before? What Nations walked and walk the land? What treaties have been signed here? Were they agreed upon under political or economic duress? What will the soil look like in 100 000 years? Why are there seashells 20 feet deep in this landlocked place? Responses to each of these questions direct time away from the atemporalized ever-present and ever-presence of trauma.

This is the beginning of witnessing the traumatized, traumatizing witness, and then, to move beyond. It is a beginning to live without always having to make meaning from the epicentre of one’s own trauma. Without new dialogue, the neat containment of my narrative causes harm, imposing traumas that distract away from centralizing the life and death of Mr. Vu. With the introduction of new perspectives, the meaning and significations of this place, that small bit of land, is potentially released from private murmurs that deny or undermine the investigation of new relations. How do we begin to talk to one another about historical, ongoing, and sustained political, systemic violence notwithstanding trauma narratives that may otherwise contain one another? How might trauma narratives maintain one’s inability to witness beyond one’s protagonistic position? At the same time, how do we witness in respectful acknowledgement of the histories and memories we carry with us?

The gestures made to commemorate Mr. Vu’s presence at the farm constitute a witnessing performance. It is a private performance specific to a spirit rather than human audience, as well as to an absent familial audience. Indeed, Ashok is the only physically
present human to witness these feeble actions to remember a stranger. And the performance is only retroactively recognized as such. The acts of filial abidance, or 孝行 (kōkō), which extends beyond familial borders to include increasingly wider perimeters of social duty, intermingles with a turn toward the beautification of the everyday. Performance, in this sense, is the materialization or by-product of social ethics and aesthetics specific to my socialization. This performance is an outcome not only of my wish to pay respects to Mr. Vu but also a result of my own traumas that are interwoven into that commemoration. In the enfolding with my personal and politicized histories of violence, I realize how easily my own narratives can work at cross-purposes to respecting Mr. Vu’s life. Mr. Vu’s death and then my subsequent duty to pay social respect might be the initial intention that motivates me into action, but then the particular actions themselves, as well as the compulsion to act on behalf of the family, arise from the cultivation of values, relational dynamics, and embodied habits.

In the next section, I wish to establish further the idea that one’s intention to act is propagated and surpassed in the actions themselves. I would like to demonstrate that in the midst of responding to a call, one’s reactions combine cognitively conceived movements and engrained social habits. The performatives of witnessing speak to the accumulation, interpretations, and re-expressions of one’s experiences, values, and consequently shaped points of view. Implicit in the discussion is the notion that witnessing is a manifestation of intentional and unintentional bodies moved into action.

3.3 Acknowledging values gathered from being on other lands

It may be much too presumptuous to state that Japanese communication is highly performative. I can only speak to drawing upon certain values that seem to have either a cultural-historical or familial pedigree, or a combination of both, which were inculcated in the 後藤-清川 (Gotō-Kiyokawa) household within a specific socio-political environment in rural Canada. Of these values, my three sisters and I absorbed and represented them in different ways, with divergent foci and circumstances that would oblige us to act in distinct ways from one another. The values that shape my compulsion toward and the aesthetic decisions within a witnessing performance are: 孝行 (kōkō), 生活の美学 (seikatsu no bigaku), and 糞たれ (kusotare). These values were demonstrated primarily through gestures, actions, and direct orders. Actions precede word comprehension, and it is only in dialogical retrospection with お母さん and other family members, and through reading, that the philosophies behind the acts make embodied
intellectual sense. Each term has been cultivated through action and relationality; the words sometimes eventually catch up to the actions.

3.3.1 孝行(kōkō)

Arguably, 孝行, or filial abidance, is an organizational social value that is presented and impressed upon many Asian communities transnationally and filters through Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism (Lee, 2016; Lim, 2014; Paramore, 2015; Tan, 2013; Xing, 2010). In the Analects, Confucius is attributed to the idea that 孝 (xiào) or “filial piety and brotherly respect are the root of humanity” (Chan, 1969, Confucius 1:2, 475-221 BCE/1979). The centralization of the relational places the family – specifically, the father-son relationship – rather than the individual as the basic unit in society. Confucius is also credited with providing explicit directions for the inferior to follow in relation to other values and pursuits:

Young men should be filial when at home and respectful to their elders when away from home…They should love all extensively and be intimate with men of humanity. When they have any energy to spare after the performance of moral duties, they should use it to study literature and the arts.

(Chan, 1969, Confucius 1:6, 475-221 BCE/1979)

It is not merely coincidental that the Chinese xiào and Japanese kōkō share the same character, 孝. Confucianism, and with it the value of filial piety, was introduced to Japanese society around 400 A.D. (Hsu, 1971, p. 67). According to psychological anthropologist, Francis L.K. Hsu (1971), Japanese scholars were sent to study Confucianism in China, the lessons and writings of which were introduced to the Japanese ruling class upon their return (p. 67). And environmental ethicist and East Asian philosophical scholar, Yamauchi Tomosaburo (2011), suggests that Neo-Confucianism dominated in the training of hierarchy and respect in the samurai class during the Edo period (1603-1867) (p. 97). Yamauchi posits that the Japanese samurai-caste scholar, Kaibara Ekken, was pivotal in popularizing Neo-Confucian thought by “indigenizing” it through its incorporation with Shintoism after it had traversed and had been influenced by Korean thought (Lee, 2016; Yamauchi, 2011, p. 98). Yamauchi’s assertion supports Hsu’s earlier assessment that while the social and political environment would determine at times divisive articulations of filial piety in China and Japan, it is nonetheless integral as a pillar ethical value aimed at contributing to social harmony and order in both countries. Likewise, Hsu’s (1967, 1975, 2007) research on
how Confucianism has spread and been integrated in other Asian societies is part of his broader interests in understanding kinship relations in Asian communities, which exist outside of the geopolitical borders of their respective nation-states. The particular practices of filial piety are deeply affected by location and cultural inhabitants.

Expressed as a shared value, through voice commands and gestures at the mushroom farm, as well as in the home, 孝行 was a step-by-step learning to follow with respect to seniority and knowledge. Those who were considered of a higher ranking due to age, experience, and education, were responsible for directing the actions of those in lower positions. For instance, of the first two Vietnamese families sponsored by the town through the employment assurance of Tiger Mushroom Farm in 1979, the eldest adult man in each household became the respective first and second managers of the farm throughout お父さんの ownership of the business.

While the gender problematics cannot be ignored, inversely, learning the particular patriarchal variation of 孝行 in the context of farm employee dynamics has facilitated an elliptical and visceral critique of gender power relations in Japanese and other societies. I will comment more on this subject in upcoming chapters. For now, I am trying to describe how the social ethic of 孝行 rather than a unifying language was used to bind farm interactions. Because so many languages were spoken and unspoken at the farm, 孝行 was regulated through a whistle, arms and finger-pointing, non-verbal calls, and one-word commands in English. If one of the managers whistled while holding up a mushroom picking lamp, it was understood that my sisters and I, as well as other children and new staff working at the farm in nearest proximity, would have to run to collect the lamp for distribution to the waiting employee. Failure to express enthusiasm in completing this task would result in corporal punishment for my sisters and me back at home. Thus, the responsibility of the senior was to make commands comprehensible and followable. The complementary responsibility of the junior was to show a readiness to comply with the order and to accomplish the task in a seamless manner.

The role of witnessing in 孝行 is to enact respectful responses to the command or request. Witnessing means to pay attention to prospective expectations; one’s capacity to witness well is determined by the smoothness of the response. Within the farm and in the 後藤-清川 home, 孝行 was expressed with specific roles based upon gender, age, knowledge, and physical capacity. Just as 孝行 in the Confucian sense prioritizes male roles over female roles, at the farm, “men’s work” included driving the forklift, turning the
manure, working on the green machine, and general construction and maintenance. On the other hand, “women’s work” was comprised of picking, washing, and packaging mushrooms. There were exceptions to this division of labour. A few men were designated mushroom pickers, and my two sisters and I would sometimes be invited to work on the green machine so that we would learn how the mushroom beds were made and stacked. My one sister was trained to turn the manure with the tractor and to work the forklift. And both men and women were tasked with delivering mushrooms to restaurants, food distribution centres, and grocery stores in the surrounding communities of Southern Alberta.

In the household, gender roles were even more defined. As the youngest of four daughters, my role was to silently follow directions provided by everyone else who held seniority. The many memories of failures to remain quiet or to properly accomplish a task has become ingrained just as much as I recall the accomplishments, as they were rewarded with compliments regarding one’s abilities to follow orders well or of being お利口 (orikō), to not be selfish or わがまま (wagamama), and to be dutiful or 素直 (sunao). While お父さん used the threat of corporal punishment to mandate adherence to 孝行, お婆ちゃん and お母さん instilled its importance through demonstrating abidance with the expectation that we would imitate their actions. お婆ちゃん rarely spoke or asked for assistance, and お母さん would compliment お婆ちゃん’s industriousness by saying how much お婆ちゃん would 我慢 (gaman) or selflessly persevere. My sisters and I were led to emulate お婆ちゃん’s virtuous character. Perhaps one of the few ways in which such rigid hierarchies could be contested is through the concept of 矛盾 (mujun), which describes contradictory actions as it relates to one’s character. In our household, a younger person could playfully accuse the older of acting counter to their own expectations of others. For instance, one would commit 矛盾 by ordering the junior person to clean up while leaving a mess themselves.

Overall, I have learned to embody and appreciate the social value of 孝行 as a result of its inculcation throughout my childhood years, both within multi-cultural Asian labour dynamics and a Japanese linguistic and cultural upbringing. 孝行 has become habituated as a social response and profoundly influences my decisions as an adult in both Asian and non-Asian environments. 孝行 has been central in my attempts to contemplate through performance Indigenous and non-Indigenous interrelationships. In
the coming pages, I will discuss reaching the political and ethical limitations of blindly adhering to 孝行 in the attempt to act respectfully with regard to others. For now, it has been my intention to communicate how such a value becomes habituated, practiced and embodied in everyday interactions.

3.3.2 生活の美学 (seikatsu no bigaku)

Presentation is everything. This mantra streams through me as much as 孝行 directs actions that are meant to establish relational regard and deference. The aesthetics of the everyday speaks to the incorporation of beautifying one’s surrounds (Saito, 2007). One art philosophical scholar, Saito Yuriko (2007) draws upon her personal experiences to support the thesis that art and aesthetical practice is integral to all aspects of Japanese culture. She distinguishes this integrative approach to aesthetics in Japan from the categorical separation of art, the artist, and art practice, which she ascribes to be “Western paradigmatic art” (p. 29). While I do not have the space to go into a thorough examination of the debates regarding Japanese aesthetics, I wish to present and critically engage with Saito’s ruminations as a starting point to considering the complex overlaps between aesthetic judgment and practice, nationalism, and cultural sovereignty. According to Saito, in modern Western aesthetics, the art object becomes the focal point for catalyzing art-making; whereas a Japanese aesthetical approach describes actions to establish a state of affairs, that is, to make things artfully. However, Saito identifies artistic exceptions that challenge the Western art paradigm. She argues that in “Western” art-centred practice, performance art and environmental art challenge conventions established by the modern artworld. In her view, performance art that simulates everyday experiences tends to break down clear and thick boundaries between the white-cube walls of the gallery and ordinary activities (pp. 32-33). Meanwhile, environmental art, which Saito contends is premised upon a social ethic to improve the world through artistic intervention, blurs the separation between art and life through that intervention (p. 32). Ultimately, however, Saito wishes to identify and articulate an art-as-a state-of-affairs sensibility over an art-object based one. The Japanese sense of artfulness moves away from claims to specific authorship and status in artworlds and moves toward appreciating the immersion of art in every aspect of the world (Saito, 2007, p. 39).

In my youth, the sophistication in phrasing art contemplation as 生活の美学 was beyond my linguistic comprehension. At one point, I would have argued that musings
dedicated to discerning a culture’s philosophical underpinnings for art practice and appreciation were the purview of intellectuals and specialists both within and beyond that culture. Currently, I participate, no matter how obliquely, in imagining art and social engagement in Canadian, Indigenous, and transnational contexts through an upbringing that draws from Japanese heritage. Therefore, Saito’s (2007) presentation of Japanese aesthetics leads to larger questions about the national and diasporic frameworks and directives for understanding, and subsequently critically evaluating the meaning of art practice, appreciation, and ethics. As with Saito herself, such reflections come a posteriori to revisiting habituated artful engagement in the everyday. The key difference between the two contemplations is the change in the socio-political environment.

生活の美学 was shown within familial and cultural contexts in a rural and suburban Albertan setting. お母さん both consciously or unconsciously instilled the practice of presenting beautifully. Rather than vocally instructing, she expressed in a matter-of-fact way the artful completion of tasks. I would spend hours upon hours watching quietly as お母さん packed 弁当 (bentō) with happy faces formed using 海苔 (nori) onto the surface of the お握り (onigiri) and braised carrots shaped into 桜 (sakura). I was awestruck by the uniformity of her 餅 (mochi) balls during お正月 (oshōgatsu) preparations, and by how she often painstakingly wrapped all of the Christmas and お正月の gifts for the mushroom farm staff diagonally, so as to use only one piece of tape. Every Halloween, お母さん drew ghosts, cats, and witches on every paper bag package of sweets for distribution, developing such a reputation for having the best treats in the neighbourhood that children would come by twice and sometimes three times, if they could get away with it (until my sister and I pelted them with rotten crabapples from the rooftop). Outside of the family, there are memories of a Japanese man namedしんぺいさん (Shinpei-san) who organized 折り紙 (origami) parties during the summer holidays. I remember distinctly the lessons on the importance of precisely folding corner to corner, line to line, in order to unfold and refold well. In the beautiful shape of the finished 折り紙, the skill and efforts, as well as character traits such as patience and the capacity to pay attention, of the folder were revealed. As a young adult, for three summers during university breaks, I was employed by my brother-in-law, a Japanese garden designer who had graduated from 東京農大 (Tōkyō nōdai), お父さん’s alma mater. Much of the work was accomplished through observing then imitating the more senior employees,
however, at times my brother-in-law would provide specific explanations for the orientation of a rock, the rationale for lines drawn in the shale lake, and the beauty of impermanence or 侘び寂び (wabi sabi). Through this unexpected training – to identify the face of the rock, the practice of maintaining cleanliness and orderliness throughout the construction process, the correct way to dig a big hole – I actually developed an appreciation for all kinds of gardens - something to which I had previously held absolutely no interest - and for considering the labour required to create spaces that are meant to perpetually shift in beauty.

While Saito (2007) argues for the everyday seamlessness of 生活の美学, within a rural Albertan context, this aesthetic attention to detail and process stood out in its particular absence in situations deemed non-Japanese. With a town population of approximately 1600, comprised almost entirely of European-descended people (save the mushroom farm staff and their families), お母さん’s efforts to beautify effectively meant that she would be conspicuous because of her aesthetic choices. Her acts could easily be understood within Saito’s binaristic analysis to contrast Japanese and Western-based art practices. Indeed, お母さん’s practice did draw attention due to its foreignness and estrangement from the aesthetic expectations of everyday presentation. And in this regard, her aesthetic exceptionalism provides evidence for Saito’s suggestion that a “Western” gaze from those around her would focus upon the art object rather than the state of affairs. As well, as a person born and raised in Japan, お母さん’s artistic flair itself could be considered unexceptional in Saito’s view, and in keeping with the Japanese aesthetical regard for beautifying as due course.

Let us reconsider Saito’s (2007) contrasting of Western and Japanese aesthetics. Saito’s binaristic thinking presupposes definitive boundaries between the constituents of Western and Japanese artistic appreciation and practice. In the case of お母さん’s everyday acts, those boundaries become blurred, as well as Saito’s rationale for making the distinction in the first place. The ongoing exceptionalism of お母さん’s attention to aesthetic detail within a rural primarily Euro-Canadian context becomes a new common occurrence. In other words, it can be argued that artistic appreciation shifts from the who (the artist) to the how (the practice) through the what (artified object) thereby creating a new expectation of the context itself. A substantive shift takes place so as to catalyze a shift in process. Those acquainted with お母さん would have an impact on what she would make in terms of food, gifting, etc., and in turn, such particularities would become
a familiar presence, effectively transforming culture(s) from the inside out.

Within the language of postcolonial discourse, Homi Bhabha’s (1994) thesis on hybridity seems to support my contestation of Saito’s (2007) binaristically grounded premise, and of the potentials of social and art practice to transform power relations. Recall in Chapter One, Amar Acheraiou’s (2011) task to ground hybridity discourse within real-life considerations of class and race. A contemplation of お母さんの routine behaviour to beautify is perhaps the kind of lived example that Acheraiou seeks, and with it arise the complexities of cultural (re)production, post-, neo-, and non-colonial meanings, and being in excess of those categories. First, inasmuch as お母さんの actions habituate a new responsive aesthetical regard from those around, her “foreignness” is also reestablished both within her and their experiences. This “apart-from-ness” confirms Saito’s original Japanese v. Western distinction. Likewise, my brother-in-law’s training to be a Japanese garden designer is premised upon enacting certain aesthetical and ethical views of Shintoism and Zen Buddhism, which are presented in contrast to European garden architecture and philosophies. If we as thinkers are to take into consideration the political and ethical ambivalence of hybridity that Bhabha has described, it is possible that reiterative and consequently prescriptive materializations of cultural expression are amongst that which emerge in the third space. In a post-deconstructive phase of intellectual analysis, the third space gives rise to the crystallization of so-called cultural truisms or authenticity, no matter how momentary they may be, while simultaneously proliferating states of affairs and objects that exceed those cultural expectations and norms.

Second, the political, interpretive ambivalence of お母さんの aesthetical regard gives real-life credibility to the explanatory power of hybridity. In classical postcolonial theory, colonial identities are clearly defined and demarcated. The colonizer is often imagined as White European and the colonized as darker skinned. This racialization centers upon European colonization, without due consideration for other colonialisms and non-colonial power dynamics, that both challenge and reinforce the hegemonic force of a European-focused conceptualization of colonialism and postcolonial theorizing (Kwon, 2015; Todd, 2005). For example, from the late 1800s until the mid-1900s, imperial Japan pushed for the colonization of Asia (Kikuchi, 2004; Xiong, 2014). Initially, it might seem peculiar to foreground this imperial legacy, when it is worlds away from a poor Japanese family living in a rural, farming community in Southern Alberta. But upon closer examination, what becomes apparent is that the perpetuation of the values that
were asserted in Japan’s colonizing missions were reiterated within my household. I will
discuss this familial history in further detail in the following chapters. For now, I wish to
point out that お婆ちゃん, who effectively was the first mother in our household, and her
husband lived in China for eleven years, as part of the well-educated, middle-class
colonizing waves of migration. お母さん too lived in China for five years, barely escaping
with お婆ちゃん back to Japan as the Second Sino-Japanese war intensified. At the
time, 生活の美学 arguably was understood as a means to reproduce a Japanese citizen
and civilize colonial subjects of the Empire of Japan (Kwon, 2015; Todd, 2005). To her
death, お婆ちゃん was a die-hard imperialist, often advising my sisters and me to act
appropriate to a woman of a certain educational and social status, and to mimic the
mannerisms of the ruling Crown Princess. She also never contemplated the larger
colonial intent that encouraged her familial presence in China, which was evidenced in
the way she recounted her memories of living and travelling there. Keeping this historical
context in mind, 生活の美学 communicates the political ambivalence of hybridity. In a
rural Canadian setting, お母さん’s artful presentation simultaneously can be interpreted
as: a colonized Asian subject resisting assimilation into European sensibilities; a
Japanese colonizing force in competition with European aesthetic judgment and
practice; a neocolonial presence asserting Japaneseness through artistic habituation;
and a noncolonial act of expressing culture. Bhabha’s (1994) conceptualizing of hybridity
has the interpretive capacity to describe the multiple precipitates of political and social
meaning in excess of the actor’s intention. However, it does not elucidate actor agency
in interpreting, enacting, and instructing others to participate in expressing certain
cultural values.

Third, the proliferation of representations that are assigned to the actor in
question has the potential to entrap that person’s state of being within prescribed
categories of existence. One of the objectives of hybridity, according to Bhabha (1994),
is to exceed imposed significations of culture, including postcolonial identity (pp. 171-
172). Questions arise as to what is being exceeded. Knowns? Expectations? Defined
boundaries? In the case of お母さん’s practice of 生活の美学, personal and cultural
being exceed and are also less than the collation of political and social meanings that
are inscribed. Growing up and witnessing お母さん’s artful presentation in the everyday,
I would argue that her actions were a means to bridge Japanese and non-Japanese, an
invitation to participate rather than to enforce cultural separation and nationalistic ideals.
That お母さん’s actions and her life can never be fully encapsulated by intellectual treatises on political power differentials, such as postcolonial discourses, is somewhat of a relief, because she cannot be held in place as an object for the sake of theoretical fitness. Instead, she exists beyond enacting rationalized intentionality, affecting and being affected by inanimate and animate presences that are intersubjectively entwined to create a state of affairs.

The inability of postcolonial theories to contain the vast meanings of hybridity, fundamental to the critique that Acheraïou (2011) continuously revisits, once again focuses attention on the intellectual, historical context and the basic political and ethical tenets of that time in which conceptualization of the third space is to have taken place. Upon reflection, it could be supposed that postcolonial theories of the 1990s and the early aughts – and apparent in the Location of Culture (Bhabha, 1994) - imagined hybridity in terms of visual and textual representation. The fluidity of identity at best could be described as freeze frames or stop motion animation in which the ethical relationship between the self and others could be read, comprehended, and meaningfully contained by others. I wish to argue that prioritizing the visual in theorizing (political) representation, a tacit normative expectation of the parameters of acting and being overly prescribed to fulfill either the colonizer or colonized position, is at the cost of being mindful of the more complex and at times contradictory nature of existing together. In other words, how someone is seen and read would determine how they ought to act and think, in keeping with a stabilized and synchronized position that has been mapped onto them. To be in excess of these expectations is to be vulnerable to becoming irrelevant, nonsensical and ultimately expendable in such a regulated political world.

I am interested in the aspects of excess and ambivalence that Bhabha (1994) instilled in his theoretical development and how they point toward something beyond his idealizations. If you adhere to an idea for a significant amount of time, it is surprising to find out what eventually will emerge as the most important teaching. In those moments of enacting 生活の美学, while お母さん might have had in mind a pining for her childhood home and memories of past artistic attempts, her actions have instilled the value of paying attention to aesthetic detail that orients toward certain colour/pattern combinations, movements of hands and torso, size, texture, taste considerations, and gift-giving protocols. Her actions exceed her or any other person’s rationalization of them. This failure to contain a person epistemically, politically, and existentially will be an important theme in considering what is revealed in excess of one’s intentions in the
performatives of witnessing. For now, suffice to say that it is one of the outcomes of hybridity discourse that leads to constructively critical political redirection.

The second consequence of focusing on hybridity is recognizing the value that Bhabha (1994) placed on ambivalence. It would seem that he was attempting to distance himself from scholars who unproblematically elevated the emancipatory capacities of postcolonial discourse in the perennial tug of war for power between the colonizer and colonized. As with Bhabha, I am compelled to questioning the moral superiority or inferiority of ideas and ethical actions. Certain relational terms seem to connote a moral supremacy, while others initiate a negative state of being. I wish to suggest that rather than evaluating an ethical precept on an individual basis, it might be more elucidating to understand certain behaviors, emotions, and actions in relation to one another and the state of affairs that emerge from the confluence of those terms. With this in mind, I will now turn to the third aspect of character or habituation that helps shape my contemplations on the performatives of witnessing.

3.3.3糞たれ (kusotare)

I come from a family of assholes.糞たれloosely translates into a combination of "asshole" and "shithead", and it was a term bandied around a lot in our household, especially byお父さん. Granted, one might assume that no one wishes to be known as a糞たれ, I can safely say that many times, in our family, being an asshole has been pronounced with a certain amount of pride. Behaving like a糞たれis not a defining characteristic only within our nuclear family, but seems to have been passed down matrilineally, just like the 後藤 (Gotō) name, throughお婆さん's bloodline. According toお父さん, his father, who was born甲斐(Kai) was not a糞たれ, but a quiet, mild-mannered, and kindhearted man even after he adoptedお婆さん’s (obāsan) surname as well as her relations. It would seem that historically, Japanese family names would be

---

57Although the terms morality and ethics are often used interchangeably, in the area of moral philosophy, they are at times distinguished theoretically and practically in terms of relational culpability and scope. Morality refers to one’s personal values and principles regarding the rightness and wrongness of an act. Whereas ethics are the rules and codes of conduct that are applied from external sources such as from a religion or ethnic community. Please keep in mind that this distinction between morality and ethics is one created within European philosophical traditions, and European and N. American scholars have amply critiqued this division (Norman, 1998). In my own usage, morality is presented as inclined toward one’s cognitive and emotional intentions, whereas ethics signifies the gathering of one’s habituated responses in response to a demand or situation.
passed down matrilineally if the woman’s family had higher socio-economic status. お父さん’s mother, on the other hand, had a reputation for her larger than life personality. The somber commemorative photo of お婆さん adorned just above the 仏壇 (butsdan) in her descendants’ houses does a disservice to representing how people remember her: someone with a booming laugh, which created a slight whistle between her widely gapped teeth, who drank with hearty abandon, slapping those around her in inebriated anger or jubilation. お母さん recollects お父さん telling her that the 後藤 property was always packed with extended family, farmhands, and casual workers, who were promised accommodation, food, and payment in exchange for their labours. While お爺さん (ojīsan) quietly and persistently cooked delicious cuisine for everybody, お婆さん kept spirits up or down, depending upon her mood. In the household, she would have the final say on who belonged and who should be shunned. The糞たれ quality would carry over from Japanese into other socio-political contexts.58

I emphasize the habituated character trait of being a糞たれ because it has greatly impacted creative decisions in performance, witnessing, and reacting critically against unfair treatment or expectations. As a糞たれ, お父さん would advise me in my too serious moments as a youngster, “おまえ反対しな,” that is, he ordered me to oppose or to antagonize myself, effectively to play a trick on myself. And he too would do anything to break the peace in a Rabelaisian fashion, for example, by blowing over a multi-tiered playing card mansion just on the verge of completion, or by tricking my sister and me into eating our wormy mud pies by convincing us, on three consecutive

---

58For example, it is because they were both糞たれ, that お父さん and his older brother, my Uncle Elephant, got into a heated row about dividing the mushroom farm shares, which devolved into the two adult brothers chasing and hitting each other with 剣道 (kendō) sticks as neighbours looked on with fascinated horror. And as a糞たれ, Uncle Elephant immediately packed up his family and belongings and returned to Japan, with both brothers refusing to talk to one another for eight ridiculous years. And because we too were糞たれ, my sister and I used to kick off the greedy little brats who had jumped onto the back of the mushroom truck, trying to steal more than their share, on the rare occasions that the farm had produced a surplus of mushrooms to give away to the watching crowds during the August long weekend town parade. And as an adult, my sister continued her糞たれ ways, walking up to a table of English guys in London and throwing champagne into the ringleader’s face, because the table (also糞たれ, but of no relation) had actually thrown a jug of water at my other sister and her best friend for being Asian. Years can be spent regaling those interested with stories of supremely糞たれ behaviour and choices made by various family members and myself that have been rash and at times regretful.
occasions, that in the “baking” process, the mud inadvertently transformed into real chocolate. The danger of a 糞たれ is that unabated it becomes an excuse to act deplorably with disregard for people’s feelings or states of affairs. And if being a 糞たれ is one’s only frame of reference on behaviour, the means and contents of doing really shitty things to others and to oneself become boundless. However, in relation to other character habits and traits, the 糞たれ becomes an important counterbalance, creating a perspectival shift in one’s intentions and consequent actions.

The ethical usefulness of having within one’s character the capacity to be a 糞たれ can be understood in the contemplation of how traits, be they transnational, cultural, or familial, come to be valued or disvalued. In people’s efforts to present themselves, perhaps there is a tendency to elevate that which are considered good qualities, while hiding from oneself and others one’s character flaws (or conversely, to advance one’s perceived poor features while ignoring the honourable ones). I wish to counter-argue that although traits are prima facie designated with differentiated preferential valuations, they each have the potential to cause harm or to create good. 孝行, or filial abidance, which in abstraction is presented as a positive ethical precept, can be used as a justification to blindly adhere to familial and social protocols so as to lead to political disaster. Similarly, 生活の美学, or the aesthetics of the everyday, which is espoused as a particularly Japanese aesthetical philosophy of beautifying actions and the surrounds, can lead to denigrating judgments, and discriminating against other states of affairs deemed ugly and not-Japanese. Finally, the 糞たれ, or the shithead asshole, supposedly the unsympathetic troublemaker, can become the absurd disruption in the unbridled pursuit of one’s intentions to do or be good. What does it mean performatively to reach the ethical limits of each quality? I will discuss such outcomes in the latter chapters. For now, I wish to suggest that rather than thinking of these habituations separately, it might be helpful to regard them in relation to one another.

In Rinrigaku, Japanese modernist moral and ethics philosopher, Watsuji Tetsurō (1937/1996) refers to 間柄 (aidagara) or the inbetweenness of human beings, arguing that to be 人間 (ningen) or human is to be individual and social dynamically such that their interdependence is reinforced in every act (p. 18). He contends that one’s intention to act is not isolable to a singular consciousness, but that the decision itself is predicated upon “subjective communal existence” (p. 19). In other words, 人間 cannot be self-
contained or self-containing but ontologically relational. 人間 is not a permanent, fixed self, but fluid, always shifting and changing with respect to the perceived context (Watsuji, 1937/1996, p. 117). According to Watsuji, the ethical relationship between self and society is embodied, eschewing the stark separation of body and mind, which is often articulated in Western moral and ethical discourses. Feminist comparative studies philosopher Erin McCarthy (2010) is compelled by Watsuji’s integration of the mind and body as the site of experiencing knowledge because it does away with the “Western” masculine prioritizing of mind over the feminized sense of body (McCarthy, 2010, pp. 37-39). She understands Watsuji’s conception of 間柄 as a “carnal interconnection” (p. 39). Watsuji provides the example of the relationship between mother and child to elucidate the embodied aspects of the self and the social (Watsuji, 1937/1996, p. 62). And McCarthy dwells upon this example to communicate how the relation precedes and compels the body to carry out an act, existing in the inbetweenness (McCarthy, 2010, p. 40). In reflecting upon the habituation of 孝行, 生活の美学, and 糞たれ, these qualities are not experienced as objective, discernible characteristics but fully embodied outcomes of human interaction. The meaning of 孝行 or filial abidance can only be known in its performance or in rejection of it, just as the valuation and evidence of everyday aesthetics, which might initially appear to exist outside of the doer, is actually a culmination of agreements made between people on that which constitutes beauty. The 糞たれ too is only so in relation to those who have been wronged, duped, or upset by the unexpected action or redirection. Thus, the body is the site of new knowledge, the third space, in the relational interactions between these three qualities as they move into each other, hit up and conflict with one another, and at times create cataclysmic changes that lead to emotional and intellectual reconsideration and political and ethical reorganization. This relationality is not limited to the inbetweenness of humans but also interwoven with natural phenomena.

For Watsuji (1935/1961), the context, or environment itself, is in a perpetual dynamic relationship to human experience; the phenomenon of climate is understood as expressions of the human subjective experience of space (p. v). Premised upon 空 (kū) or the Buddhist notion of emptiness, Watsuji theorizes climate to be the site of conditioning the variegated modes of human contact with other humans, society, and nature (Baek, 2013). He discusses at length the relationship between the individual and society as a reciprocal negation. In Rinrigaku, Watsuji (1937/1996) explains that
individual assertion is founded upon the negation or rebellion against the whole; at the same time, adherence to the whole is a rejection of the individual in opposition to the whole (Mochizuki, 2006; Watsuji, 1937/1996, pp. 101-2). In the processes of successive sublimations, the dual construction of 人間 ultimately moves toward emptiness as an absolute totality (Watsuji, 1937/1996). Just as 人間 is intertwined with fellow 人間, so too is it inextricably bound to nature. Representational meanings of both 人間 and nature, and their abstractions, emerge as a consequence of this primordial intertwined relation.

Watsuji’s (1935/1961, 1937/1996) spatially, embodied, and experientially based epistemologies of climate and ethics generate a reaching toward human-land relations that resonate with others who have expressed similar ideas. Furthermore, in a post-modern reconsideration of the thinking body and embodiment, 間柄 (aidagara), or inbetweenness, can be useful in describing new body formations that are both greater and smaller, and rearranging in ways unimaginable in the modernist, atomistic conception of the human individual form.

In this section, the introduction of 孝行, 生活の美学, and 食たれ has been meant to move beyond verbal acknowledgments of traditional territory, and to contemplate those moments of passing through in excess of one’s traumatic past. These values, whose verbal expressions are understood as an outcome of socially engaged cultivation, have been discussed in relation to one another. In the next section and in the upcoming chapters, I will begin to consider how these values are carried within, and how they might shape, limit, and open up new and unexpected interrelationships.

3.4 Steps toward acknowledging the land

In the present, on a nearly daily basis, I run on this land. Sometimes, this land is the unceded territory of the Syilx people. According to the Okanagan Nation Alliance (n.d.b), the root term “yil” means to take any fibre and to roll and twist it together to make one unit. Thus, the word Syilx contains the command for each individual to bind and

59For a comprehensive discussion of Watsuji’s theoretical indebtedness to the Buddhist notion of 空 (kū), please see Nagami, Isamu’s (1981) article, “The ontological foundation in Tetsurō Watsuji’s philosophy: Kū and human existence.” Watsuji’s knowledge and articulation of Buddhist thought is highly regarded in Japanese scholarship. He wrote what is considered a classical text in the understanding of Buddhism in Japan, The Practical Philosophy of Primitive Buddhism (Watsuji, 1992). Watsuji draws heavily on Buddhist themes to develop his ethical philosophy.
unify with all others (Okanagan Nation Alliance, n.d.b). Okanagan scholar and knowledge keeper Jeannette Armstrong (2012) examines how oral literature arises out of experiences of the land. She maps out a theory of Syilx orality to reflect long-term knowledge of human-earth interrelatedness. According to Armstrong, Syilx oral storytelling is predominantly a literary expression of ethics, which guides behaviour and interactions with the environment (pp. 347-348). Armstrong presents a different frame of reference for the shaping of language itself, and how it cannot be separate from living on the land. In an interview with English professor Karin Beeler (1996), Armstrong talks about the spirit characters, and names the spirit chiefs of the land: Bear, Saskatoon berry, Bitterroot, and Salmon (p. 147). Fundamental to everything, these beings together provide the spirit force of the person living in Syilx territory (Beeler, 1996, p. 147).

Anthropologist of Stl’atl’imx’ heritage, Christine Elsey (2013) elegantly describes the interrelatedness of humans and the land as an enfoldment of the environment into the fabric of one’s “own” body such that the body is not an individual self but collective in nature, the interweaving of one’s experiences within the context of “terrestrial social action” (p. 9). Elsey terms this interweaving the poiesis of being and doing, that is, the creative expression of humans being-on-the-land collectively, relating to the land in a spiritual manner.

Elsey’s (2013) writing on the relationship between the land and people alongside Armstrong’s (2012; Beeler, 1996) explanation of the nsyilxcen language of the land resonate profoundly with Watsuji’s (1935/1961, 1937/1996) conception of 間柄 and 風土. They describe deeply interwoven agreements between human and land. Every day that I pass through a minute portion of this land, concurrently it is experienced differently and similarly. Some parts of the land seem to have remained unchanged for millennia. Other beings and relations shift from day to day, hour to hour, second to second. On every run, I imagine if, on that day, my feet will have learned to listen for the language of the land, even as the texture of the ground changes considerably, based on season, temperature, humidity, and time of day. My own speed, lung capacity, and energy levels also determine the kinds of communication that take place in the 間柄 of human-land.

In passing through, land becomes a verb, reciprocal motions: in every landing of

---

60 Syilx refers to “people of the Okanagan”, which distinguishes this community from other Salish peoples. The term Syilx translates to “an action turning into a thing.” Armstrong (2012) describes the nsyilxcen as an orality-based language that is experienced closer to visualization rather than signification.
the foot onto the surface, there is equally the embrace or hold of the ground to absorb the impact of contact. It takes a great deal of effort to learn a new language, and greater effort still to understand the stories of and in that language. The Syilx territorial languaging of the land speaks to the verb rather than the noun-based shaping of the land (Armstrong, 2012). It is easy to become cognitively overwhelmed to try to mull over the land’s multivocal languages, inclusive of Indigenous territorialized vocabularies. The land ceaselessly exceeds human intellectual comprehension. Even as the whole body passes through, thinking is experienced as an all-encompassing yet unfinished exercise of chasing and being shaped by several kinds of shadows, only to find oneself transforming into a shadow. Visual shadows are instructive in directing the gaze toward something or someone who is strangely hidden in plain sight. The osprey that flies across the sun casts a looming shadow, reminding me to witness above. At the perfect time of day, high noon in the spring into summer, visual shadows cast by wild grasses remind me that the land is in constant motion, even as it is rooted into place. Those grassy shadows sway on the surface of the pavement only for a brief while and then disappear until they are once again hit by the sunlight at the right angle. At the same time, there are other shadows that exist beyond the visual realm: sonorous, performative, and tactile.

In the following chapters, I will describe becoming different kinds of shadows in relation to Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Adrian Stimson, and Peter Morin. And in arguing that sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows exist beyond the surface realm of visual shadows, I will describe how they express weight, depths, texture, and shift in shape, size, and meaning. I wish to show that witnessing is an intersubjectively grounded, embodied and dynamic interplay of the illuminating source, object, and shadow, an important state of being in the间柄 of living with respect to one another. I endeavor to develop more respectful ways of acknowledging territories and the land through fostering relationships with Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter.
Chapter Four: In sonorous shadows of Cheryl L’Hirondelle

As I have been living and learning Nehiyawin (a Cree worldview) – I have been impressed by how it is more relational than proprietary, and process-oriented rather than object-based. To say nitomen (my friend) – one is saying the-friend-I-am-relational-to, and in that there are roles and responsibilities encoded. To approach and see from that point of view, then, everything is shifted and transformed so it’s not a dissolution of what is but a shift in perspective – a window to what has always been.

(Interview with Cheryl L’Hirondelle. Nanibush, 2008, p. 33)

In this chapter, I wish to explore my growing friendship with Cheryl L’Hirondelle. In terms of art practice, I identify this relationship as 先輩-後輩 (senpai-kōhai), or a mentorship. At the beginning of the chapter, I will discuss that paths of social relations and the larger political context within which this 先輩-後輩 relation has arisen. This discussion will be followed by the presentation of specific art works that Cheryl has produced. Next, certain values associated with nehiyawin, or a Cree worldview, will be interwoven with the transnational, cultural, and familial values that I carry into a nascent performance practice. The chapter will conclude with the contemplation of performance as a form of witnessing Cheryl’s politicized art practice. The idea of becoming a sonorous shadow in relation to Cheryl will be appearing throughout the chapter.

4.1 Coming to witness Cheryl L’Hirondelle

It is very difficult to write about someone whom I respect immensely, for I will surely fail to do justice to the scope of her art and life practices. Perhaps the best way to start is to move seemingly far away from describing the building of a personal relationship with Cheryl, and to pass through the worlds that she has inhabited.

I was first introduced to the work of Cheryl L’Hirondelle in 2011, when artist and curator of Indigenous and European heritage, Lisa Myers talked about Cheryl’s collaborative art project, NDNSPAM Cookbook: Celebrity Edition, during her presentation, Best Before: Recipes and Food in Contemporary Aboriginal Art, at the 2011 gathering of the Aboriginal Curatorial Collective (ACC) in Toronto, Ontario (Aboriginal Curatorial Collective [ACC], 2011; Myers, n.d.). The theme of the gathering was “Revisioning the Indians of Canada Pavilion: Ahzhekewada (Let Us Look Back)”, in reference to the Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo ’67 in Montreal, Quebec (ACC, 2011). It was the first time that Indigenous people were invited to
was “Revisioning the Indians of Canada Pavilion: Ahzhekewada (Let Us Look Back)” in reference to the Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo ’67 in Montreal, Quebec (ACC, 2011). The purpose of the conference was to identify and discuss pivotal moments in Indigenous art history that would come to influence the directions of future artmaking by Indigenous artists (ACC, 2011). Dene painter, Alex Janvier, Saugeen First Nation poet, Duke Redbird, and Seneca artist and curator, Tom Hill, who were central in organizing and curating the Indians of Canada Pavilion, sat on the inaugural panel of the 2011 ACC conference (ACC, 2011; Turions, 2012). They reflected upon the political and practical struggles that they had encountered in bringing together an exhibit that would present the continuing, colonial, and unequal relationship between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian government (Hill, 2016; Ruffo, 2008, 2015; Rutherford & Miller, 2006; Turions, 2012).

Settler-colonial researchers are perhaps rather too enthusiastic in coming to the conclusion that the Indians of Canada Pavilion had very little long-term impact in Canadian society beyond the lifespan of Expo ‘67. For example, historians Myra Rutherford and Jim Miller (2006) (both self-identified as settlers) have argued that the Indians of Canada Pavilion has failed to have a deeper longstanding influence both within Indigenous circles and on non-Native Canadians (pp. 172-173). They point out the irrelation between Indigenous political figures involved in the construction and presentation of the Indians of Canada Pavilion and those who rose up against the 1969 White Paper, which amongst other objectives, sought to abandon the Indian Act62 (p. __________

participate at an Expo event. Taking the opportunity to present the history and outcomes of contact between Indigenous and European people, Indigenous artist-consultants Alex Janvier and Duke Redbird, alongside other Indigenous artists, came into direct conflict with civil servants, who wished to present a more sanitized version of colonial history in Canada. For more information on the history of the Indians of Canada Pavilion, please see: Armand Ruffo’s (2008) essay, “Celebrating Canada’s Centennial”; Myra Rutherford and Jim Miller’s (2006) historical analysis, “It’s Our Country: First Nations’ Participation in the Indian Pavilion at Expo 67,”; and Forget, Belleau, and Régnier’s (1967) short documentary film, Indian Memento, which is available through the National Film Board of Canada.

62In 1963 the Canadian Federal Government commissioned University of British Columbia anthropologist, Harry B. Hawthorn (1966) to produce a comprehensive study of the socio-economic status of Indigenous persons across Canada. Known as the Hawthorn Report, it was concluded that Indigenous peoples were the most disadvantaged and marginalized of population groups in Canada due to ongoing failed governmental policies, including the continuation of Residential Schools (Hawthorn, 1966). The two-volume Hawthorn Report is available in the Government of Canada Archives. The report findings led the Liberal Federal Government to consult extensively with Indigenous leaders during the mid-60s to address poor quality of life in their communities. The infamous White Paper, (Government of Canada, 1969)
171). That is, Rutherdale and Miller compare the poor social reach of the Indian Pavilion to other instances of Indigenous protests and presence, such as the Oka Crisis in 1990 and the dissemination of the report of the 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), suggesting that these too failed to shift Canadian mindsets regarding Indigenous people (p. 172). Settler-colonial scholar, Jane Griffith (2015) comes to a similar conclusion, based upon an education-oriented analysis of the Indian Pavilion in relation to other components of the Canadian compound at Expo ’67. Griffith argues that the critical pedagogical approach at the Indian Pavilion was for the most part overlooked by non-Indigenous visitors, who were inundated with a dominating presentation from the Canadian pavilions that espoused colonially grounded progress. In this context, progress was understood as a linear, technologically driven sense of cultural and national development (Griffith, 2015). In these pavilions, Indigenous people were framed historically, while the future success of Canada was to be found in exploiting and conquering industries such as water, lumber, and nuclear power (Griffith, 2015, p. 187). Griffith also considers how the CA-NA-DA song, which would come to be seen as the theme song of Expo ’67 and the Confederation Train63 effectively celebrated colonial rule of Canada (pp. 188-193). Altogether, these elements combined to loudly revere European colonial processes of nation-building, and to interfere with non-Indigenous visitors’ capacity to listen openly to the critiques made within the walls of the Indian Pavilion.


63The Canadian Centennial Commission spent nearly $50M dollars (unadjusted for inflation) to construct a Confederation Train, which would travel from the east to west coast and then back to Quebec for Expo ’67. According to settler-colonial scholar, Jane Griffith (2015), the train was meant to materially reference Confederation and the unity of the provinces.
desire to shift responsibility, I wish to question the constituents of their imagined audience in addressing non-Indigenous people and to challenge the assertion that the Indians of Canada Pavilion had little lasting impact within Indigenous and non-Indigenous circles. First, in considering the historical context of Expo '67, it may be useful to look through a wider political lens at the changing governmental policies on immigration, as well as the federal government’s immobilization in redressing past racial injustices. The year 1967 is considered pivotal in changes to the Immigration Act, which introduced the Points Based Assessment System\(^{64}\) and eliminated immigration based on race (Anwar, 2014; Fitzgerald & Cook-Martin, 2014; Pendakur, 2000; Plaza, 2004; Walton-Roberts, 2003). Prior to 1967, race-based immigration bias in Canada led to severe restrictions for people of Asian, African, and Middle Eastern descent with exceptions with regard to labour- and, at times, colonial links to the British Crown (Anwar, 2014; Plaza, 2004; Walton Roberts, 2003; Yu, 2009). Up until the early 1960s, Northern and Southern Europeans and citizens of the British Isles comprised the vast majority of those immigrating to Canada (Fitzgerald & Cook-Martin, 2014; Pendakur, 2000; Triadafilopoulos, 2013). Political scientist and migration scholar, Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos argues that external international pressures both from the United Nations and the United States impelled Canada to eliminate racist immigration practices. Expo '67 provided the opportunity for Canada to show the world that it was a nation worthy of international attention based on its sense of cultural inclusivity and technological advancements, in a bid to attract the “right kind” of citizen (Bumsted, 1996; Kenneally & Sloan, 2010; Lownsbrough, 2012; Miedema, 2005).

This international performance in showing Canada to be a progressive, modern nation-state was at variance with those of Asian, African, and Middle Eastern descent who had managed to enter the country prior to the changes made in the Immigration Act of 1967. For example, according to poet, scholar, activist, and my mentor, Roy Miki (2004), who was pivotal in the Japanese Canadian Redress movement, both liberal Prime Ministers, Lester Pearson and Pierre Trudeau, were extremely reticent in apologizing for the internment of people of Japanese descent during World War II. As

---

\(^{64}\)The Points Based Assessment System enabled individuals to self-assess their chances of living successfully in Canada by calculating their eligibility for immigration based on: age, education, and work experience. Successful applicants could enter into Canada without pre-existing employment arrangements. For further information on the Points Based Assessment System please see Arif Anwar’s (2014) article, “Canadian immigration policy: Micro and macro issues with the Points Based Assessment System.”
was discussed in Chapter Two, Roy Miki had argued that the call for justice and a formal apology from the Government of Canada for the internment of people of Japanese ancestry was a fight for Japanese-Canadians to be recognized as having full citizenship under the law. For Miki, full citizenship rights included the capacity for Japanese-Canadians to make changes to the democratic system to prevent future possibilities for the Federal Government to commit racially motivated harms to its citizens (p. 235). For example, Japanese-Canadians sought to place the Charter of Rights and Freedoms beyond the legal scope of the War Measures Act, so as to prevent the Federal Government's legal capacity to oppress its citizens in times of international and national conflict (Miki, 2004, p. 235).

Presently, I wish to suggest that racially discriminatory immigration policies prior to 1967 placed the onus upon those who had been racially and ethnically grouped to prove themselves to be model citizens, and/or to be rightfully living within the nation-state of Canada. In other words, it could be argued that the shaping of Canadian nationalism for federally and provincially identified racialized communities is a result of resisting further exclusions. Such resistance could come in different forms – street protest, active petitions, or quiet assimilation – which would break apart the myth of the homogeneous ethnic group and create fractures within and outside of these “communities”. In 1967 and beyond, in the modernist march toward multiculturally driven expansionism, federal neglect in acknowledging past racial injustices may have been perceived as an extension of racism for those whose lives had been negatively affected.

When Rutherford, Miller, (2006) and Griffith (2015) place the onus on non-Indigenous people to learn about the ongoing effects of past and present-day colonial policies on Indigenous people in Canada, perhaps unintentionally, they are speaking both in the past and present. The imagined non-Indigenous person from within Canada visiting Expo ’67 was most likely someone of British, Northern and Southern European descent, given the demographic make-up at that time (Fitzgerald & Cook-Martin, 2014; Pendakur, 2000). The non-Indigenous person being addressed in the present day might be a member of, or ethnically affiliated to, a group that has experienced discrimination based on race or geographical origin, or a member of a new ethnic or political presence in Canada; the non-Indigenous person might currently be facing social discrimination, or they might have no personal knowledge of being treated in a racially prejudicial manner. When Prime Minister Justin Trudeau (Lawson, 2015) himself publicly questions the
social goodness of a unified nationalism, I would argue that part of the responsibility of those living in Canada is to contemplate, from their specific experiences, past calls from members of their self-identified communities for recognition rights that inadvertently would have fed into a homogenized nationalism for the Canadian state.

Furthermore, I wish to counter Trudeau’s declaration that Canada is the “world’s first postnational state” (Lawson, 2015). Trudeau defines “postnational” Canada as a country that does not have a strong sense of national identity with regard to language, religion, and culture. He then goes on to elevate this carelessness in terms of values shared by Canadians, such as “openness, respect, compassion, willingness to work hard, to be there for each other, to search for equality and justice” which comprise the postnational state (Lawson, 2015). To counter Trudeau’s romantic pronouncements, I wish to argue that Canada is a multinational state situated upon British and French colonial legislations. Multinational is meant both in its connotations to large corporations, and to the multiple national identities and affiliations that are carried by people as they temporarily pass through or reside permanently in Canada. There can be moments of the postnational for those who do not collapse national with cultural identity (Plaza, 2004; Walton-Roberts, 2003). Simultaneously, there are those who argue for the recognition of a neo-national reality that is not premised upon the history of British and French colonial rule (Yu, 2009).

Ironically, the questioning of nationalism by non-Indigenous people can lead to another point of estrangement from Indigenous calls for sovereignty rights and the recognition of nationhood (Alfred, 2005b; Coulthard, 2007). However, this apparent chasm creates a false clean division between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. As with non-Indigenous folks, those of Indigenous descent have complex and diverse relationships to nationhood. As such, it cannot be assumed that those who are pushing for a nation-to-nation relationship with the Canadian state have a unified vision of what that relationship entails. It would also be wrong to assume that questions of sovereignty and nationalism have not and cannot be discussed in the mix of Indigenous and non-

\[65^\text{In an interview with journalist, Guy Lawson (2015), Justin Trudeau remarked that with no core identity and no mainstream, Canada was the world’s first postnational state.}\]

\[66^\text{East Asian Studies scholar Henry Yu (2009) argues that a Pacific Canada had existed prior to and was disrupted by European presence. According to Yu, a Pacific Canada was built upon cultural exchanges and interactions between those on the West coast of Canada and other countries in the Asia Pacific region. For more information on Yu’s position, please see his 2009 article, “Global migrants and the new Pacific Canada.”}\]
Indigenous people. For example, in 2002, South-Asian-Canadian writer, scholar, artist, and before he became my life-partner, Ashok Mathur (2006) brought together Indigenous and racialized non-Indigenous artists and thinkers in an endeavour to answer the voluminous question: How do racialized, Indigenized, queer, classed subgroups of any particular “nation” work through and beyond those putative borders (p. 4)? This question led to IntraNation, a series of events and gatherings that would respond in multi-faceted and membership-shifting collaborations. In his reflections on IntraNation, Mathur acknowledges the work of Monika Kin Gagnon and Richard Fung (2002), whose collection *13 Conversations about Art and Cultural Race Practices* influenced the formation and momentum of these gatherings (Mathur, 2006, p. 4). Thus, IntraNation was and is to be understood as one among several gatherings of racialized and Indigenous artists and thinkers, some of which have been documented by Gagnon (2000) in *Other Conundrums: Race, Culture, and Canadian Art*.

This discussion could appear to be a convoluted preamble to talking about Cheryl L’Hirondelle. In fact, it is necessary to place Cheryl within the context of these gatherings, because it speaks to her actions and relationships as a multi-dimensional artist, activist, and mentor. Cheryl’s presence at some, but not all, of these symposia, residencies, and circles, creates an important challenge to Rutherford, Miller, (2006) and Griffith’s (2015) postulation that the Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo ’67 had little long-term influence on Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Cheryl did not participate in the 2002 IntraNation meeting at the Emily Carr Institute of Art and Design in Vancouver, British Columbia, nor was she part of the 2004 IntraNation residency in Banff, Alberta. She was, however, heavily involved in organizing and participating in Minquon Panchayat, a group of artists of colour and First Nations artists that came together in the early 1990s to challenge the way artist-run centres were operating in Canada (Gagnon, 2000; Lai, 2000).

Like Cheryl, there are several people of different generations of artist-activists who serve as linkages. I wish to suggest that Roy Miki, Shirley Bear, and Ashok Mathur

---

Minquon Panchayat is a compound of the Maliseet word, minquon, which means “rainbow,” and panchayat, the Punjab/Hindi word for “village. It was coined together by Shirley Bear and Chris Creighton-Kelly for the purposes of the gathering. Minqwôn Minqwôn, which translates to “double rainbow,” is Shirley’s spirit name in Wabanaki. She loaned the word “minquon” to the coalition. Please see Shirley’s 2011 essay, “Ramblings and resistances.” For more information on the history of Minquon Panchayat, please refer to Larissa Lai’s (2000) interview with Ashok Mathur, and to Monika Kin Gagnon’s (2006) essay, “Building Blocks: Anti-Racism Initiatives in the Arts.”
are among those whose very presence ensures multiple lineages of thought, art-making, and political critique.\(^{68}\) It is not only that they are present at key gatherings, but it is also how they are present that sustains the momentum of memory enfolding into future commitments. I have spoken about Roy’s (Miki, 2004, 2011) efforts in the Japanese-Canadian redress movement in previous parts of this thesis, and his other works will be introduced in upcoming sections. And I have discussed Ashok’s cultural organizing work in Chapter One. Now, I wish to communicate some revealing anecdotes about Shirley Bear, which speak of her significant impact on people like Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Adrian Stimson, and Peter Morin, and to her commitments to interweave seemingly disparate communities. I will limit these current discussions to Shirley’s interconnectedness to Cheryl and will revisit her relationships to Adrian and Peter in upcoming chapters.

Shirley Bear was one of the founding members of Minquon Panchayat, a group that had formed from within ANNPAC/RACA (the Association of National Non-Profit Artists Centres/Regroupement d’Artistes des Centres Alternatifs) in the attempt to self-assess the reasons for the lack of cultural diversity in ANNPAC/RACA membership (Bear, 2011, p. 16). In 1993, Minquon Panchayat, which had developed local chapters in large cities across Canada, organized the It’s a Cultural Thing! gathering in Calgary, Alberta to showcase the talent of artists of colour and Indigenous artists, and to increase the membership of racialized artists in ANNPAC/RACA (Bear, 2011). It was at this gathering that ANNPAC/RACA and Minquon Panchayat came to a head. In a key confrontation at the Native Friendship Centre, when one ANNPAC executive stated that the larger organization had allowed the latter to present their work, Shirley replied, “Allowed? You allowed us?” With that, she stood up from the circle and left, telling members of ANNPAC/RACA and Minquon Panchayat, who had followed her from the room, that it was not the right time to attempt a reconciliation with those in ANNPAC who had dismissed the research and art-making of Minquon Panchayat as counterproductive (Bear, 2007, p. 90; Bear, 2011, p. 19). This confrontation is one among many examples of race-related divisions between White and racialized artists and thinkers that would compel artists of colour and Indigenous artists to create alliances and coalitions. It is also a small window into Shirley’s leadership and supportive roles in Minquon Panchayat and other such groups that addressed issues of social exclusion based on gender.

\(^{68}\)In moving relationally closer in the discussion, I will refer to Roy Miki, Shirley Bear, and Ashok Mathur (who is my life-partner) on a first name basis.
miscegenation, sexual orientation, race, and art.

Prior to her involvement in Minquon Panchayat, in the early 1970s, Shirley joined other Aboriginal women from the Tobique Reserve in New Brunswick and across Canada in a bid to repeal Section 12(1) of the Indian Act, which for over 100 years had decreed that Native women would automatically lose their status upon marrying a non-Native or non-status Indian (Tobique Women’s Collective, 1987; Bear, 2009, p. 20). The legislation of Bill C-31 in 1987 was an attempt to ensure that Native women would be recognized equally under the law, even as the Indian Act itself continued to systemically discriminate against Indigenous communities in Canada. The penning and passing of Bill C-31 brought to national attention the multi-dimensional and systemic nature of the effects of colonization on First Nations people in Canada.69

Shirley could move between different communities, effectively creating linkages in spaces where political friendships were tenuous and volatile. She was and is fearless in addressing social injustices that might unsettle a group’s status quo, if such contestations might ultimately create a broadened sense of inclusion.70 At the same time, this fighting-againstness, as part of an alliance or collective, would have taken its toll on personal and social bodies, raising questions about the efficacy, intimacy, and limitations of aggressive opposition to various forms and regulations of inequity and oppression. Shirley herself describes in detail one particular incident where Maliseet women barricaded themselves in the Band office to protect a young eight-month pregnant woman who faced imminent eviction from her band-owned housing (Crean, 2009, p. 46). The women were deemed troublemakers and their physical safety was threatened by their actions to shield the young woman. Shirley’s account is one among innumerable stories of deep divisions that occurred along gender lines, also pitting Indigenous women against one another, in the process of advocating for the legislation of Bill C-31, gender amendments to the Indian Act.71

69For more information on the gender discrimination imbedded in the Indian Act please see Pamela Palmater’s (2011), Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity. See also: Tobique Women’s Collective (1987), Enough is Enough: Aboriginal Women Speak Out. Joanne Barker (2006) goes into historical detail about the formation and implementation in favoring patrilineal lineage in the Indian Act as well as the ensuing gender divisions which were created in Indigenous communities.

70Shirley’s (2006, 2009) and other Indigenous women’s experiences with race and law-based gender discrimination within Indigenous communities have been well documented in her art, poetry, and essays.

71Native Studies scholar, Andrea Nicholas Bear (1994) provides a comprehensive
From a lived experience perspective, I cannot help but wonder about the physical, social, and spiritual consequences of living for years, if not a whole lifetime, in a fighting posture. It is possible that the compulsion to hit up against, push away, and attack would eventually have one turning against the very people who are considered allies. In habituating embodied responses to struggle against social injustices, the standing up alongside nonetheless might have allies standing against one another, back-to-back, both metaphorically and literally, rather than facing each other, to witness displays and experiences of one’s vulnerabilities in the other. What kinds of political normative expectations are placed upon members of a fighting-against collective or movement, and at whose relational cost? In breaking from the expectations of the group’s overarching intentions, it may become much too easy to default to fighting-against, which ultimately and ironically continues to perpetuate violations against the activated group in question.

Inasmuch as Shirley participated and led in fighting-against movements, she also cultivated and nurtured relationships through and in excess of her allegiance to those causes. Shirley was mindful of limitations of antagonistic resistance, reflecting through poetry, art, and storytelling the impact that such resistances had upon her body, communities, and kinships (Bear, 2006; Graff, 2009). It could be argued that because of members like Shirley, activist groups such as Minquon Panchayat transformed from within, changing names and stances, moving from standing-up-against to making and presenting art together, eating together, and socializing, as was done at the IntraNation residency in Banff, Alberta in 2004.

Like Shirley, Cheryl has shown continuously that she uses her position and membership in an organization or collective to invite participation from unexpected or unknown others. Cheryl’s actions reveal the collaborative strategies that underpin her social and artistic practices. As the animation and co-conference coordinator of Minquon Panchayat and program coordinator at Truck Gallery in Calgary, Cheryl curated Dene artist, Celina Ritter, in her installation of Reclaiming identity: A state of dignity in October 1992 (L’Hirondelle, n.d.). In keeping with the mandate of Minquon Panchayat to “create access and opportunities for Aboriginal artists and artists of colour within the artist-run centre movement” (L’Hirondelle, n.d.), Cheryl worked thoughtfully with Ritter, the niece of

narrative regarding the controversies surrounding the fight for and implementation of Bill C31, and the colonial roots of gender-based divisions within Maliseet communities, in wider Indigenous contexts, and in legislations.
world-acclaimed painter, Alex Janvier, so that Ritter could express through art the traumas that she had experienced while attending Blue Quills Residential School (L’Hirondelle, n.d.). Given Ritter’s personal history, Cheryl was very cognizant of Ritter’s wariness of the institutionalization of art. Therefore she strongly supported the artist’s efforts to subvert the expectations and rules of the “white cube” gallery through the installation and delivery of the show, a powerful critique of the Catholic Church and residential schools (L’Hirondelle, n.d.).

In returning to 2011, Cheryl attended the Aboriginal Curatorial Collective (ACC) conference to present her working paper, “Codetalkers: Recounting Signals of Survival” (L’Hirondelle, 2014), as part of a panel of Indigenous media-based artists talking about their current projects. The audience was comprised of people both physically and spiritually present. Although Shirley was not there in person, she was present as someone who profoundly influenced Cheryl, and in particular Indigenous women artists and curators. Alex Janvier, who had had a key role in creating and organizing the Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo ’67, was also at the 2011 ACC conference. Alex, who at the time of the 2011 colloquium was the Artist-in-Residence at Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops, B.C., was accompanied by Ashok to attend the ACC conference. Although Alex had participated in neither Minquon nor IntraNation, later prolonged interactions between himself and Ashok would bring their different political histories together. Daphne Odjig, a monumental painter of Odawa-Potawatami-English ancestry, and founder of the “Indian Group of Seven,”72 (LaVallee, 2013) was not physically present, yet her legacy and mentorship of six Indigenous male artists – amongst those, Alex Janvier - was interwoven into the artists’ memories and art-making. It was moving to witness young artists and curators such as Michelle LaVallee, Jessie Short, Vanessa Dion Fletcher, and Nigit’stil Norbert becoming overwhelmed by emotion during their presentations because of those being addressed in the audience, many of whom were known as having trail-blazed paths for these younger artists to follow.

A musical interweaving was created between the mention of those physically absent and the unspoken respect towards those who were present. Ephemeral and seemingly incidental, the crisscrossing of multiple lineages of political activism and creativity at the 2011 ACC meeting was an opportunity to understand events such as

---

72In 2013, Michelle LaVallee, curator and artist of Ojibway descent, curated and published a comprehensive catalogue and travelling exhibit of the “Indian Group of Seven.” Please see the art book, 7 Professional Native Indian Arts Inc (LaVallee, 2013).
Expo '67, Minquon Panchayat, IntraNation, and the ACC colloquium not as isolated footnotes in history but rather as sections of a musical score.

In a long-form refutation of Rutherford and Miller's (2006) deduction that the Indians of Canada Pavilion and the Oka Crisis did not have lasting impacts in Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities, I would argue that the researchers focused on the material and the spoken-aloud, over the relational and unspoken in their historical analysis. In interpreting the physical absence of certain leaders or members of a community at one event as apathy to or rejection of the gathering, Rutherford and Miller mistakenly assume that of those absent, their works, histories, and lineages were also wholly evacuated from the event. In accessing media coverage to trawl for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous opinions about the Indians of Canada Pavilion, Rutherford and Miller determine those opinions as frozen in place and time, instead of appreciating that perspectives, as well as those who would be willing to speak, could change over time, context, and life experiences. Moreover, the temporal scope of their investigation was too narrow in determining the overall socio-historical impact of the Indians of Canada Pavilion in 1967, in terms of its influence on Indigenous protests to the 1969 White Paper. That the leaders of the 1969 protests did not specifically speak about the Expo ’67 pavilion is not sufficient proof that the two events were impervious to one another. Indeed, viewed from a longer interval, it could be counter-argued that both events together were meaningful to individuals who had been present at neither. This raises another methodological concern as to how an event might be measured in terms of its impact both within and outside of its assumed membership. Is it possible to quantify the cultural impact of a person, place, or event? If yes, then what are the epistemological limitations of a quantitative analysis? Although Jane Griffith (2015) wishes to move away from determining the failure or success of the Indian Pavilion (p. 197), shifting the reader’s gaze instead to understanding the significance of the Pavilion pedagogically, she too isolates that moment in 1967 in order to conclude in an ethically normative manner that non-Indigenous people need to learn from the teachings inscribed in the walls of the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Rutherford, Miller, (2006) and Griffith (2015) create strong, homogenizing divisions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, failing to move closer relationally and further away temporally when considering the heterogeneous nature of the conflicts, agreements, and ever-changing associations that constitute an event, and the reverberations of the lineages that pass through.

Learning takes many different forms. Coming from a social context in which 孝行
was taught through observing, acknowledging, and enacting, as I sat in the audience at the ACC Conference in 2011, it became increasingly clear that the purpose in presenting one’s art practice was not to showcase the originality of work in and of itself. Instead, the artists respectfully paid homage to the individuals and communities that had, directly and indirectly, influenced the assemblage of their ideas and creative production. As younger artists acknowledged Alex Janvier, Tom Hill, and Duke Redbird, I was made cognizant of the fact that the Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo ’67 (and other seminal moments in politicized Indigenous artmaking history) had profound artistic, cultural, and political effects on many of those who had yet to be born at the time of the Exposition. Certainly, the ACC Conference organizers had set the tone of formally honouring past artistic accomplishments by Indigenous artists in their efforts to establish legacies of practice.

In this setting, Cheryl was both 先輩 (senpai) and 後輩 (kōhai). Rather than acknowledging territories and relationships as a precursor to talking about her own project, she seamlessly bridged artists, thinkers, and community activists of different generations together, and the lands upon which those collaborations took place. Cheryl would voice her admiration for an artist younger in age and experience than herself in the same manner and breath as she would speak deferentially about the artists that had preceded her. She interwove identified peers in what could effectively be described as a collaborative practice, one that shapes and is shaped by music composition, performance, and social justice activism.

Cheryl often says that composing and playing music is fundamentally a collaborative process. Cheryl was born in Northern Alberta of Cree/Métis/German descent and grew up surrounded by music, both ceremonial and alternative (L’Hirondelle, 2012a, 2015). In different settings, Cheryl has explained the meaning of her surname, L’Hirondelle, as “a migratory, swift-flying songbird,” and with that, has expressed her propensity to travel far and wide to make music and art. Cheryl has spent her life crisscrossing the current state of Canada, composing and singing as she passed through countless lands within and beyond its national reach. In an artistic practice that has spanned over three decades, in her travels, Cheryl has teamed with storytellers, songwriters, musicians, media artists, performance artists, traditional makers, and knowledge keepers (L’Hirondelle, 2012c; L’Hirondelle, 2011). Outside of and/or often intermixed with her musical practice, Cheryl is highly respected as a multi-media and performance artist (Iseke-Barnes & Danard, 2007; L’Hirondelle, 2012b; Loft & Swanson, 2014; Rind, 2009). With partnerships too numerous to count, I wish to focus on her
projects, *Why the Caged Bird Sings*, *Songlines*, and *Cistêmaw Iyiniw Ohci*, because they speak to her sense of musical collaboration, social activism, and cultural cultivation. Furthermore, these pieces in particular directly motivated me to begin *in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu*.

### 4.1.1 Why the Caged Bird Sings

Since 2008, Cheryl has been travelling between different correctional institutions to work with incarcerated women and men on a collaborative project to jointly compose, perform, and record songs. Within a five-day period, participants co-create songs that are sound recorded and sold, with collective permission (L'Hirondelle, 2015). All participants receive a percentage of the profits every time their song is purchased and downloaded. The recording of the songs is perhaps best articulated as an act of sonorous freedom. While the women and men physically remain confined within the walls of the correctional institutions, they live outside in socially, politically, and creatively engaged relation to those who listen to their songs.

The creative seeds for *Why the Caged Bird Sings* were planted in 1998 when Cheryl was invited to perform at the Pine Groves Female Correctional Centre in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan (L'Hirondelle, 2015, p. 6). Cheryl recalls that one inmate’s suggestion to sing the “Strong Woman’s Song” (Anishinabe kwêwag & Zhoganosh kwêwag, n.d.) led to unifying those in the audience with herself and her performing partner. Cheryl remembers the concert at Pine Groves as having been a pivotal moment, because she had been made aware of the significance of telling a story, not of her own history, but which would help to develop trust and respect in her “willingness to visit and become part of the sisterhood” (L'Hirondelle, 2015, p. 8). This recollection speaks strongly to Cheryl’s lifelong commitments to being widely inclusive, women-centred, and to use music as a transformative, collectivizing, and life-affirming force.

In her Master’s thesis, Cheryl describes, in depth and detail, musical and Cree cultural underpinnings for the collectivizing project, *Why the Caged Bird Sings*. The ethical basis for the project is built upon a Cree worldview, *nêhiyawin*, which is grounded in *pimâtisiwin* (life) and *tâpwêwin* (truth) (L'Hirondelle, 2015, p. 15). Cheryl explains that from a Cree perspective, one “must also inevitably ‘suffer’ and ‘earn’ their right to do,

---

73In keeping with Indigenous protocols, Cheryl asked the woman to talk about the authorship, lineage, and context of learning about the song. The woman suggested that since Cheryl was on the stage, that she might explain the “Strong Woman’s Song” (Anishinabe kwêwag & Zhoganosh kwêwag, n.d.) as she understood it. Having heard the story told hundreds of times, Cheryl provided a version, which is available in her thesis (L'Hirondelle, 2015, pp. 7-8).
have, and become” (L'Hirondelle, 2015, p. 15). She likens the depth of ceremony in a sweat lodge to creative practice because both require full presence, focus, and truthfulness, in order to create something of deep meaning and originality (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p.16). She draws upon Cree teachings for the construction of a mîkiwahp, or teepee, to articulate spiritual-ethical grounds and to envision the collaborative process of composing music in *Why the Caged Bird Sings* (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 40). For someone who is constantly moving, the teepee is home; every time that she has virtually and sonorously constructed one, she has built temporary shelter not only for herself but with and for others as well.

In the 2008 song, *Kîkinaw*, Cheryl sonorously constructs a mîkiwahp with fifteen life-affirming values, each of which are represented by the respective poles of a tipi. These pillars are:

1. nanahihtamowin (obedience): listening to those who know
2. kihcêyihtamowin (respect): respecting those who know
3. tapahtêyimisowin (humility): interconnectedness – no one is above or below
4. miywêyihtamowin (happiness): showing enthusiasm, encourages others
5. sâkihtowin (love): for all beings (i.e. in a Cree worldview even rocks are animate)
6. tâpwêhtamowin (faith): belief in truth and a spirit world
7. wâhkôhtamowin (kinship): know who you are and where you come from
8. kanâcihowin: (cleanliness): of mind, spirit, emotions and body
9. nanâskomowin: (gratitude): take nothing for granted
10. wîcêhtowin (compassion): sharing what you have
11. sôhkâtisiwin (strength): bravery, courage
12. miyopohpihâwasowin (good child-rearing): raising future generations
13. pakosêyimowin (hope): for a better future
14. nâtâmostawin (protection): always find shelter and good people to be with
15. tipêyimisowin (freedom): balance own oneself and/or be in self-control

(L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 41)

As Cheryl explains, the first three pillars of the mîkiwahp intersect to create the lodge. The next twelve value-poles are stacked upon the grounding pillars (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 41). Cheryl maps a 4-circle foundation within the circular floor of the mîkiwahp: nêhiyawin (cultural grounding), community engagement (sharing your gifts), attuned sensory empathy (deep listening), and creative expression (using your gifts)
(L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 45). Four socio-interpersonal methodologies emerge from the overlapping of the four circles: collaboration, consensus, courage, and contribution (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 45). Cheryl notes that in lifting the methodology from the circles, the shape of a propeller becomes apparent (L’Hirondelle, 2015, pp. 45-6). This idea of propulsion is an important point for Cheryl, who is interested in creating movements that advance spiritually and socially positive ways of being.

Four different directions materialize from practising the socio-interpersonal methodologies together within the mîkiwahp frame: sonic survivance, collective ownership, freedom songs, and radical inclusivity. In sonic survivance, Cheryl draws upon Anishinaabe writer and scholar, Gerald Vizenor’s exposition on survivance. For Vizenor (1999, 2009), survivance is an active sense of presence over stories of historical absence, deracination, and cultural disruption due to colonization. Cheryl is compelled by Vizenor’s notion of survivance because it moves away from the language of victimhood toward a more positive and constructive sense of cultural and political persistence (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 53). Whereas Vizenor discusses survivance in very much a literary and historical sense, Cheryl contributes to the notion of cultural survivance through sound, the memories of alliteration, and the creation of voices together (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 53). Collective ownership refers to a community-engaged rather than individual ownership of music composition, performance, and production (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 55). Freedom songs are proof of “why the caged bird sings” (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 56). Drawing upon the Cree conception of freedom, tipêyimisowin, where one is one’s own boss, and therefore in a state of self-control, Cheryl argues that freedom songs come to be from a state of collective self-expression (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 57). Cheryl has coined the term radical inclusivity in acting and living through the writings and thoughts of several thinkers, starting with her mentor, Shirley Bear. Cheryl contemplates Shirley’s advice to ground all acts with one’s good intentions as a means toward healing the earth (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 50). She connects this aspiration to the animacy of nêhiyawin. According to Cree worldview, all things are included beyond human and animal beings (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 50). Kiyânaw, which means “all of us together,” is linked to the inclusion of the trickster, a sentiment that is discussed in depth in Vizenor’s (2011) writings. Radical inclusivity is the ground upon which Cheryl reflects on the use of the English or colonizer’s language to co-write the songs with the inmates, who also rely on this language to communicate with one another (L’Hirondelle, 2015, pp. 51-52).
In my pedestrian attempts to summarize Cheryl’s process of interweaving cultural, activist, and artistic practice, the superficiality of my understanding is pronounced. Cree words form awkwardly in my mouth, and I do not know the structure and history of the language to comprehend how the words relate to one another, and to the ideas at large. In listening to Cheryl reflect upon Why The Caged Bird Sings and other projects, I am compelled to learn more about Cree cosmology, stories and language, not to develop any authority on a subject matter, nor to speak on behalf of romanticized others. Rather, it is to better understand Cheryl as a person, artist, and 先輩. Simply put, because Cree knowledge is important to Cheryl, it has become important to me. Through her practice and social interactions, Cheryl persistently shows that a Cree worldview profoundly impacts the way she moves through communities, grounding interactions with those around her.

Moreover, I might never grasp the depths of the intimacy and trust that Cheryl has built with her collaborators, the incarcerated women and men, nor will I meet most, if any of them, face to face. Being so far removed from much of Why The Caged Bird Sings, it is perhaps disrespectful and intrusive for me to interrogate Cheryl or her collaborators regarding the intricacies of their developing relationships. From what Cheryl divulges in her thesis, there is a gross overrepresentation of Indigenous people in prisons across Canada. While Aboriginal people represent approximately 4.3% of the Canadian population, they make up 33.3% of those in correctional institutions and detention centres (L’Hirondelle, 2015, pp. 11-12). Based on how I have witnessed Cheryl bringing the work and lives of those who have often been overlooked, I surmise that her collaborations with the individuals who are currently incarcerated is motivated, in part, by her wish to have others cultivate a more thoughtful view, beyond prejudicial conceptions of criminality, danger, and consequently, justifiable social maltreatment. Cheryl does not interact with these individuals as though they were helpless victims in need of rescue but regards them as having full creative agency to collaborate as equals. In bringing projects like Why The Caged Bird Sings to wider social attention, Cheryl is inviting the

---

74Criminologist, Reza Barmaki (2016) argues that song and music are effective decolonizing strategies to promote healing and to prevent recidivism of Indigenous prisoners. He looks specifically at the programs at the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge, in which approaches to corrections and rehabilitation are premised upon Aboriginal views of justice and reconciliation. According to Barmaki, due to the programming successes of the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge, more healing lodges have been opened.
public and other artists to do the same.

Between July 15 and August 15, 2013, Cheryl was part of an artist residency, Reconsidering Reconciliation, at Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops, Traditional Secwépemc Territories. During this residency, Cheryl brought together other women artists and intellectuals to create a video of the song *Here I Am (Bless My Mouth)*. *Here I Am* had been co-composed by women incarcerated at the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge, their literacy teacher, and Cheryl (L’Hirondelle, 2013). The healing lodge, a minimum-security federal institution situated at Nekaneet First Nation in southwestern Saskatchewan, had not allowed Cheryl and her co-producer to bring in sound recording equipment, so they were unable to record the women singing their own song. Rather than seeing this as a limitation, Cheryl responded creatively. She decided to record each woman as she individually phoned in to sing the song, and then incorporated all of their voices into Cheryl’s studio-recorded version. She also understood the initial refusal to record on-site as an opportunity to have others witness the lives of these women in a collaborative fashion. She invited women at or passing through the Reconsidering Reconciliation residency to participate in a sound and video recording of the song and to stand in for the women who had written it.

The process of creating this multimedia work was emotionally intense and thought provoking. In resonance with the women at the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge, each woman participating in Cheryl’s video used a payphone available at the cafeteria of Thompson Rivers University to dial in a number. One of the other women participants answered the call on the other side of the line and listened in as the woman sang *Here I Am* in full. Although the woman sang alongside Cheryl’s studio version of the song, only the voice coming through the phone was recorded. Cheryl and her assistant, Secwépemc media artist, Gabe Archie, video-recorded each performance. All of the voices and videos were brought together for the first time in a multi-media, multi-vocal

---

75In interview with Donald Brenneis, ethnomusicologist and anthropologist, Steven Feld (2004) recalls his experiences of recording songs of the Kaluli people in Papua New Guinea. He contemplates the ethics of sound recording as an ethnographic practice, and specifically his position as an outsider in gaining the trust of the Kaluli community. To reflect upon Cheryl’s situation, it could be argued that in many ways she is an insider, outsider, and go-between. As an Indigenous woman sharing sonic space to sing politicized, traditional songs with other Indigenous women, who are incarcerated, she is an insider. As a visitor to the correctional centre, she is an outsider. Finally, by recording the songs co-composed with the women, she moves in between institutional spaces to bridge different communities together. I would argue that Cheryl’s intention is not to act as an anthropologist, but to serve as a co-composer and collaborator, working across different communities of institutionalized women (and men).

As one of the women invited to participate during the residency, I was deeply moved to sing the words that had been composed by the women at the healing lodge. It was as though a sonorous bridge had been created between the women who had written the song and the women in another institution, Thompson Rivers University, who had sung it aloud. I wish to suggest that a sonorous bridge is a type of intangible cultural construction. Who would imagine that the first meeting place between seemingly disparate lives would be through a song? Significantly, Cheryl’s process of creating this socio-relational bridge was well considered and years in the making. What began arguably as an “activist intention” was elongated over a decade, and transformed to adjust to the changing contexts of the different correctional institutions and the people who lived within them. Next, in order to share the music co-composed with the inmates beyond the institutional walls, Cheryl developed ways to communicate respectfully the creative and social labour of all those involved, which profoundly shaped her art practice and presentation. The echoing of actions of sitting in front of the payphone, making a call, singing into the receiver, and then listening in to the voice of another, created an embodied affiliation between the women incarcerated and the women at the artist residency. This performative shadowing became one of the possible means through which the women could understand each other beyond the gaze of categorical differences.

Unlike many activist-driven art works, which centralize the initial intention of the artist and the object/ideas brought forth from that individual intention (Duncombe, 2016; Grindon, 2011; Hancox, 2012), Cheryl utilizes her role as the artist to link together individuals in new socio-creative formations. Consequently – and in keeping with Cheryl’s preference – the singularity of the artist/activist is decentralized and overtaken by the process and the new relationships that ensue. Curator and writer, Matthew Ryan Smith (2014) contends that *Here I Am*, and other artists’ works which were included in Steve Loft’s (2013) curated show, *Ghost Dance: Activism. Resistance. Art.*, defy simple categorization. He suggests Cheryl and the other artists are “entrenched in layers of social engagement, moving fluidly between people of different geographies, classes, and histories” and in the process, muddying the categorical distinctions between “activism,” “resistance,” “art,” and “social praxis” (Smith, 2014, p. 53). The aesthetical appreciation of *Here I Am* is intermeshed with social and political knowledge, and with the processes
that have brought them all together. In keeping with activist art that exceeds the white cube walls of institutions, whether art or educational, Cheryl’s practice would literally move her onto city streets and into rural communities.

4.1.2 Songlines

Over the past several years, Cheryl has also embarked on mapping the land through sound in the aptly named Songlines project, which is part of the overarching Nikamon Ohci Askiy (Songs Because of the Land). Cheryl recalls that the idea of creating Songlines first came to her in the mid-1990s when she was on the road with her frequent collaborator and dear friend, Cree singer/songwriter and knowledge keeper, Joseph Naytowhow (L’Hirondelle, Jimmy, & Bose, 2012, p. 95). At the time, they were crisscrossing communities, territories, moving between highways and smaller routes, all the while singing as they travelled. Cheryl commented to Joseph that when they sang aloud through different spaces, they were effectively constructing songlines (L’Hirondelle, Jimmy, & Bose, 2012, p. 95). Cheryl’s initial musings for the Songlines formally took shape as a project in 2007 when she began collaborating with Saami Joikers, who described their way of singing as a “vocal mapping method” (L’Hirondelle, Jimmy, & Bose, 2012, p. 96). Intended as a long-term project, Cheryl aims to create 15 different lines across the globe, which correspond with the 15 Cree teepee teachings articulated above. So far, Cheryl has established Songlines in Vancouver and Toronto.

76 During this period of contemplating songlines, Cheryl was not aware of Bruce Chatwin’s 1987 book, The Songlines. It could be argued that Cheryl is embarking on a significantly distinct project from Chatwin’s, whose work has been received with mixed reviews. In The Songlines, English author and traveller, Chatwin (1987) muses on the origins and moralities of human life as he journeys through the Australian outback to learn about the songlines, said to have been left by Aboriginal ancestors who had sung the world into existence. Written in 1987, the book has maintained its relevance as a cultural text both within and beyond Australian Aboriginal communities, and as a result, has fueled much debate and its own notoriety. Chatwin’s articulation of the songlines has been critiqued for: valorizing the author as celebrity, over-romanticizing Aboriginal-Land interconnectedness, unreflectively providing colonial descriptions of primitivism and authenticity, and silencing and objectifying women/earth in relation to travelling men-heroes. For deeper analyses of these critiques, please see: Robert Clarke’s (2009), “Star traveller: celebrity, Aboriginality and Bruce Chatwin’s The Songlines”; Joe Moran’s (1999) “Primitivism and authenticity in Bruce Chatwin’s travel writing”; Eleanor Porter’s (1997) “Mother Earth and the wandering hero: Mapping gender in Bruce Chatwin’s The Songlines and Robin Davidson’s Tracks.”

77 A joik is a traditional form of song of the Saami people, comparable to chanting in other Indigenous communities (Hilder, 2014). A Joiker is someone who practices this singing/musical form. For more information on Saami culture and joiking, please see ethnomusicologist, Thomas R. Hilder’s (2014) book, Sámi Musical Performance and the Politics of Indigeneity in Northern Europe.
and some day, she hopes to sing a world-sized teepee into sonorous existence with the completion of the remaining thirteen lines (Allison, 2011).

In the present discussion, I wish to focus on the *Vancouver Songlines* in order to show how Cheryl’s creative vision and process generates a multivalent reach toward social inclusion. Between November 24 and December 31, 2008, Cheryl sang through the streets of Vancouver and developed her meanders into what is now known as the *Vancouver Songlines* (Songs Because of the Land, 2008). Her encounters with those around her were audio and video recorded, with their permission, on mobile phones and then uploaded. Each audio clip was then incorporated into an interactive online platform, where it was tagged with one or more of the Cree teepee teachings (Songs Because of the Land, 2008). Cheryl’s identity as a Cree woman is politically and ethically significant here. As an Indigenous woman, her compositions express a form of sonic survivance, a reconstitution of space and places that have been inhabited by non-Indigenous people.78

The songs are recordings of her body passing through locations, which had been renamed through colonial ownership, are evidence of ongoing Indigenous presence and meaning-making in collaboration with the land. During her time in Vancouver, Cheryl also intermixed daily, unscheduled walking performances with four scheduled performances that were available to the public for free. On December 19, 2008, Cheryl performed at Oppenheimer Park as part of the entertainment component of a Christmas Giveaway79 to those living in and around the neighbourhood (Nikamon Ohci Askiy, 2008). And in February 2009, Cheryl held a concert to launch the *Giveaway* CD80 (L’Hirondelle, 2009a) and the *nikamon ohci askiy* DVD (L’Hirondelle, 2009c) at the Mountain View Cemetery Celebration Hall in Vancouver, Traditional Coast Salish

78Cheryl’s public collaborative song composition is in keeping with what Ivanna Yi (2016) describes as storying the land as an act of survivance. Examining the multiple forms of storytelling in diverse Native American traditions, Yi argues that storying the land is a present form of decolonization. Ethnomusicologist, Klisala Harrison (2009) also discusses the role of singing in cultural healing programs in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside. She presents three examples of Indigenous-led, musically oriented healing circles offered to Indigenous people living in the Downtown Eastside.

79Giveaways take place at the end of a gathering or celebration. Visitors are brought together as the festivities wind down, and the hosts express their appreciation of the visitors’ presence with a gift. For more information on giveaways, please see: Saskatchewan Indian (1975), “The giveaway ceremony.”

80The songs on the *Giveaway* CD are available for listening at: https://cheryllhirondelle.bandcamp.com/album/giveaway-5-song-ep
The Giveaway CD (L’Hirondelle, 2009a) is comprised of five songs: Kikinaw, Lost and Found, Love One Another, and Giveaway. The video for the song Love One Another draws upon video footage of Cheryl’s sonorous mapping of Vancouver, where many of the shots were collected from the Downtown Eastside (Nikamon Ohci Askiy, 2009). Cheryl composed and sang as she walked along the streets. Newly created verses were immediately uploaded onto the Songlines website. She stopped to engage with the people she encountered, offering to sing the songs and to ask for permission to video- or sound-record their interactions in exchange for a small fee (Nikamon Ohci Askiy, 2009).

The texture, imagery, and pace of the video for Love One Another is reminiscent of a series of paintings that Shirley Bear had completed during the ten years that she lived in Vancouver (Graff, 2009). Both Cheryl and Shirley implore their viewers to avoid averting their gazes from the imagined horrors of existence in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver, an area infamously labeled in the Globe and Mail as “Our Nation’s Slum,” and described as “a vortex that sucks in junkies, the mentally ill and other desperate souls from across the country,” (Matas, 2009). In Shirley’s representation, women are not depicted as helpless victims or desperate addicts but as getting on with the busyness and business of living. In her matter-of-fact portrayals of the everyday, she conveys the idea that representations that restrict the audience’s imaginations to focus solely on gross trauma and perpetual suffering effectively strip those being imagined of their very humanity. In Cheryl’s video presentation, many of the individuals who have agreed to Cheryl’s request to record gaze directly into the camera, as if to say that even as they are being watched, they themselves are returning in kind. Both artists’ works resonate with literary critic, Michael Warner’s (2002) reconstruction of the public sphere, where in reference to identity politics he writes about the ongoing importance of eschewing “the denial of public existence,” which he considers to be another form of domination, rendering invisible the lives of those deemed invalid or shameful (p. 26).

What sets Cheryl’s video apart from Shirley’s paintings is a matter of medium, and consequently, the experience of collaborative agency. As a painter, Shirley becomes situated as an empathetic witness to the goings-on in her immediate spheres.

81A sampling of these paintings is found in the curatorial publication of Shirley’s retrospective show at the Beaverbrook Art Gallery, New Brunswick (Graff, 2009). Please see Graff’s (2009) Nekt wikuupon ehpit: Robin on Hastings, 2000 (p. 27), Commercial Drive, 1998 (p. 74), Family on Commercial, 2000 (p. 75), and Balaclava St., Vancouver, BC, 1998 (p. 76).
of influence. She effectively acts as the fulcrum to redirect the ways in which the audience witnesses those depicted in the images, frozen in the midst of their activities. Whereas in *Love One Another* (Nikamon Ohci Askiy, 2009), footage intermixes shots of people sleeping rough on the streets with individuals gazing into the camera, bringing to the fore the political agency of the participants. Eyes looking back onto the viewer break the fourth wall of the video frame, thereby cutting through the possible voyeuristic consumption of people living in the Downtown Eastside. That sense of agency is advanced further within the video where Cheryl is seen laughing, in conversation with the participants, and walking through the streets. In these social exchanges, the dialogical nature of Cheryl’s compositional practice is revealed. Of course, in valuing alternative readings of the video, it would be fair to counter my interpretations to suggest that Cheryl’s process and production may nonetheless, if unintentionally, position her as a heroine amongst the downtrodden. However, this criticism holds only in so far as it is contained within a visual evaluation of the finished video. In recombination with the aural, the “contours, movement, and the energy of the land” is evidenced in the way the tempo, rhythm, and lyrics of the song materialize (Nikamon Ohci Askiy, 2009).

How does the land collaborate in the creation of a song? When the land is serenaded, does it sing back in harmony? In *Kîkinaw*, which means “our home” in Cree, the land is not an idealized abstraction, 吸受に absorbing everything thrown at it. Rather, it is a specific set of locations, at a specific set of times, in specific company, passing through and alongside one another. The land is the voice of the man who says, “money is not my god”; it includes the sounds of the wind and seagulls flying in formation and then at cross purposes to each other; and it serves the grains of indiscernible conversations that motivate Cheryl to construct a sonorous mîkiwahp in its midst.\(^2\)

When Cheryl sings, 周りの空気が変わって来る. Just as the air shifts, it repositions and wraps around in new configurations, vibrationally set by the song, then orchestrating the beat of hundreds of foot strikes on pavement. At the same time, because we humans are immersed in the experience, the meaning of the land exceeds our understanding. It is uncontainable in idea, form, and material existence. Would we even know how to listen

\(^2\)Influenced by the soundscape practices of German-born Canadian composer, teacher, and activist, Hildegard Westerkamp, Cheryl incorporates recordings from her soundwalks to create songs and multi-media art installations. For more information on Westerkamp’s practice and soundscape compositions, please see Westerkamp’s (2002) “Linking soundscape composition and acoustic ecology,” and Andrea Polli’s (2012) “Soundscape, sonification, and sound activism.”
in the event that the land sings? For Cheryl, listening and then responding with respect, that is, witnessing, is a whole-bodied, kinetic, and cultural experience.

4.1.3 *Cistêmaw iyiniw Ohci (for the tobacco being)*

In the mid-1990s, Cheryl lived in Northwest Saskatchewan for five years, a period of time that her colleagues affectionately refer to as Cheryl’s “Bush Master’s Degree” (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 3). Cheryl and Joseph Naytowhow had been hired by the Meadow Lake Tribal Council to jointly serve as co-storytellers in residence for nine First Nations communities in the region (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 3; L’Hirondelle, Jimmy, & Bose, 2012, p. 99). Cheryl has reflected very fondly on that period, in particular remembering the many hours spent in the company of Elders (L’Hirondelle, 2015). Not only did they teach Cheryl about Cree codes of personal conduct, but they also regaled her with many stories, all of which would greatly influence her artistic and collaborative practices in future projects (L’Hirondelle, 2015, p. 38).

One of the stories that significantly affected Cheryl was that of Cistêmaw iyiniw. Cistêmaw iyiniw, a Cree man who had lived two generations prior to Cheryl and Joseph’s presence in Meadow Lake, became famous in the area for delivering tobacco and messages from community to community (Hopkins, 2005; McLeod, 2016, p. 235). Although he had the opportunity to travel by horse, Cistêmaw iyiniw chose instead to travel by foot – sometimes running, sometimes walking – to invite people to participate in traditional ceremonies (Hopkins, 2005). People were amazed at the distances that he could cover in short amounts of time, and according to his grandson, Harry Blackbird, Cistêmaw iyiniw could cross rivers without getting wet (Hopkins, 2005).

In the summer of 2001, to honour Cistêmaw iyiniw’s memory, Cheryl decided to run one of his routes, the length of Makwa Sahgaiehcan Indian Reserve, 25 kilometres from one end to the other (Hopkins, 2005). She wore a sports jersey so that she would stand out as doing something distinctive within the everyday. She recruited Louise Halfe, Cheli Nighttraveller and Joseph Naytowhow, who were tasked with writing Cree syllabics in chalk in locations of their choosing, and to document their words by camera if they so wished. They also were asked to approach community members to see if the tradition of inviting strangers for food and drink was still in practice. If someone adhered to this custom, then the syllabics for water was written by their house, a signal to invite Cheryl in for a rest (Hopkins, 2005). A film crew also followed Cheryl as she ran, during which time she visited with residents in two different homes.

In *Cistêmaw iyiniw Ohci*, Cheryl entwines available media technology with
traditional protocols and stories from the land. According to Métis/Tlingit curator and writer, Candice Hopkins, Cheryl’s homage reaches beyond a gallerist conception of “public art” (Hopkins, 2005). Hopkins argues that instead of expecting a ready audience to move toward Cheryl, she chooses to move toward them. Enlisting the help of others, including local radio stations, which broadcast the story of Cistêmaw iyiniw, as well as having her helpers on foot to spread the news of the run through word of mouth, Cheryl invites those who happen to be present to participate in this activity. Ever mindful of the large experiential gap between regular, city-dwelling gallery audiences and those living on reserves, Cheryl devises a way of passing through the community that would exalt the memory of a person, place, and time. And in the process, she garners respect from those in proximity who witness her acts. In his essay, “Migration as Territory,” Métis painter, intellectual, and friend, David Garneau (n.d.) suggests that Cheryl’s performance transforms traditional knowledge passed on by local Elders into deceptively simple and elegant acts of commemoration. He argues further that in wordlessly performing the story of Cistêmaw iyiniw, Cheryl awakens within community members deeply seeded cultural protocols that are then intuitively followed. In Garneau’s own words, Cheryl’s run is “a teaching disguised as an artwork” (Garneau, n.d.).

Cheryl’s work is significantly informed by Cree teachings, stories, and protocols. She performs her knowledge of Nêhiyawin as an invitation towards the people, places, and things in her surrounds. In this regard, culture operates as a source of extending beyond oneself. In witnessing Cheryl couple Nêhiyawin to habituated processes of collaboration, which have been instilled in her as a musical composer and performer, I wish to argue that she presents an example of constructive inclusion. This call to include is process-based; Cheryl invites participation in making something together. The sonorous construction of a mîkiwahp, and the traditional Cree teachings that suffuse the physical structure with cultural meaning, is in a sense the building of a temporary home, built together, within which all can abide. The impermanence of this shelter speaks to the experiences of many like Cheryl, like myself, who happen to pass through, with no intention of remaining fixed into place. Culture expressed as a sonorous rather than solid form seems softer. It impresses upon the listener an ephemeral sense of malleability and permeability, the invisible shape-shifter. Songs wash over and through the listener, placing cellular vibrations on a collision course that do not harm. Within this space of constructive inclusion, Cheryl is one among many, not necessarily centralized as the performer to be set apart from the audience, but as one who is just as much engulfed in
the sonorous experience. By pairing traditional Cree teachings with musical expression in contemporary spaces, Cheryl presents those teachings as living, motile memory. In 100 Days of Cree, Cree writer, artist, and scholar, Neal McLeod (2016) interlaces the Cree language with current-day events, places, and activities. His translations of Star Wars, Kentucky Fried Chicken, Tim Hortons, and Leonard Cohen songs into Cree express the language not as one that existed prior to colonial contact and in danger of extinction, but as one that continually thrives in recombination with shifts in time and space. Similarly, Cheryl chain-links the past and present, sometimes through music, sometimes through her temporary, physical body as she passes through. In so doing, the traditional teachings that she has inherited from her Elders continue to live in new forms for pakosêyimowin, one of the many pillars of the teepee.

4. 2 先輩/後輩: Moving relationally closer in

There could also be a personal reason for Cheryl wishing to decentre attention from herself as “the artiste”. On several occasions, I have heard Cheryl describe herself as being an introvert. This might come as a surprise to the many who have witnessed her on a large stage, speaking and singing with the poise and eloquence of a consummate performer. Yet, the underlay for that composure may be due partly to a sense of fulfillment in the completion of deeply collaborative praxis. In having taken a closer view at the relationally grounded processes that have led to the materialization of Why The Caged Bird Sings, Songlines, and Cistêmaw Iyiniw Ohci, Cheryl’s assurance does not come as too much of a surprise. At the same time, as I stand at a distance to witness either her interactions in the process of creating a piece or her political and cultural reflections upon closing off or sustaining a project, I realize that she is a very private person and rather shy. Although Cheryl and my paths have crossed at several different intervals, I have done my best not to get in the way. This wish to not impose myself is not in response to anything that Cheryl has done or said but is an old body reaction that has been habituated since childhood through the instillation of 孝行. Sometimes, it is by mere coincidence that relational proximities shift and transform from past dynamics.

In early February 2013, I was nervously preparing to do my very first public, performative intervention Commemoration at Oppenheimer Park. Cheryl was in Vancouver to attend the opening of a group show, Andante (a walking pace)
(Campogna, 2013) at the Richmond Art Gallery. Ashok and I were living in Vancouver at the time, and we invited Cheryl to stay with us while she was in the city. A couple of days after the Andante opening, Cheryl and I were alone at home visiting and catching up around the dining room table. She must have picked up on my “am not quite sure what the hell I’m about to do” vibe, because what began as idle chit-chat suddenly morphed into my very first performance lesson. We talked for nearly four hours straight, where Cheryl took the time to give me invaluably constructive performance advice, teachings that I have carried with me through every performance ever since. The guidance she provided came from her own experiences, trial and error, of what had worked and what had not within a given set of circumstances, including her own creative expectations.

- **Strip away everything so that only the most basic elements remain.**
  In working through an idea, Cheryl tells me to think of everything that might go into the art piece, performance, or installation. Either metaphorically or literally, all of the what-ifs can be placed into a center pile. Then one by one, she advises me to remove from the heap those aspects that might distract away from the overall intention or idea.

- **Have at least one spot person.**
  Cheryl tells me that in any given performance, there is a swirl of reactions that come at the artist from all directions. Some people will regard the performance with ambivalence or suspicion, while others will become highly emotional. It can be overwhelming, especially amidst the attempt to carry through an idea. She says that it is possible to harness the tumult of energy to power the performance. Yet it is equally important to ground oneself, so as to not become caught up in the emotional swirl. She tells me always to have present at least one person who will act as an emotional/performative anchor. This person should be someone whom the artist trusts deeply and can rely upon them psychically in the event that the performance becomes unraveled.

---

83For a description of Andante (a walking pace) (Campogna, 2013), please visit the Richmond Art Gallery site: http://www.richmondartgallery.org/exhibition/andante-a-walking-pace/. Cheryl was one of the many artists invited to present their work with regard to walking through urban and rural spaces. In the show, Cheryl created a new interactive installation of Nikamon Ohci Askiy, which enabled gallery visitors to enter into the landscape where she had composed and performed the songlines. To hear her description of the project, please see: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-WY9SvQLI8 (Richmond Art Gallery, 2013).
• **Ensure that every performance has a beginning, middle, and end.**
In those performances that stir things up politically, socially, and emotionally, the spiritual weight of those responses might remain with the performer. In order to protect oneself, it is important to establish clear starting, middle, and endpoints for the performance. Cheryl suggests that it is crucial to enclose the actions, particularly in cases where the subject matter compels the artist to become immersed in the experience. Even if the endpoint may not be apparent to the audience, it allows the artist to emerge from the work, unfettered by the all that has followed from the performance.

• **Do not harm yourself for the craft.**
Cheryl begins this piece of advice with a story. She recalls a performance collaboration in which she had to repeatedly tumble over furniture and eat through drywall.\(^\text{84}\) Decades after this durational piece was completed, Cheryl still experiences bodily damage including back pain and digestive issues. She tells me that at the time, she had been very enthusiastic about putting her whole mind and body into the performance, not knowing the irreparable harms it would cause her. Cheryl offers this cautionary tale as a way to remind inexperienced artists like me not to forget to take care of oneself even as much as the performance might make demands to reach for the limits of one’s physical and creative capacities.

This impromptu instruction signals the moment that Cheryl transforms from an acquaintance into 先輩 and I into 後輩. Seemingly an instantaneous relational shift, quite a bit of time and contemplation go into realizing that a person has become an 先輩. Certain values and ways of being draw my attention. I tend to admire those whose actions align with their words. I also respect people who do not loudly boast their accomplishments but quietly go about their business in following through with an idea. And I am inspired by people who, no matter their age, maintain an almost childlike

---

\(^{84}\) Feminist performance artist Rita McKeough and Cheryl did a collaborative, durational performance called *Take It Through the Teeth* at the Glenbow Museum in January 1993. Over the course of 38 consecutive days, the two ate through dry wall and rolled over furniture. Meant to last for 45 days, the performance was cut short when Rita and Cheryl became sick from ingesting the drywall. The purpose of the performance was to make a commentary on the silencing of domestic violence toward women. For a clip of the performance please see: https://vimeo.com/24930248 (McKeough, 1993/2011). For more information about the performance, please see Nancy Tousley’s (1993) short essay, "Rita McKeough: an excavation. Glenbow Museum."
curiosity with the world. I could list endlessly qualities that I value, but it would be a mistake on my part to impose such expectations on others. Who could ever live up to the idealized version of a 先輩? In taking a few steps away to shift my point of view, it becomes apparent that these are the very values that have been imparted to my sisters and me since our earliest years. Rather than thinking that a singular person must embody this ever-burgeoning inventory of qualifications, it is better to consider them not as imperatives, but retrospectively as teachings. As often the case, those moments that take one’s breath away, in which something or someone exceeds my expectations, draw me closer in. Incrementally and in shifting proximities, I come to realize that Cheryl’s relationship with her mother has made a deep impression upon me. I trust in the relationship she has with her mother and learn from it as a younger sibling looking up to an older one. In this case, the 先輩-後輩 relationship is borne out of familial reverberations. Would it be a misinterpretation to suggest that she puts into action three pillars of the mîkiwahp: kihcêyihtamowin, nanahihtamowin, wâhkôhtamowin?

An inkling as to experientially derived meanings of these pillars arise from witnessing Cheryl in social relation to Elders. To Cheryl, the Elders and the values that they espouse do not remain fixed as a theoretical ideal. I start to understand that her public face of art making and advocating for respecting Elders is mirrored in the way she interacts with her mother. If I am not sorely mistaken, perhaps Cheryl’s enactments of kihcêyihtamowin, nanahihtamowin, and wâhkôhtamowin resound with my own living knowledge of 孝行. Although there is bound to be a large number of discrepancies because of the distinctive shaping, embodiments, and enactments of Cree and Japanese, certain word/social body formations create alignments in meaning. From this stance, I decide that I wish to learn more about Cheryl and to pay homage to the work that she lives.

4.2.1 in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu

In mid-January 2013, six James Bay Cree youth, led by guide Isaac Kawapit, set off from Whapmagoostui, the northernmost Cree village in Quebec, to walk 1600km to Parliament Hill in Ottawa. Inspired by the Idle No More movement and Chief Theresa Spence’s hunger strike,85 they began their trek in what would come to be known as the

---

85On December 11, 2012, Theresa Spence, then Chief of Attawapiskat First Nation, began a hunger strike at Victoria Island in Ottawa. Camped less than one kilometre away from Parliament Hill, she demanded an audience with then Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Governor General David Johnston to have a nation-to-nation talk about Canada’s treaty
Journey of Nishiyuu, with the hopes of meeting with then Prime Minister, Stephen Harper (http://nishiyuujourney.ca; Carpenter, 2015). In Cree, nishiyuu means “the people” (Filice, 2015). Founding member David Kawapit wanted the walk to draw attention to challenges that many First Nations peoples faced: inadequate housing, poverty, marginalization, and poor availability of clean drinking water (Hall, 2014). However, motivation for their journey arose beyond their wish to publicly rally behind other Indigenous initiatives and concerns. The six young men, between the ages of 17 and 21, also carried very personal reasons for trekking across the snowy landscape at the coldest time of the year. David Kawapit walked to heal from depression that he had been living with for some time (Wheeler, 2014). Another walker, Raymond Kawapit, followed his grandmother’s advice and walked to heal from having lost a brother to suicide (Barrera, 2013). By the time they arrived on Parliament Hill on March 25, 2013, approximately 250 others had joined them in the journey while a crowd of over 4000 was waiting to greet them (Barrera, 2013; Carpenter, 2015; Filice, 2015).

I first heard of the Nishiyuu walkers through Twitter. Plains Cree writer and editor Paul Seesequasis (2018) began posting daily photos of the walkers’ progress on his Twitter account. My attention was further piqued upon learning that they were Cree, like Cheryl. Although it may seem rather trivial, knowing someone of Cree heritage meant (and means) that I would take specific notice of Cree news and events taking place outside of my immediate social and political sphere because paying attention might help to better appreciate Cheryl’s heritage and worldview. As a runner, I was viscerally pulled in by the journey because I thought I could physically imagine what it would feel like to cover the walkers’ aimed distance of 1600km, but I could not conceive of the temperatures of -40˚C to -50˚C in which they travelled. I soon became hooked on Paul’s tweets (Seesequasis, 2018), not only because of the walkers’ tenacity and courage but also from watching communities as they welcomed and feasted with them as they passed through. It was very exciting to witness the building momentum of the Nishiyuu relationships with Indigenous peoples. The strike lasted for six weeks, ending on January 24, 2013, after a Declaration of Commitment (Assembly of First Nations, 2013) was authored to address Theresa Spence’s concerns. For more information on Theresa Spence’s hunger strike and public responses to it, please see: Audra Simpson’s (2016) essay, “The State is a man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the gender of settler sovereignty”); Shawn McCarthy & James Bradshaw (2012), “Protests support Chief Spence”; Canadian Auto Workers Union (2012), “Negotiate First Nations Treaty Rights, Labour leaders urge, in support of Chief Theresa Spence”; Terry Pedwell’s (2012) article, “PM urged to help end first nation chief’s hunger strike”; Shiri Pasternak’s (2016) essay, “The fiscal body of sovereignty: to ‘make live’ in Indian country.”
At the same time, I had been following the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and had already attended a number of local, regional, and national gatherings. Quietly sitting and scanning the rooms at the differently sized and located events, I had become increasingly alarmed, yet unsurprised, by the lack of visibly racialized, non-Indigenous people in the audiences. From what I could see, the people present were primarily “White” or Indigenous. I did not recognize members of other communities like お母さん, お婆ちゃん, or お父さん, and so began speculating wildly as to their absence. Could it be a matter of language barrier? The word “reconciliation” was so alienating, especially to second-language English speakers. Were the TRC events classist? Working class folks, like those at the mushroom farm, could not take even one day off to attend the gatherings, especially if they were living far away from the events. Moreover, did many new immigrants, newcomers, or those present on temporary work visas recuse themselves, believing that the public addressing of this historical Canadian wrong was none of their concern? And considering my upbringing, having been raised to not ask direct questions regarding someone’s (especially those senior to me) traumatic life experiences, I sat in the sharing circles at the TRC, literally open-mouthed with shock, trying to do my best not to stare disrespectfully as people gave their testimonies. I was also becoming increasingly and uncomfortably aware of the unequal relations with regards to the emotional, familial, and social investments that went into attending the TRCC gatherings (James, 2012). Residential school survivors were permitted to give either a public or private disclosure of their experiences and then would have to contend with family and community reactions to their testimony, as well as possibly their own personal retraumatization (Reynaud, 2014; Stewart, Benesiinaabandan, Garneau, & Busby 2016). Meanwhile, audience members who had no personal affiliation with Indian Residential Schools could just get up and walk away. The option to leave in the face of personal discomfort felt too easy. What would be an act of witnessing that could even remotely match the emotional, social, and psychological labour of survivors telling their stories?

Instead of expending energy to rail against the TRCC or racialized communities, I began to consider actions that could bridge the two together. If the TRC gatherings were extraordinary events that took place outside of the scope of everyday interactions, what could be its counterpoint, an activity that would exist in the immediacy of public engagement? I wanted to do something that would catch the interest of people like my
parents, the mushroom farm staff, and those who did not speak English as a first or second language. In meditating upon Cheryl's practices of singing the land, and of moving the art out and towards others, I started to wonder what it would be like to be her song shadow. When Cheryl walked as she composed, what kind of sonorous shadows were cast? How were they similar and dissimilar to visual ones? How did they shift everyday affairs while deeply embedded within? The concept of shadows was attractive to me, partly because they invoked the sense that they would neither overtake nor obstruct the original presence. I also wanted to engage in an activity that would link what I knew with what I did not know; the former would compel persistence and grounding, while the latter would situate me as learning alongside others, and that we would all be developing knowledge together. As for the latter, I began to wonder about my own relationship to the land and the years I had run upon it without even realizing that my feet required the ground. Because of all of those years of not thinking about the land, I knew that a short distance would be insufficient to generate a relational shift to the spaces that I wished to pass through. 100, 200, even 500km would not make an impact, but perhaps 1600km, the distance covered by the Nishiyuu walkers, would alter my experience of and through the land.

On July 01, 2013, I began the collaborative project, in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu. The aim was to run consecutive days until Thanksgiving weekend, to contemplate the casting of both literal and metaphorical sonorous shadows upon the land. Every day, after each run, I painted a watercolour on paper to attempt to visually translate the sonorous experience. I also kept a diary in Japanese and English. This collaboration was unusual for me, in that rather than both being physically present in the same space and time, my moving body was working together with Cheryl's recorded voice. Having received permission to run to music related to Cheryl’s Songlines project, I strapped three speakers around my waist to run in vicinities where Cheryl had either composed or performed her music.

When I first started running, I made a silent agreement with myself to follow a certain set of rules. First, I had to run every day, regardless of where I travelled or whether other tasks needed to be completed. This meant that if I were to fly to Toronto, I would have to run either prior to the flight or soon upon arrival. Second, if during my runs, someone were to call out to me, in jest, support, or aggravation, I would have to stop, approach them and explain my actions. This explanation would involve telling them about the Nishiyuu walkers, Cheryl’s Songlines, being a sonorous shadow, and thinking
about the land beneath our feet. Third, on traditional Indigenous territories, if local events or buildings such as museums or galleries were open to the public, my run was to include visiting those places. Otherwise, like a shadow, I should pass through without imposing my bodily presence in those communities. Fourth, under no condition was I permitted to stop and rest during a run, exempting explanation of the shadow projects and visiting sites in First Nations communities. In retrospect, these rules would prove consequential, socially, physically, and existentially.

The first two weeks of running was a period of physical adjustment. As a long-distance runner, I was accustomed to running frequently but not consecutively without taking breaks every three or four days. Giant blisters formed fairly quickly on the soles of my feet, and I had to learn to run with a soundbelt squishing in my gut. In the early days, painting the picture to conclude the day was a comfort to me, sort of like the daily closing off of a beginning-middle-end performance of each run.

The closing of the second week coincided with the beginning of the Reconsidering Reconciliation Artist Residency at Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops. The month-long residency was an intensely collaborative and productive time, where artists offered critical feedback to one another. During crits for the sonorous project, Cheryl advised me to lay tobacco during each run, to respectfully acknowledge being on the land. She also told me to pay attention to numbers, explaining they were important in Cree cosmological meaning. Finally, she suggested that I approach other musicians whose territories I passed through, to run to their music. New songs and traditional Secwepemc stories were added to the soundbelt. It was in Secwepemc territory that I began to contemplate the difference between visual and sonorous shadows.

Secwepemc territory is sweltering in the summer months. With desert-like conditions, lips crackle and pucker in a matter of minutes, and the wind sears leather the surface of the skin. During the day, temperatures would soar up to 40˚C, perfect conditions for suffering from sun and heat stroke. Therefore, I had the choice between running either early in the morning before sunrise, or after the sun had set, usually in a cloudless, starlit sky. Choosing mostly to run late at night, many of the runs began well past 10:00 p.m. On those occasions, the luminosity of the moon and street lamps were
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86During the Reconsidering Reconciliation residency, Secwepemc artist and curator, Tania Willard, introduced me to traditional Secwepemc stories, saved on CDs. With her permission, these stories were downloaded onto the songbelt.
so powerful against the landscape that the sharpest of visual shadows were cast on the ground below. My eyes would deceive me into running to avoid what would appear to be a gaping hole in the sidewalk, only to fall flat on my back from miscalculating the depth of the ledge alongside the road. I tripped so many times – face first, on my sides, squarely on my ass – because the shadows actually melded with the object that had cast them in the first place. It was becoming painfully apparent that I could no longer rely on sight to navigate through the land. Instead, I would need to depend on texture, touch, and sound to ensure safe foot passage.

Sonorous shadows reverberate long distances, deep into the crevasses of the earth. In the vibrations that ricochet in the minutest gaps, air tunnels to and fro. An intimate relation develops between touch and sound traces. Rather than travel at severe angles on the surface of adjacent matter, sonorous shadows leach and permeate through rigid objects. These shadows move the imagination to contemplate the porosity of solid forms; they evoke water seeping through the cracks in the pavement, newly acquainted cellular materials agitating to coalesce into novel forms, the strange streams of heat that swirl and intermingle with cold fronts, like those cobwebs that seem to materialize out of nowhere. すべて命が音楽に乗りながら解けて来る. Depending upon the speed of contact, some sounds pong back, letting the listener know that a surface limit looms on the immediate horizon. Perhaps a trick of the empirical realm, the cement below is softened by the microscopic quakes that wave through from human to nonhuman material. Visual shadows yield to sounds that guide the body to touch the ground. I learn to stop falling down.

Listening becomes a full-bodied, multi-vocal, and multi-directional experience.\textsuperscript{87} Human and non-human sounds intermingle. With songs wrapped around my belly, those epidermal cells are the first to be hit by sonorous waves. The torso literally feels the pulsing of rhythm, beat, and voice, in the visceral stretch of seconds before the sounds reach the ears. I feel the vibrations course through me, stream in my veins, arteries, pulsate like new bodies within bodies. Could it be that the internal organs change shape because of the music? Now they carry the memory of the cyclical recurrence of Cheryl’s songs. Yet, I come to appreciate the other noises and stirrings that rush at my frame.

\textsuperscript{87}Australian-based soundscape researchers, Michelle Duffy, Gordon Waitt, and Theresa Harada (2016) discuss the role of the body in understanding the experience of space, time, and mapping the land through sound. They develop a research methodology called visceral sonic mapping.
from the outside that modulate these bodily emissions: cars zooming past on hectic highways, coyotes crying up into the night sky, people laughing or shouting as they pass by, dogs viciously protecting their owners’ property line, stormy gales whipping naked branches back and forth. This orchestra sonorously shape-shifts the body, inflected through space and time.

At certain points, this running figure is a mere carrier of song, at other times, a show of power from a gendered physique. I want children to witness the strength of a recombinant woman’s body and voice, capable of doing and being in excess of their imaginations. The sonorous body extends far beyond the visual boundaries of an individual form. A new presence arises in which sounds lead the rest of the mass forward into interacting with others. People, animals, errant leaves, all experience Cheryl’s and the other singers’ voices far before they see my moving body because the music bends around corners, is carried in air pockets and sneaks through buildings like ghosts. The climate is changed, and the meaning of climate shifts accordingly. In keeping with Watsuji’s (1935/1961) notion of 風土, the reformulation of the physical and human social environment is a dynamic negation of the separation of the individual and the whole. Recall from previous discussions that Watsuji believed that climate is understood as expressions of the subjective human experience of space (p. v). Representational meanings of both 人間 and nature, and their abstractions, emerge as a consequence of this primordial intertwined relation. But I begin to question the distinction between 人間 and nature. Moving away from the singular atomistic and modernist notion of the complete individual, I start to wonder if sonorous shadows, temporarily through sound, blur the boundaries between humans and between humans and non-humans. In other words, 間柄, or the inbetweenness of humans, exists in different vibrational covalence, thickness, and movement. Similarly, the point of contact between foot and ground is an outcome of subjective communal existence, and for that short while, a new land-human being is formed. Such agreements exist beyond individual human intentionality.

With this developing knowledge, a new responsibility arises. Due to domestic violence and racism in public spaces, the better part of my life has been spent trying to shrink down to avoid being targeted for attack. Nonetheless, not all malevolent circumstances can be sidestepped. When people have called me “chink” or have told me to “go back to your own country” or have made random squawky noises to mock
speaking “any Asian language,” a stock number of reactions have become instinctual. Sometimes, I have burst into tears from shock, because the attack has snuck up on me. Sometimes, I ignore them, pretending that I do not understand either their language or intent. At other times, the 病たれ family trait kicks into full play, and I have been known to chase down carloads of people like the Terminator, throw cans of Campbell’s soup at bratty shit teenagers trying to intimidate me, and yell back, “fuck you! And the proper slur is jap, not chink, assholes!” Although in the immediate context, it would often feel good to stand up for myself, these are definitely not helpful or nurturing responses to racial discrimination. During the course of the Nishiyuu project, I have food, drinks, and garbage thrown at me from passing vehicles, I am called “fucking cunt” and “slut” on several occasions, and told to “get off the road, chink.” It requires quite a bit of self-control to not respond in an equally aggressive manner. But I become keenly aware that this body is not only my own but elongated and expanded through carrying the voices of Cheryl, Joseph Naytowhow, Kym Gouchie, and at times, Secwepemc traditional stories. I remember reading somewhere that sonic memories evoke much more longstanding, visceral reactions than visual ones. If this were the case, it would not be right to associate my offensive behaviours with songs sung in Cree, songs about healing from residential school, and traditional morality tales. In being entrusted with these songs and stories, I should not act to arouse negative responses in passersby, were they to come across these voices in another place and time. Instead, in many cases, I approach belligerent individuals and groups as quietly as possible to explain the purpose behind the sonorous running. Another pillar of the sonorous mikiwap, tipéyimisowin, might best articulate this calmer path. Rather than being bound to an aggravated response that makes me lose control, the singers’ voices remind me to act in such a way as to become free from the power that those racist taunts have over me –freedom that comes from constraint. There are times, however, in fearing for my own safety, I break one of the rules of the Nishiyuu runs: I do not explain the nature of the project to the people who looked as though they would cause physical harm.

It would be misleading for me to convey all of the human interactions during the Nishiyuu runs as negative experiences. On the contrary, many are beautiful moments of
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88Kym Gouchie is a singer/songwriter from the Lheidli T’enneh Nation. She was visiting Cheryl during the Reconsidering Reconciliation residency. When I explained the Nishiyuu project, she gave me permission to add two of her songs, For the People (Gouchie, 2014a) and Sister Rain (Gouchie, 2014b) to my sound belt.
connecting and passing through. As expected, a large number of visibly racialized people, women and children, in particular, ask about the music. In Kamloops, one South-Asian woman who has seen me two days prior actually chases me down for a couple of blocks while carrying bagfuls of groceries, before catching up to talk. One of the most surprising turns is when visibly white elderly women enquire about the songs and the soundbelt. As soon as many of them speak, it is clear that English is not their first language, and that they do not usually talk to strangers in public places. An elderly woman at a bus stop in Vancouver gives me a sidelong glance and asks about the language of the song, having caught wind of one of Cheryl and Joseph’s Nikamok songs, which is streaming in Cree. When I explain the project to her, telling her about the Nishiyuu walkers and the daily runs, she replies in a thick Eastern European accent, “it’s good work. Hard work. Remember, keep hydrated.” We nod to each other, smile, then part ways. This interaction remains with me long after, and it dawns on me that up until now, my perception of “White people” as well as my understanding of racism has been dictated by a visual imaginary. What about those who are racially discriminated against on the basis of sound, smell, movement, and cultural clashes? It makes me return to post-colonial and critical race literature with a critical ear, wondering if in prioritizing visual over other sensory discourses with regard to racism, it renders invisible and unspeakable those who are collectively labelled “White.” In using visual cues only to determine and demand that all white skinned people have White privilege, in the past, I have certainly silenced those, like that old lady at the bus stop, in their tentative attempts to reach out. The sonorous pillar, sâkihtowin, potentially challenges categories built to exclude. This is the beginning of reexamining the tacit political expectations I have placed upon myself and others, based on the visual constraints that have shaped theoretical developments in race relations.

Despite my best intentions, other expectations and rules that I had previously laid out soon begin to conflict with one another, or just crumble apart as the Nishiyuu runs progress. As a 後輩, the need to abide by Cheryl, all of the performers, and the Nishiyuu walkers come to outstrip my sense of 生活の美学. At the beginning of this journey, olfactory, visual, and kinetic decorum are of utmost importance as an aesthetical expression of 孝行. Before I start, I actually envision in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu to be a performance in 孝行. As the days pass, however, when physical and psychological demands begin to accumulate, quite frankly, I stop giving a shit about how I look or
smell. I begin to break another rule regularly too, to not rest while on a run. At times my legs feel as wobbly as a jellyfish from the exertion that I force myself to stop to catch my breath. To breach the resting rule also means that I break from social conventions of action in relation to place. Sometimes I plop my ass to the ground, regardless of location, time of day/night, and weather conditions. People and animals stare as I lay down on a sidewalk, which runs alongside a busy road, or sit with legs widespread for an hour on a pile of dirt at a construction site. This raises questions about affiliating beauty and honouring acts, and whether the very meaning of a beautiful act changes because of profound shifts in relation to time and space.

At first, I feel ashamed for breaking so many rules, but then become cognizant of a way of being that has subconsciously influenced my social engagements throughout my life. It is only when diverse demands to abide contradict and compete with one another, that I realize the extent to which I like to follow rules. All of those years of embodying 孝行, obediently listening to orders and running errands at the mushroom farm, silently abiding by お父さん, お婆ちゃん, and お母さん and all of the cycles of gender-based 孝行 throughout the 後藤, 清川, and 甲斐 familial lines suddenly weigh upon me. This deeply habituated need to adhere forces me to contemplate the possible and actual disastrous social and historical consequences of blindly following with respect to others. If they achieve nothing else, the Nishiyuu runs are unsettling, shaking up complacent practices of transnational, cultural, and familial existences.

Bodily shape-shifting occurs out of the topsy-turvy relational transformation of Canadian living conventions of time and space. Beyond the physical and psychological toll of the Nishiyuu runs on the body, what can be described as a spiritual estrangement to place develops in the kinetic passage of space over time. Somewhere along the way, what has begun as a daily activity – one among many in the course of the day – becomes the overarching state of affairs that encompasses everything else. Just as the songs and stories engulf, curve, and stretch out beyond the visible Ayumi body form, so too might they reshape time so that it becomes a hermeneutical carrier for the other activities that take place within a day. A new perspective is shaped through the繰り返し of motion. The repetitive beginning-start-end of preparing for Nishiyuu run-painting/writing itself creates a running rhythm much like a heartbeat, which performatively overrides minute closures of each run, and does not cease until the last day of the project. This kinetic meditation on land and passing through Indigenous
territory makes me keenly aware that the subjective experience of time readjusts the valuation and categorization of relationships, work, leisure, private v. public, and the bodily limits of endurance.

In as much as the Nishiyuu runs temporally stretch out and reposition experiences in the world, so too does time become insignificant in relation to space. When faced with landscapes that stretch out in all directions, no matter how long one runs, it is impossible to reach any end. Much like a microbe attempting to contemplate the meaning of its human host, the earth looms too large so that I become easily beleaguered by the question: how do I change my relationship to this land? The perception of the Ayumi body as a singularity is broken by the constancy of song. Here, shape-shifting does not only mean new coalescences through sound. Sometimes, and in keeping with 陰陽, other bodies are pulled apart. Voices that begin as low murmurs increase in volume from deep within the visible body, voices that are not my own but those interwoven to this current sense of personhood. I hear お父さん, the shitehead that he is, at turns taunting and egging me on to complete the project. 歩美ちゃん絶対無理だよーーー！お前此の奇妙な遊び突き進まれるか知ら？ Mustering all the 糞たれ within me, I shout back aloud, “絶対に負けないぞーーー！” These arguments with お父さん are so loud that they nearly drown out the more persistent voice that finally announces itself through the fray. A woman’s voice, in utter shock with her surrounds. 此の景色は初めて見るですね...今何処に通るとしていますか?... 其の工場初めて見ますですね...It takes many more vocalizations before I recognize that she is from far away, my 曽祖母, お婆ちやんの母親です. In the months before お婆ちゃん passed away, she began mistaking me for her mother. To put her mind at ease, I played the role, telling her that yes, I was her mother, and that yes, would be there for her when she awoke from her naps. But this is the first time to hear Great-Grandmother’s voice. From the inside, she begins to urge me to return with her to the sky, to the familiar, to the known, and when I look down, I see that my feet no longer touch the ground. The invisible spirit form starts to separate from the visible running body, and panicked, I come to appreciate that Cheryl’s voice tethers me down, preventing me from floating away.

I deliberate on the music, thinking that perhaps it has been playing at a frequency to create the perfect conditions to awaken my ancestors. In modern scientific terms, geneticists have mapped out the human genome, the complete set of nucleic acid sequences required to form a human being. By reading different sequences of the code,
familial inheritances of diseases and conditions can sometimes be recognized. Genetics, the scientific reinterpretation of what other cultural beliefs would call reincarnation, tends to fixate on isolating and identifying potentially problematic sequences of code, which might lead to the manifestation of disease. But what if the sequences are to be understood in relation to one another, a song that is performed only within a specific vibrational range? In this sense, the moving human form is a song. In the course of the Nishiyuu runs, in the circulation of Cheryl’s, Joseph’s, Kym’s, and storytelling voices, when 曾祖母 timelessly beckons me, am reminded that this body is not an individual fixed existence. This might be a formless materialization of tâpwēhtamowin, relational shifts in the experience of the physical-spirit world that arise through sound. In the impermanent body formation, in the course of sonorously shadowing others, multiple songs intersect and harmonize for a short while.

Placed intellectually together, modern Japanese philosopher, Nishida Kitarō (1966, 2012) and anthropologist of Stl’atl’imx’ heritage, Christine Elsey (2013) aid in deciphering the subjective warping of space and time. In his philosophical career, Nishida was focused on the body, taking decades to mull over and re-cognize the concept of acting intuition. According to Nishida, the body rather than the intellect is central to understanding the non-dual relatedness to the world (Krueger, 2008, p. 213). The body is both subject and object at the same time; it acts upon the world and is acted upon by the world (Krummel, 2015, p. 795; Yuasa, 1987, p. 67). This self-contradictory body structure is both itself and not itself, a fluid and dynamic unity of acts in the relationship between the formed and forming (Nishida, 1966, p. 176; Yuasa, 1987). In the Nishiyuu runs, this embodied reciprocation can be described as a creative, active intuition between the witnessing "I" and the witnessed Ayumi running form. For Nishida, acting intuition means that the body, having no permanent and static demarcated self separating itself from its surroundings, develops meaning from acting (Krummel, 2015, p. 794). In other words, the world and the self are co-implicative, interwoven into an embodied agency (Krueger, 2008, p. 214). Such co-implicated being arises in an ongoing unity of opposites, where subject and object confront one another. In the negation of the individual, the environment is formed, and in the negation of the environment, the individual is formed (Nishida, 1966). For Nishida, the body is not to be understood solely as a sensorimotor complex, but in being human, it is a world related existence, which is always already embedded in the socio-historical context. Humans are necessarily relational beings, and thinking is an outcome of the acting body moving
through in relation to others (Cheung, 2014). Nishida believes that human bodily relational experience can be cultivated through mindful practice, thinking specifically about creative intuition and art practice as the means to reach toward the deeper, base structure of the non-ego self (Yuasa, 1987).

Meanwhile, Christine Elsey (2013) contends that a poiesis of being or doing, that is, the active emergence of self-expression is very much entrenched in the collective being-on-the-land of Indigenous people (p. 10). Territory is a storyscape of generations of lived human experience upon land that is imbued with spiritual meaning (Elsey, 2013, p. 11). Elsey argues that First Nations identity emerges as an enfoldment with their specific territory, rather than from a homogenized ethnic grouping of Indigenous Peoples, which tends to override the specificities of lived experiences on a particular land (p. 11). This poiesis describes the movements of living through space, anchoring the culture in spirituality, meaning, and art practice (Elsey, 2013, p. 12). The human body is one that is coextensive with all that is touched, connected through the senses (Elsey, 2013, p. 46). Elsey is motivated by the pressing need to protect Indigenous territories from ongoing neo-colonial strategies to exploit the land for material and political gain, and to avoid further assimilation with mainstream settler society. In short, the Indigenous locale is the site of “preserving Indigenous difference in a global epoch” (Elsey, 2013, p. 17).

Both Nishida (1966, 2012) and Elsey (2013) discuss the embeddedness or enfoldment of the human in relation to the environment. Both present the idea that humans are co-extensive with experience in the world, emphasizing the ontological prioritizing of the relational in humans’ experiences with and in the world. However, whereas for Nishida, place or 場所 (bashō) is a phenomenological movement toward deepening into absolute nothingness, Elsey’s prioritizing of the local is a specific place that intertwines the spiritual, social, and non-human. The outcome of these experiences acutely separates their senses of being (Elsey, 2013). For Nishida, the self is fluid and temporarily defined as a collation of acting in the world, while in Elsey’s conceptualization, the self is a specifically land-based solidification of Indigenous identity. On the one hand, the self is so fluid that it can never be permanently grasped, and on the other hand, the self is so solidified in place so as to have no sense of ambiguity or flexibility. But maybe it is misleading to approach Nishida’s and Elsey’s respective conceptions of the self from the perspective of the idealized outcome. For Nishida, the movement toward a deeper experience of being is a labored process,
requiring years of focused cultivation. He aspired to reach those depths through the 
practice of meditation, but he ceased from instructing others on how to delve beyond the 
surface experience of the world (Nishitani, 2016). For Elsey, her words of Indigenous 
belonging to specific territory can be considered a reassurance, while not dictating how 
one ought to proceed to come to know their sense of cultural and historical affiliation to a 
place. In this way, the fluidity of the shape-shifting subject/object and the solidification of 
identity create spaces in between for moving, acting, and working through states of 
knowing and not knowing the self in relation to others. The relationships in which one is 
embedded historically, socially, familially, transnationally, physically, and culturally will 
inspire specific processes of investigation that may, in turn, resonate with those who are 
implicated in the activity. These relationships do not work in perfect collective 
synchronicity but at times might conflict with each other. Furthermore, their influences 
may not all be present in a conscious way when a person decides to learn through 
movement. Knowledge then is astounding, often a dawning of an idea or state of affairs 
that exceeds one's intentional imagination.

To sonorously shadow Cheryl, Joseph, Kym, and Secwepemc storytellers, the 
experience is overwhelming, difficult to comprehend. But the sense of shadowing is in 
the least a movement of gratitude, お陰で, where shadow is the root of expressed 
thankfulness. One of the characters for shadow 陰 stands for gratitude, as well as for the 
the yin principle. The movement of sound across the land gives rise to the complexing of 
gratitude/shadow/soft balance. This meaning is very particular to the linguistic-historical 
Ayumi body acting in relation to Cheryl, Joseph, Kym, and the Secwepemc storytellers' 
voices, and exists only in the course of sound movement. This experiential definition 
quickly dissipates, unable to dictate any type of epistemological universal, while giving 
rise to a different understanding of one's cultural-social affiliations in relation to others. A 
sonorous shadow maintains the separation of individuals involved at the same time that 
the relational recombination of all is greater than the meaning of each individual 
intention.

Thinking specifically of Cheryl, お陰で付いて行きます resonates strongly with the 
先輩-後輩 relationship, which motivates me to begin the Nishiyuu runs in the first place. 
The 先輩-後輩 pairing is a witnessing relationship, one that requires time spent in 
different proximities in order to gain multiple perspectives of someone in relational 
action. It forms from paying attention to another and then making a decision to move
closer in and attempt to emulate the spirit rather than imitate the contents of what the 先輩 has said or acted. The 先輩 often does not know the extent to which they have influenced the 後輩, and in this sense, there is an apparent imbalance in the relationship, but perhaps it is better this way. Otherwise, the 先輩 who knows the scope of their influence on others might begin to think too big of themselves, and then wield power over those perceived to be below them. Likewise, the 後輩 who insists on being recognized or praised for adhering performatively contradicts the relation in over-centralizing and imposing themselves onto others. Over time, this balance can be reestablished if the 後輩 one day becomes a 先輩 to another person. This hierarchical relation may best fit with the sonorous pillar of tapihtéyimisowin. Although the actions are specific to a role, no one is above or below.

In sonorously shadowing Cheryl, I am confronted with a perspectival shift with respect to land and knowledge. For Cheryl, the land itself is an active collaborator, and prior to the project, I expected that in following the sound of her voice, I would become better acquainted with the land that I passed through. Instead, days after the final run, I wake up screaming in the middle of the night, "My legs are burning! My legs are burning!!" One night, I am startled awake to the sound of someone breathing deeply right next to my sleeping form. I sit up to see if Ashok or the cat is close by. It is only then that I realize that my breath has long left my body. Only by the grace of muscular memory, and the mechanical habits of oxygen in and carbon dioxide out, does my physical form persist. I begin to weep uncontrollably, thinking, "the land has taken my breath and it has rejected me!" Only at this point, am I devastated to learn that I have broken possibly one of the most important performance rules that Cheryl has shared with me: do not harm yourself for the craft. The next day, I run without her voice for the first time in a very long time, in a state of confusion and desolation. And the next day after that. I come to a very slow, staggering realization that running 1600km in 104 days is a teaching in coming to know the extent to which one does not know, and to question one’s assumed ways of knowing. In sonorously shadowing Cheryl, so far away from my so-called homeland of Japan, I clearly hear my Great-Grandmother’s voice. At the same time, I am alarmed to learn that in the time that I have lived in different parts of this land being, my feet have never touched the ground. By taking my breath away, the land dares me to chase after it, and in the process, to continue to pass through. It teaches me the limits of the kind of knowledge that can be formed in the act of running through territories. And it teaches me
to move toward other means to establish a deeper knowledge. In the expanse of not
knowing, new possibilities emerge for developing a better relationship with the land, and
with those who have a lived upon it from other points of view. Those viewpoints are
prismatic, a gemstone shattering into multiple relational possibilities. Thinking about
Cheryl as a 先輩, in the multiplicity of her social and creative interactions, she, like
Shirley Bear, leaves a myriad of examples to begin down a new path.
Chapter Five: Performatively shadowing Adrian Stimson in four directions

This is the conundrum: if the person(a) speaking/acting/doing/being is in a constant state of change, does the witness stand still or move about to appreciate more wholly the complexity of their situated relations? Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, Miss Chief, Adrian Stimson: they are altogether greater than the sum of their stories. In my novice attempts to learn from and about these fluctuating identities, unexpected lessons arise with regard to colonization, gender fluidities, familial duties, and the toiling drive of the land to reclaim themselves. Inasmuch as one might come to know another, it becomes increasingly clear that larger remnants are left unknowable. This rest assures that one person, or the confluence of personhoods, persistently exceeds the witness’s understanding, thereby signaling from multiple points of view the uncontainable existence of the other. Knowledge formation in these instances is that which emerges in the in between, or 間柄 (aidagara), of those changeable interactions, instead of resulting from placing the other under an objectifying and object making lens. Without the ontological presence of the prior relation, it could be argued that whatever is labelled as knowledge is rendered meaningless or worse, evacuated of its spirit. I can only come to know because of the nature of the relationship that has been established, which then determines the processes and directions of learning.

This chapter is presented in multiple parts. Each section is portrayed as a means to communicate the tonality of the call and response relationships between Buffalo Boy/Shaman Exterminator/ Miss Chief/Adrian Stimson and geisha gyrl/Ayumi Goto. The particularities of witnessing can perhaps best be described as arising from a ロールモデル (rō-ru moderu) or “role model” relation. The text in this chapter can be considered a written performance of calls and responses. Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, Miss Chief, and Adrian Stimson compel diverse responses that generate away from their initial calls. Through changes in writing tone and voice, I will respond as the alter-ego, geisha gyrl, and as Ayumi Goto. Both geisha gyrl and Ayumi Goto are presented as performative shadows, compelled to move in distal relation to the four directional presences. Each written performance of the established direction will be followed by critical analysis and the presentation of a geisha gyrl performative response to the various calls. This movement away concurrently functions as a movement towards addressing assumed states of affairs: familially, culturally, and transnationally. I wish to
argue that the actions, words, and play of Buffalo Boy, Miss Chief, Shaman Exterminator, and Adrian Stimson politically and socially provoke those in the surrounds to reconsider the seemingly apolitical status quo of presence upon traditional Indigenous territories.

The strange reverberations of spoken and body languages is that their familial, transcultural, and transnational reaches go far beyond one’s geo-political expectations and known histories. Enter Adrian Stimson. As with Cheryl, I was quite shy about approaching Adrian. Instead, I spent many years in the shadowed periphery of his performances, attending art openings that showcased his installations and paintings, and I heard many stories about his practice. One of my partner Ashok’s anecdotes has made a lasting impression. In the mid-1990s, Ashok was working as a sessional instructor at the Alberta College of Art and Design (ACAD) where Adrian was enrolled as a student. As one of his instructors, Ashok knew very little about Adrian’s background, save scant knowledge that prior to entering art school, Adrian had held a political position as a band councilor for the Siksika Nation. Then, Shirley Bear arrived to be the artist-in-residence at the college. At the beginning of one of Shirley’s public talks at the school, Ashok witnessed Adrian standing up to welcome Shirley formally onto Blackfoot territory. To the surprise of his fellow students and teachers, Adrian spoke eloquently in Siksikitsipowahsin, the Blackfoot language (Bastien, 2009, p. 128), to invite Shirley respectfully, by then a well-established Maliseet artist and activist, to be a guest on his ancestral lands. Although I only know about this story through Ashok’s rendering, I have imagined the encounter between Adrian and Shirley many times. At the time, Shirley was nearing 60 years of age, and according to Ashok, her hair had turned grey and flowed long in the signature style with which she is known today. To the students, would she have been seen as a senior citizen? It is Adrian’s actions that have captivated my attention. The way I picture Adrian addressing Shirley resounds with my understanding of孝行, showing respect to an Elder who had so much life, artistic, and political experiences to share. Kainai Elder, Wilton Good Striker (1995) describes Elders as “teachers of wisdom and traditions because they know the secrets of life; they have walked the path…Throughout all, the elders are the ones who never lose hope” (Good Striker, 1995, pp. 25-26). By welcoming Shirley formally, through his actions, Adrian demonstrated how an Elder is to be regarded. In speaking his mother tongue openly in a public place, Adrian, perhaps unknowingly, also granted linguistic permission for others to speak in their own languages beyond the confines of their homes. And together,
acknowledging Shirley’s presence in Siksikaitsipowahsin, Adrian presented to the other students, as well as to the instructors, the linguistic and political situatedness of art education, housed through reverential regard toward an elder within traditional Siksika territory. In trying to imagine the art that arises from the spaces in between Siksikaitsipowahsin and Shirley’s mother tongue, Maliseet, I begin to speculate about that which might spring forth in the meeting up of these languages with Japanese.

In the following discussion, my aim is to provide an example of how the intermingling of two languages, written, spoken, and embodied through performance, creatively raise questions about nation-building, gender relations, cultural appropriation, and land-human interbeingness. I wish to focus on the aesthetic, political, and ethical ideas that materialize as a consequence of the meeting up and visiting of Siksikaitsipowahsin (Blackfoot) and Japanese, two of the “unofficial languages” identified in the 2011 National Household Survey (Statistics Canada, 2013). Most times, the meeting up of Blackfoot and Japanese is performative rather than vocalized, ultimately traversing these linguistic boundaries. As Adrian states:

> Words can be so convoluted and twisted…With performance art, it is what it is and people are able to interpret what it is for them. It’s also play for me. I love the idea of play. I think that we lose it as we get older…Performance art is a form of activism in which people don’t know they’ve been hit on the head until they start thinking about it, and when they start thinking about it a space of criticality and reflection opens up.

(in Garneau, 2014a, p. 2)

In the knowledge of the uncontainability of Adrian’s life, I will do my best to articulate the shape-shifting nature and the static limitations of witnessing. Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, Miss Chief, and Adrian Stimson: each rouse at times very animated responses from the ever-fluid dyad of geisha gyrl/Ayumi that shift in voice and movement, which will be expressed in each of the four parts below. It is from these enthusiastic responses, internal and often giddy voices going every which way, that geisha gyrl and Ayumi’s witnessing performances start to come into being. The performatives of witnessing Adrian and his alter egos culminate and manifest into respective performances as responses.

5.1 Part One: Buffalo Boy

> Step right up! Step right up! Welcome to the unpredictable, unforgettable, unstoppable worlds of Buffalo Boy!! He/she/they are here to tantalize, to probe the
deepest, darkest recesses of your...whatchyamacallems. Hey, hey, hey, don’t shy away, it’s time to play! What better way to introduce the ever so flamboyant, charisma-oozing creature that is human, non-human, male, female, neither, more than, falling between the cracks of gender, sexuality, colonization, animation, and spirit (Bell, 2007; Garneau, 2014a; Rice & Taunton, 2009)? Keep your eyes and ears open, friends, or he/she/they will slip away. Where was Buffalo Boy last seen? Well, the very, very first time, at the Mendel Art Gallery, 2004, with Belle Sauvage, aka his partner in crime, Lori Blondeau, that’s where! They were putting the wild back into the west, yessirree bobs, they were (Rice & Taunton, 2009, p. 24)! Where next, where next? I/We/They saw him at Burning Man, year after year, many many times. Hey, me too! Me too! We’re big fans of Buffalo Boy. What’s Burning Man, you say? You don’t know Burning Man?!? Every August, at the Black Rock Desert, Nevada, a temporary city is built up up up only to be burned down again! That’s crazy, right? Crazy. Why does Buffalo Boy go? Because it’s the place where everyone can exist, accepting difference, hybridity, and, you know, Buffalo Boy with all that gender, genre, and identity shifting goin’ on, he’s in good company, that’s why (Bell, 2007).

Okay, okay, but where did Buffalo Boy come from? Does anybody know? Anyone? Anyone?? Well, I’ve heard Buffalo Boy was born in the coldest of winters, some say it was −65°C with windchills! Yah yah, it was right in the middle of the prairies, when the gosh darn embryo sac shattered from the cold, and smack!, this baby...thing tumbled out. Good thing anti-freeze was streaming through its veins otherwise it woulda died fer sure. Animals lookin’ out for it, while it fed off the milk of the milky way, and it was the wind who came up with the name, Buffalo Boy, don’tcha ya know (Stimson, 2005, p. 2)? Ever since then, he’s been cropping up here and there, sometimes taking the piss, eh? But man o man sometimes, he doesn’t take jack shit from no one, different being entirely.

Well then answer me this: who, or maybe better, what the hell is Buffalo Boy? There’s no single what, get it? Sometimes, he’s a he, sometimes it’s an it, or she’s a he or she...damn, makes my head spin, always changing, always shifting, so that you can’t pigeonhole Buffalo Boy into a singular. But I can tell you this with some measure of certainty, he’s gonna ball bust the shit outta colonization, what
some in these parts call white settler culture, dominant white culture, you know, the Europeans, English and French, the founders of this here nation-state of the good ol’ true north of Canada (Bell, 2014). And what a founding it was. Turns out, there were se-er-i-ou-ss translation problems in the signing of Treaty 7, don’tcha ya know? I’ve heard that back then in good ol’ 1877 there were no words in Blackfoot for treaty, reserve, surrender, an imperial queen, even (Good Striker, 1995)! So then we’ve gotta ask ourselves, what the hell was bein’ agreed to? Heard the translators were questionable too, like Jim Bird, hard to know how much they could understand, and at Blackfoot Crossing (Soyooh pawahko), where the signin’ took place, well there was so many languages crissin’ and crossin’, seriously, who the hells could keep up (Good Striker, 1995, p. 21)? The Tsuu T’ina speak totally different from the other members of the Blackfoot Confederacy, you know? Their language is from up north some, and down south some. And then this Treaty 7, well it came on the heels of peace treaties between the Blackfeet and Cree, after years of fightin’ and tradin’ (Good Striker, 1995, p. 8). But according to those in the know, agreements between non-Whites keep their word (Good Striker, 1995, p. 10), while Whites change their hearts and minds too much. And on top of all this mixing and meddlin’, the languages themselves are sooooooooo doggone different. They say that White folks speak in nouns and Blackfoot folks, hells, many Indigenous folks, speak in verbs (Good Striker, 1995, p. 23). One says oral while others, Whites, say written is the word. Who’s to say who’s got the right interpretation? Things will get mixed up real fast, yessirree. Tell you one thing though. Whaz that, then? Pretty dang sure Buffalo Boy was there. Now, how the hell would you know something like that? Well, think about it, man. The Blackfoot call the signing of Treaty 7, “otsistsi pakssaisstoyiih pi,” or “the year the winter was open and cold” (Good Striker, 1995, p. 3). Yah, so? So, Buffalo Boy was born when it was super cold, maybe even colder than the winter that things went so wrong. 1877. Or maybe that’s when he was born. Who’s to know when he first stood on frozen ground, but that Buffalo Boy, he’s died and come back to life so many times, it’s hard to keep count (Bell, 2014). I just know that he was there. Watchin’ over and listenin’ in, just in case. Just in case what? Just in case it got all fucked up and well, come on, it’s a-l-l fucked up! Besides, if he can shape-shift
gender and all that, why can’t he shape-shift time and space?

She’s a performative shadow of Buffalo Boy. A what? Performative shadow! In Japanese, it is 付け回す (tsukemawasu). In ENGRISHI it translates to “shadow” but you would, like, seriously, miss the whole point without knowing this. Know what? The transliteration, dummy! Transliterated, 付け回す is a verb. It means “stick to” (付け) and “turn” (回す). So? Oh my god, I have to spell it all out, don’t I?! Yes please. So?

So, a performative shadow is the pent-up energies, the extrusions of the multiple facets and ever-shapings of something, of Buffalo Boy, for instance. So what does it mean to stick and turn? Okeeeeee, so let’s go at this from another direction. Do you know コスプレ? Huh? Cosplay. Oh yah, yah I do. So then think of geisha gyrl as political cosplay. Why? Ohhhhhhh miiiiii gooooddddddddd, because that’s what she/it is! Explain? Well, if she’s full-on cosplay, she would be like this mini-buffalo-girl, but to her, it means pretty much jack shit. She has no connection, really, cosmologically, and especially genetically, to buffalo. So if she tries to be any sort of buffalo, well, some would call it cultural appropriation. Maybe she would even call it cultural appropriation. Cultural what? Cultural appropriation. You know, when you pretend that you know something deeply, as if it were yours, but it never was, but you’re just trying it on at the same time that you call it yer own thingamajig, as if it belonged to yours all along. But d’you know what? It’s not all about just copy cattin’ around, because as you know, imitation is the greatest form of flattery, ain’t it? There are some serious power inequality issues, with cultural appropriation, right?

The messed up thing about cultural appropriation is that deep down, those people believe they have the right to gobble up that knowledge as their own. Like the bully in the schoolyard, taking away the other kids’ lunches and saying it was theirs in the first place. Or kind of like being told yer speaking the wrong language in a public place. That same sorta big brother demand to be comprehensible to everyone. Well, I’m guessing that cultural appropriation and the language police come from that same place: you kind of think you have every right to everyone’s business all the time. Yah, so? Soooo, in regular cosplay, geisha gyrl would be running around trying to look exactly like Buffalo Boy and all of her friends would be dressing up like him
too, replications of and all that. But after watching and thinking more about what
Buffalo Boy was doing, she figured that he wasn’t asking people to mimic him, but
through his crazy laugh out loud antics, he was tryin’ to get them to rethink what
they thought they knew and to become curious about the things they hadn’t even
thought about. Like he knew that he was releasing all of this cosmological energy so
that it could be transformed into coming to know things, maybe, just maybe in a
more respectful way, remember things that might have been intentionally erased. So,
am thinkin’ now that when she’s goin’ around 付け回す to Buffalo Boy, well, that
there is an example of political cosplay. Ya stick to somethin’ and turn it into
somethin’ else in response.

But wait a minute, you’re getting it all wrong. The whole point of Buffalo Boy
and Belle Sauvage: Putting the WILD Back Into the West was to play colonial dress-
up (Rice & Taunton, 2009, p. 25)! Yah, but the whole, whole point of the dress-up
was to get people to think about all the crazy-ass stereotypes about Indigenous
guys because of all of those traveling shows and Hollywood movies and pictorials of
Cowboys and Indians over the years (Bell, 2007; Garneau, 2014a; Sagala, 2010).
Think about it, with Belle Sauvage, Lori Blondeau is taking the piss out of Doris Day
in Calamity Jane and playing up to the make-belief of the Indian Princess and the
Squaw (Rice & Taunton, 2009, p. 24). And Buffalo Boy, well I don’t know if he’s
trying to make the audience laugh or cry. Maybe both. Buffalo Boy is a riff off of
Buffalo Bill, that White fella who toured the Wild West shows in the late 1800s and
hired real authentic Indians, man he got so big that he performed all over Europe
too (Bell, 2007, p. 47; Sagala, 2010; Vuillard, 2014)! Buffalo Bill, now that fella did
quite a number, yes he did! Reviled and celebrated in one swoop, I got to think that
he directly contributed to creating some longstanding misrepresentational bullshit
about Indigenous folks up to this day (Martin, 1996).89 In Belle Sauvage and Buffalo

---

89William F. Cody, a.k.a. Buffalo Bill toured his Wild West Show from 1883 until his death in 1917. In that time, his act had become world famous, in part because he employed ‘real Indians’. Celebrated for his theatrical showmanship, Cody is nonetheless an ambivalent historical figure. Advertising himself as a historian, educator, and amateur anthropologist, it would seem that Cody’s intent was to encourage Native Americans travelling and working for the show to maintain their traditional practices, as well as to advocate for their employment at the Bureau of
Boy, we’re not just supposed to have idiot fun, dressing up like a Cowboy or Indian. I think they’re trying to get it through our thick skulls how dress-up and make-believe all of those wild west stories were and continue to be. Buffalo Boy, well he’s a trickster, using outrageous and over the top staging and play to subvert and topple grand narratives of how Whites won the west (Rice & Taunton, 2009, p 20; Stimson, 2005). And in the process, the topsy-turvy world gets remade again and again and again. Speakin’ of remaking...

Putting on that kimono, geisha gyrl has to reckon with her own colonial history, far, far, hell, worlds away from the fakin’ makin’ stories of the ol’ West. In trying to keep to the beat of Buffalo Boy’s momentum, geisha gyrl has her own bag of trickery and mayhem. You know, there’s a whole lot of misconceptions around geishas and Asias too, somewhat familiar to Indigenous folks, the whole exoticizing and objectifying parts of it all, actually. Do you know that geisha translates to “person of the arts”? Betchya didn’t though, instead, your head filled with images of motionless chinadolls or prostitutes in Japanese cultural drag. In fact, the term “geisha girl” was used by American G.I.s during and after World War II, because they couldn’t tell the flippin’ diff between classically trained artists, geisha, and the ones working as sex trade workers in kimonos (Foreman, 2005; Kovner, 2009)! But now, geisha gyrl, well like I said before, she came to be in performative shadow of Buffalo Boy. Yah, yah, with all of that dressin’ up and dressin’ down, and making everyone’s heads and hearts spin, sweatin’ all over the place, Buffalo Boy stirred and stirred and stirred up a lot of molecules—room air molecules, emotion heart molecules, skin ones and cultural too, human and non-human were same same. Mini

Indian Affairs. However, the Wild West Shows contributed to creating binaristic divisions between White Americans and Indigenous people, presenting the former as ‘progressive and civilized’ and the latter as ‘savage and primitive.’ The shows also portrayed Indigenous people as ‘authentic,’ spectacular objects. For more details of Cody’s life as well as controversies arising from the Wild West shows, please see: Jonathan D. Martin’s (1996) essay, “The Grandest and Most Cosmopolitan Object Teacher”: Buffalo Bill’s Wild West and the Politics of American Identity”; Sandra Sagala’s (2010) book, Buffalo Bill on Stage; Eric Vuillard’s (2014) performative essay, “The earth’s sorrow: A history of Buffalo Bill Cody.” For further discussion on Cody’s interactions with the Bureau of Indian Affairs on behalf of Native employment for his travelling show, please see Rosemary Bank’s (2011) essay, “Show Indians”/Showing Indians: Buffalo Bill’s Wild West, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and American Anthropology.”
tornadoes busting swirls from all quarters of the room all because of Belle Sauvage and Buffalo Boy making too much fun! Ha! And wouldn’t you know it, the right sprinklings of 孝行 collided with a hefty dose of 糞たれ to make a mad spinning collision with 生活の美学. From the chaotic fusion of those three ‘parts,’ if you will, strange gymnastic allsorts, suddenly PoP!, out rolled geisha gyrl, still invisible to the naked eye, mind you, but already lurking as Buffalo Boy’s performative shadow.

5.1.1 幕間 (makuai): Interlude I

Euro-colonial narratives of Cowboys and Indians resonate with romanticized stories of East meets West. In the Canadian context, it could be argued that English and French were used as colonial tools to establish unequal power relations between those who could speak and write one of the two official languages with ease and those who struggled to communicate beyond their mother tongues. Has this much changed? Meanwhile, Buffalo Boy materializes from the coldest of times to show anyone in the surrounds that grand tales of colonization are neither fixed temporally, nor linguistically, nor perspectively. Through an intensive series of performances, Buffalo Boy animates the archive and queers colonial religious orders. According to art historian and decolonial scholar, Lynne Bell (2014), the inaugural performance of Buffalo Boy actually takes place on the grounds of the University of Saskatchewan in 2005, at the time of province’s centennial year (p. 7). In Buffalo Boy’s Heart On: Buffalo Boy’s 100 Years of Wearing his Heart on his Sleeve, Adrian creates happenings that move in four different directions, in thinking performatively through the teachings of the medicine wheel (Stimson, 2005, p. 8). For three consecutive days, happenings in what Adrian describes as “folds” are made as a means to present the heterogeneity of Indigenous knowledge ecologies, and to question the institutionalization and archiving of knowledge through Euro-colonial frames of reference in academic, museological, and touristic spaces (Stimson, 2005, pp. 6-9). In one of the happenings, Bison in a Bowl: This is Indian Land, a Siksika tipi, in fact, Adrian’s family’s painted tipi, is erected in juxtaposition to one of the main college buildings of the university (Stimson, 2005, p. 8). Projected on the walls of the college building are the words, “This is Indian Land” (Simson, 2005, p. 8). For Adrian, the tipi stands up and in contrast to European practices of settler memories that negate Indigenous knowledges. Adrian explains that in the Blackfoot tradition, tipis are made to protect and heal the family, a family that extends beyond human relations into states of human-buffalo interbeing (Stimson, 2005, p. 8). Indeed, Buffalo Boy is born in reverential
regard of the bison that used to roam the vast prairies, millions in numbers, prior to their near erasure by White traders in the creep toward a Eurocentric modern nation-state of affairs.

In queering the folds of European colonization, Buffalo Boy creates a kinetic, performative contrast between the fluidities of two-spirited and the categorical denial of shifting sexualities in Christian demands for heterosexual mores in its nascent Canadian citizenry. According to Adrian, the term “Two Spirit people” describes alternative representations of gender and sexuality in Indigenous communities across North America (Stimson, 2006, p. 69). As Adrian explains, “Two Spirit people” is a relatively new term that arose in 1994 as a means to think of gender and sexuality intermixed into Native senses of spirituality, and to create an alternative language to the term “berdache,” which had been used by English-speakers to talk about differences in Indigenous sexuality (Stimson, 2006, pp. 69-70). Buffalo Boy’s overt queerness is a gay denouncement of the ever-narrowing sexual allowances made by Christian missions in their attempts to physically and spiritually convert those labeled as heathens (Rice & Taunton, 2009, p. 21). In Mission Impossible: Buffalo Boy’s Wild West Peep Show, Adrian reconstructs the interior of the first Anglican mission church, which was built on Blackfoot territory in the 1880s (Stimson, 2005, p. 42). Projected onto the altar is a video montage of other Buffalo Boy happenings interspersed with images, video clips, and photographs of recorded colonial history (Stimson, 2005, p. 42). Here, Adrian suggests that the installation stage is not so different from Christian histrionics in converting the masses (Stimson, 2005, p. 42). And it performatively shadows Buffalo Bill’s Wild West shows through acts of subversive play (Bell, 2007, p. 47).

Buffalo Boy’s appearance changes from performance to performance. Sometimes he wears his head in two long braids, capped with a disco-ball cowboy hat, lipstick painted into a larger than life grin, legs covered in fishnet stockings, with the hint of a buffalo tail hiding beneath his suede-tassled vest (Putting the Wild Back Into the West) (Garneau, 2014a). Sometimes he fashions a corset made of buffalo tufts, and below a giant, furry buffalo sheathed penis flops happily in his swagger as he walks proudly in his cowboy boots, buffalo-caped - an Indigenous flaneur - down busy downtown streets (Buffalo Boy’s Why Not?) (Bell, 2014, p. 28). And sometimes, he wears a link of pearls, mixes up the suede with the buffalo vest, toying with the presentations of his Buffalo boy/girlness (Buffalo Boy Getting it from 4 Directions – poster) (Garneau, 2014a). Within the Buffalo Boy persona, there is so much movement,
undressing, redressing, and change, that it would be impossible to ascertain a definitive state of affairs. One of the common threads that course through the shape-shifting sensibilities of Buffalo Boy is that they are dealing with such serious matters with a gleaming, often uproarious humor of a cosmic trickster.

Without question, Buffalo Boy is regarded as a trickster (Bell, 2007, 2014; Garneau, 2014a, 2014b; Goto, 2014; Nanibush, 2014; Rice & Taunton, 2009). But what is a trickster? Just like with Buffalo Boy, it is not possible to establish a singular definition, and any attempts to conglomerate, homogenize, and to pass tricksters off as one true meaning, well, to be frank, that would performatively contradict the trickery of being in excess of categorization. However, it would seem that a trickster persona, character, being exists from Indigenous nation-to-nation in some guise or other (Little Bear, 2000, p. 81). Perhaps similarly (but very loosely) to how the English translation, “filial piety or filial abidance” insufficiently expresses how孝行functions transnationally and transmutates across different Asian cultures, the trickster transforms in presentation, form, and play from community to community, and from storytelling to storytelling. Cree scholar and poet, Neal McLeod (2013) cautions against stripping away the sacred, non-human, other-being aspects involved in such cosmic play, which he argues often takes place in the English term and explanations of the “trickster” (p. 97). And as Anishinabe curator and activist, Wanda Nanibush (2014) points out, the word “trickster” does not exist in any Indigenous language traditionally, but it has been taken up by contemporary Indigenous scholars and artists in their efforts to politically critique Western ways of being institutionally and religiously (p. 54). In other words, tricksters in confrontation with Euro-colonialism are the spirits of re-constituting grand historical narratives from particular and peculiar points of view. Blackfoot scholar and knowledge keeper, Leroy Little Bear (2000), states that the trickster is about chaos, the “why” of creation, creating spaces for humans to consider the consequences of poor behavior (p. 81).

In Blackfoot Ways of Knowing, Siksika education scholar Betty Bastien (2009) talks about the tricksterish ways of Napi (p. 90). She explains that although the origins of Napi are unclear, it has been said that this being’s spiritual powers were gifted from Naatosi (sacred powers, the sun) so that Napi, which translates at times to “Old Man,” would be able to survive on Mother Earth (p. 89). Bastien explains that through listening to the many stories of Napi’s exploits, Siksikaisitsitapi (the Blackfoot people) are taught about the destructive aspects of humans such as greed, deceit, cowardice, egocentricity, and of the consequences these have in the world (p. 90). Napi stories teach about ways
in which humans can transform, emphasizing the important role of ceremonies in creating balance within oneself, between oneself and others, and within communities (Bastien, 2009, p. 90). I recall too Adrian telling me that Napi translates into “friend” (Goto, 2014, p. 79). Could it be that Buffalo Boy is a present-day Napi, accompanying others, like a gleeful Bodhisattva, to face up to destruction, mayhem, and the inhumanity of European colonization in Canada in the past, present, and future? In creating spectacles so sacrally profane, does Buffalo Boy make it impossible to look away?

Buffalo Boy creates geisha gyrl. Cosplay gone political, the relationship between the two is that of a ロールモデル and superfan. Depending upon the state of being, the ロールモデル itself becomes more specific, but ultimately, it describes a particular kind of witnessing relationship. The formation of geisha gyrl is an activated response to Buffalo Boy, a transformational translation of what was experienced, considered, and reconstituted. In Japanese storytelling, Napi resonates with 河童 (kappa), a demon imp that lives in rice paddies and waterholes, playing tricks and creating chaos in human endeavours. Part turtle, 河童, although quite diminutive, are much too frightening to be considered cute or harmless. But geisha gyrl is no 河童. She departs from Buffalo Boy and 河童 by being all too human, unable to bridge human-nonhuman relatedness... yet?

Created in the swirling of 孝行, 生活の美学, and 糞たれ, it would seem that geisha gyrl’s persona does not have the gender-bending, shape-shifting capacities, and cosmological gravitas of Buffalo Boy.

In her debut performance, Commemoration, in 2014 at Oppenheimer Park, Vancouver, geisha gyrl has every intention of skipping around in respectfully joyful homage to all of the communities that (have) pass(ed) through the public/private space. Mindful of the location and timing, she has many lovely assistants set up 88 red balloons around the perimeter of the park. Historically, Oppenheimer used to be at the heart of old Japantown prior to Japanese internment during World War II. And once a year, that history is reanimated when the park becomes hostess to the annual Japanese-Canadian cultural gathering, the Powell St. Festival. Throughout the rest of the year, Oppenheimer accommodates many Indigenous and non-Indigenous folks, many of whom are passing through, daily, monthly, annually. In the northeast corner of the park, a totem pole has been erected in honour of the Indigenous women who have been murdered or who have gone missing over the years. Adjacent to “Old Chinatown,” many Asian elderly people spend their mornings and afternoons sauntering through the park. And through the
seasons, big fat seagulls continuously swirl overhead, land upon the grasses only to swirl up again like a white funnel cloud. As with location and spirits that remain therein, timing is everything, or so geisha gyrl has learned from witnessing Buffalo Boy. She times the performance so that it falls within Chinese New Year (spring!), during the height of the Idle No More movement (winter 2014!), and the day after the annual March for the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women (February 14, heart), which completes its course in front of the commemorative totem pole. geisha gyrl enters into the performative space, jaywalking across Powell St., serenaded by Cheryl L’Hirondelle’s (2009b) song, “Kikinaw,” and comes to a standstill in the centre of the park. A new song begins, The Yoshida Brothers’ (2003) “Sprouting,” at which point geisha gyrl runs madly about, skipping along with scissors in one hand, and a speaker disguised as a purse in the other, as she releases the red balloons from their Chinese red envelope anchor, so that they float high high up into the near cloudless sky. Within each envelope is a copper-coloured washer and a note that reads 自立する on the one side, and its translation, “idle no more” on the other. As she runs around the park, geisha gyrl breaks out in tiny spurts of laughter from time to time, thinking back to her childhood days when teachers would tell her, “never run with scissors!” She smiles quietly when she hears the odd, “oh I get it now” from passersby, who have weeks and days previously, watched with confusion an Asian runner practicing in the park relentlessly, about 100 times probably!, the performance with neither music nor scissors, just the jerky movements of someone imagining that she is carrying something while cutting some other things that are invisible to everyone else. But for the most part, this performance is much more somber than she would have expected.

By performing Commemoration, geisha gyrl realizes that she does not understand how to be more playful or as lighthearted as her ロールモデル...yet? At the same time, she knows that the familial inheritance of being a 糞たれ enables her to don the kimono in the first place and to run around with scissors, for that matter. Too bad she is unable to frisky up the stereotypes of the geisha girls of misinformed American pop culture and old school anthropologists...Too serious, too shy and too timid, it will take more space, time, and witnessing the workings of Buffalo Boy. In order to become more flexible, geisha gyrl needs to move in further directions. Next up: Shaman Exterminator.

5.2 Part Two: Shaman Exterminator

[Voiceover, in the style of Lorne Greene, New Wilderness] In the sweltering
heat of high noon, Shaman Exterminator’s looming presence casts a long, dark shadow against the crackling, parched surface of the Black Rock Desert. This is the year 2007, 90 one of the first sightings of the Shaman Exterminator. Part man, mostly beast, It has evaded either photographic or physical capture up until now, perhaps until It has decided to make Itself known to the human species. With large buffalo horns that point dagger-like into the sky and tufts of fur so thick and tangled, one is unable to see the actual shape of its brooding torso. Nor are Its facial features visible to the human eye. While grander and more physically imposing than anything in its path, the Shaman Exterminator does not seem to strike fear and trembling in the human bystanders. Hunched low to the ground, It seems to be on Its last legs, moving at a snail-like pace, dragging Itself, arms bent as if to hook whatever It can of the near flattened yet abrasive skin of the open desert. Some humans come closer to inspect the Shaman Exterminator’s progress, and some dare encourage Its persistence to travel, yet none have expressed any interest in intervening even as they may be witness to Its final moments. The termination point unknown, It continues on Its journey, seconds, minutes, lifetimes passing, then nearly unconscious, the human form escapes the suffocating folds of Its buffalo exo-skeletal lining, crawling out from beneath the beastly carcass to reveal the ravages of heat, sun, and sand upon its nubile body. Is it a birth? A death? One cannot know for certain.

[Voiceover, in the style of David Attenborough, Planet Earth] In the heart of the Assiniboine Delta, along the Spirit Sands Trail, just due east of Brandon, Manitoba, an unusual sighting: Buffalo Boy in communion with the Shaman Exterminator. 91 Within a diverse ecological environment, this strip of desert is

---

90 In 2007, Buffalo Boy introduced the Shaman Exterminator persona in the performance, The Red Man, during the Burning Man Festival in Black Rock Desert, Nevada.

91 Between November 02 – December 08, 2012, the video, The Shaman Exterminator: On the Trail of the Woodcraft Indians with the Buffalo Boy Scouts of America, (Stimson, 2012 November) was installed at Paved Arts Centre in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. The installation was made from mixing videotaping and photography of Shaman Exterminator in Spirit Sands, Manitoba.
remarkably bereft of animal life: only the Bembix wasp and one type of wolf spider are known to reside in the unforgiving dunes. Many species of reptiles and mammals are temporary occupants, passing through the sandy beaches, which are surrounded by prairie grasses and boreal forest. This part of Canada was once known for free-roaming wild buffalo herds prior to European contact, but the numbers have long since dwindled to near extinction levels. Yet, in the restoration of the wood bison population, Buffalo Boy has been seen frolicking joyfully in the vast fields amongst his known next of kin. Up until this unexpected co-incidence of Buffalo Boy and the Shaman Exterminator, it has been unclear whether they are either one in the same being or genetically unrelated altogether. From the video footage obtained, however, it would now appear as though they are in some manner associated. This new discovery nonetheless begs the questions: Is Buffalo Boy more buffalo than hypothesized? Is the Shaman Exterminator more human than originally inferred? Only through genetic testing can we know to a degree of certainty the extent to which they are interrelated. Regardless, they are able to communicate with one another, and although the Shaman Exterminator remains stoically silent throughout, Buffalo Boy has developed some form of Buffalo “sign language” to convey the spirit of his newly located blood relation. The Shaman Exterminator enters into the frame, moving regally toward the stationary camera at the bottom of the boardwalk, as Buffalo Boy, who awaits casually at the foot of the wooden stairs, seems to relay the meaning of Shaman Exterminator’s perambulation. Buffalo linguists in the field have managed to assemble Buffalo Boy’s “sign language”:

ho sleepers arise
the suns in the skies
the summer missed flies
from the lake and the leigh

---


93 Video excerpt from The Shaman Exterminator: On the Trail of the Woodcraft Indians with the Buffalo Boy Scouts of America.
the red gods do call
ho high hikers all
come drink from the life cup that ye never will see
then blow ye winds high
or blow ye winds low
or blow ye wet east wind over the sea
we’ll face ye and fight
and laugh when you smite
for the storm was the trainer
that toughened the tree
yo ho arise arise arise
arise yo ho

At this time, the Buffalo linguists do not have valid and reliable instruments to decipher the meaning behind Buffalo Boy or Shaman Exterminator’s word play. They cannot yet determine whether Buffalo Boy actually comprehends the English language, which might provide some clues as to this strange amalgamation of words. Some of the Buffalo anthropologists have fashioned together buffalo hides in their attempts to replicate the movements of the Shaman Exterminator. However they are unable to translate their own gestures into any meaningful language. Please stay tuned for next week’s episode: International Waters of the Salmon Run.

5.2.1 幕間: Interlude II

Before being witness to Buffalo Boy’s alter ego, the Shaman Exterminator, it was difficult, no, impossible to understand the alchemical powers of both beings, and that which materializes as a result of their movements. In particular, the Shaman Exterminator expresses through silent gestures the immense weight of Euro-colonization on the buffalo herds and the Siksika people, who connected with them spiritually, culturally, and dietetically. Adrian has frequently spoken about the devastation of the buffalo and the profound effects it has had upon his community, stating:

I use the bison as a symbol that represents the destruction of the Aboriginal way of life, but it also represents survival and cultural regeneration. The bison is central to Blackfoot being. And the bison as both icon and food source. The whole history of its disappearance is very much a part of my contemporary life.
Adrian’s interest in the buffalo as a source of creative and political inspiration resonates with Indigenous-Métis filmmaker and scholar, Tasha Hubbard, whose works have been profoundly affected by her contemplation of buffalo-human relations (Hubbard, 2009). Similar to Adrian, Hubbard (2009) argues that the reemergence and continued presence of buffalo on the land attests to their and, in parallel, plains Indigenous people’s capacities for survivance and thrivance despite targeted colonial strategies to erase, displace, or domesticate both (p. 67). Hubbard discusses the symbiotic relationship between buffaloes and Indigenous peoples, and the extent to which the notion of survival is based upon an intricate relationship between animals and humans, which give rise to a mutual set of responsibilities (p. 68). How does this symbiotic relationship actually play out? I had the opportunity to listen to Hubbard present on her creative-intellectual process during the Cultures of Reconciliation: Academic, Artistic, Activist conference at the University of Saskatchewan in September 2013. In her presentation, Hubbard talked about visiting the buffalo on the prairies. She stated that as a filmmaker, she expected just to set up the camera and take some raw footage of the herd so that she could incorporate their images into her experimental documentary project, *Buffalo Calling* (Hubbard, 2013). But the buffalo refused to show up! Days passed into weeks when it dawned upon her that she needed to slow down her expectations and that a relationship between herself and the buffalo had to be established before they could possibly allow her to film them. At the time, I was mindful of Adrian, who was also presenting at the conference, sitting in on Hubbard’s talk, and how the way she spoke of honouring the buffalo’s pacing and movements provided a deeper insight into Adrian’s longstanding relationship to buffalo being.

The Shaman Exterminator’s presence, which is menacing, silent, and formidable, emanates the power surge required to survive and surpass the Euro-colonial machinery to erase buffalo-human interbeing. The buffalo hide and hood, which conceal the Shaman Exterminator’s features, look as though they weigh the body heavily down toward the ground; so expressed is the gravitas in embodying both the deaths and lives of buffalo passing through colonization. In many talks, Adrian has shown the infamous ca. 1870s photo of buffalo skulls piled high up into the sky.94 The skeletal remains were

---

94For an image and further background about the history of European buffalo hunting, please go to: http://rarehistoricalphotos.com/bison-skulls-pile-used-fertilizer-1870/ (Rare Historical Photos, 2014)
to be used in the refinement of sugar, bone china, and fertilizer (Rare Historical Photos, 2014). Having seen this image several times, the surface shock reaction did not resound until I put on the yellow きもの (kimono) for the very first time to transform into geisha gyrl. The きもの is one made by my Great Auntie, 千代子叔母さん (Chiyoko obasan), who in her lifetime had become a well-respected kimono-maker in Japan. 千代子叔母さん’s services were in much demand throughout the country. Geisha, actresses, and politicians’ wives would commission 千代子叔母さん to sew a きもの for them, each one taking between one to three months to hand-stitch the silk fabric, which had been imported from China. Because I do not have the practised skills to put on a きもの well, お母さん would travel with me to dress me up for the geisha gyrl performances. In the combination of wearing a beautiful work of art made by 千代子叔母さん and being dressed by お母さん for whom the きもの was intended, I experienced a great burden to abide by my maternal lineage well, to not embarrass them, or to make them regret allowing me to wear the きもの in the first place. In other words, 孝行 and 生活の美学 dictated how I should move while in the きもの, which served counter to being able to performatively shadow Buffalo Boy’s lightness-of-being. The burden to behave well was not confined to a sense of familial responsibility but did remain within a state of the inbetweenness of human states of affairs or 人間の間柄. This is not the case with Adrian’s artistic articulations of the symbiotic connections between humans and buffalo.

The Shaman Exterminator soundlessly addresses Euro-colonial operations to fragment Blackfoot-buffalo states of affairs. Colonialism in the making of Canada is systemized through religious and educational institutions until it becomes infiltrated in all types of governance of humans (Castellano, Archibald, & DeGagné, 2008; Milloy, 1999; TRCC, 2015b; Younging, Dewar, & DeGagné, 2009). Existing already beyond strictly human interrelationships, through his multidimensional art practice, Adrian contemplates the intergenerational effects of Indian Residential School in human-nonhuman relations (Stimson, 2005, 2012). In the installation, Sick and Tired (Stimson, 2006a), Adrian

---

95Sick and Tired (Stimson, 2006a) was to be displayed during the first national gathering of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Winnipeg, Manitoba in 2010. Upon scrutinizing its contents, however, the Commission decided to remove the installation from its art exhibition, expressing concerns that it was “too powerful” and that it would trigger those expected to attend the gathering. It is currently installed at the Mackenzie Art Gallery. Please see Adrian’s (2012) essay, “Suffer little children.”
explores identity, history, and their transcendence through the creative reconfiguration of found objects. *Sick and Tired* (Stimson, 2006a) consists of three windows and an old infirmary bed, all from the Old Sun Residential School, where his father, Adrian Sr., attended as a young child (Stimson, 2012). The windows are backlit and filled with feathers, bathing the adjacent mattressless bed frame in a golden glow (Stimson, 2012, p. 74). The bed is also lit from the top, casting a shadow in the shape of some type of mummified remains on the floor immediately below the structure. On the frame itself, the being responsible for the birth of the shadow is what can perhaps best be described as buffalo/human in nature. With no facial features or distinguishable limbs, this presence could be imagined as being in a state of repose, recovery, or demise. As Adrian explains:

> I believe that objects hold energy. The combination of elements – windows, feathers, light, shadow, bed and bison robe – forms objects and ideas that speak to history, culture, genocide, absence, presence and fragmentation. Together they form a space in which to contemplate our present being. In doing so, we can examine our selves and our relationship to the past, present and future.

*(Stimson, 2012, p. 75)*

*Sick and Tired* (Stimson, 2006a) expresses the eerie stillness in the wake of Euro-colonial educational strategies to assimilate Indigenous people into the state of Canada, and the economic avarice within the colonial complex that would nearly extinguish the wild buffalo. Whereas, the Shaman Exterminator moves with the oppressive weight of that history and presence concomitantly, through every buffalo fibre of its being. Its ongoing existence is a testament to the "survival and cultural regeneration" (Bell, 2007, p. 48) hybridities of buffalo-humaneness. The Shaman Exterminator *is* the transformation of all of the different elements - animate and inanimate objects - into the performative shadow of Buffalo Boy, exposing the urgency and the persistence behind the cosmic play. In the depths of darkness, one can come to appreciate the depths of light.

The disinterested study of the Shaman Exterminator channeled through specialized disciplines might be insufficient in challenging the integrative systems of colonization in Canada. In reducing the Shaman Exterminator to an object of study, or in separating the human from the animal for expert-based analysis, researchers may unintentionally prolong the fragmentation of cultures and communities that exist beyond the epistemological and methodological reaches of each discipline.
In performatively shadowing the worlding of the Shaman Exterminator, the experiential journey takes an unfathomable turn. In the performance, *geisha gyrl Drums a Painting Palette into English Bay*, land-human relations inform and give way to water-human 間柄. On a very cold mid-April day in 2013, geisha gyrl is spotted meandering toward English Bay in a summer kimono or 浴衣 (yukata). Unlike the formalities of a きもの, the 浴衣 is made from light cotton fabric and can be used for discretely washing oneself in public bath houses. Up until the moment that Ayumi transitions into geisha gyrl, Ayumi’s sister helps her to dress the part, all the while incessantly commenting, “you’re nutso…people are going to think you’re crazy!…why are you doing this?...it doesn't make any sense…it’s too cold out there…you are going to freeze your ass off…” But Ayumi moving into geisha gyrl loses comprehension of her sister’s chatter. geisha gyrl slowly walks the perimeter of the Pacific, past the seawall, facing eastward. She drums on Ashok’s mother’s painting palette, oil colours permanently stained onto the wooden surface. Slowly, all the while drumming, she steps into the ice-cold waters until she is ankle, calf, knee-deep. Her teeth begin to chatter uncontrollably, much like Ayumi’s sister’s nattering, yet she continues walking until her stomach, lungs, then shoulders are submerged in the frigid waters. Her mind begins to grasp, to play tricks, any way to stay calm, “we are over 50% water, right?...I am actually warm, the water is like a cozy bubble bath…should I lower my head all the way?...this is crazy…” She raises the palette above her head, still drumming, and feeling her thought processes slowing, slowing…slowing down. Her body shuddering from the ice cold, legs as flimsy as unset jello, she realizes that in order to remain upright, she must fall into the rhythm of the water now completely surrounding her. The waves do not merely pass along the surface but serpent-like, they swirl and entwine with her limbs as if in a slow dance. This is where geisha gyrl becomes water and water enfolds the jerky motions of human gait into its own. As the saltwater reaches just below her bottom lip, savoury to the tongue, she gradually begins to re-emerge, the human separating from her water body. She crawls up onto an outcropping of rocks, the 浴衣 clinging to her like the skin of a very aged woman, she kneels, drums the palette a few more times, then still facing eastward, bows. Ayumi’s sister greets her with armfuls of warm, dry towels, telling her that during the performance, a West Coast Salish woman had approached her to ask her what was going on. Listening to the intention, the woman tells Ayumi’s sister that in her culture, people, mostly men, would bathe in the waters as a cleansing ritual.
The intentionality of geisha gyrl is outstripped by the experience. She cannot learn about the cleansing ritual until she slowly moves through the water in a way counterintuitive to her habituated Ayumi states of affairs. She cannot imagine the sheer bulk of buffalo spirits weighing down upon the Shaman Exterminator until she feels the pull of the water as it absorbs her thoughts and movements. She will never know what others might have been thinking as they pass by, perhaps pause, or ignore the happening. There is also a newly discovered weight in facing eastwards, for across the water, on the far shores, rests another history of colonization.

5.3 Part Three: Miss Chief

Miss Chief, the most coquettish of the personae, rarely witnessed live, her image is captured in photos, sexy pin-up style! So かわいい! Clad in Buffalo Boy’s signature fishnets and cowboy boots, Miss Chief, oh so femmy, so very pretty, flirtatiously blows kisses to her many untold admirers (Goto, 2014, p. 78). Or so it can be assumed. Miss Chief, the prom queen of post-Canadian Indigenous being...what? Is there such a thing? Sometimes caught up in Anglo-religious drag, you’d think that you are witnessing an upstanding man of the cloth, but look a little closer, and those telltale stockings playfully peak through such mannish robes, delightful, haha (Goto, 2014, p. 78)!

Miss Chief comes from a striking lineage of prom queens. Her namesake, Miss Chief manifests in many personae herself: Mrs. Custer, Miss Tippy Canoe, Warrior Princess, Miss Squaw, and of course Miss Chief Share Eagle Testickle (Liss, 2005, p. 82). Yes, that Miss Chief, she began showing up in historical paintings of the old Canadian frontiers! So, that Miss Chief, maybe she was the first one in an unbroken cycle of real beauties. Here. And. There. And every year. To remind her admirers that boys and girls come in all shapes and sizes and recombinations, especially beyond Canadian Christian Fanfare (Bell, 2007; Scudeler, 2015; Stimson, 2006b)!

Gender and sexuality make for funny business, wouldn’t you say? They don’t

[96]Kent Monkman’s persona, Miss Chief first appeared in his 19th Century, documentary-styled paintings. Monkman explains his interest in the American painter and writer, George Catlin, who was one of the first to explore and represent “the Berdache and the Dandy” (Gonick, 2009). For further information on Monkman’s birthing of Miss Chief, please see the interview by Noam Gonick (2009), “Two spirit in Aboriginal culture: Noam Gonick interviews Kent Monkman and Adrian Stimson.”
necessarily run parallel or seamlessly together. They may even be at loggerheads
with each other. Just because you’re liberal-minded one way, you can’t assume that
you’re liberal all the live long day! That Miss Chief, Adrian Stimson’s coy alter ego,
now she makes you think of these things all mashed up, until you don’t know if up is
down and left is right. That the stars aren’t perfectly aligned in one’s wish to be
the most progressive. Progressive, now that’s a colonially loaded word if ever there
was one. Miss Chief draws the LGBTQ from the mainstreams of White western
sexuality, to be reckoned with in a most provocative conversation about, “what if you
would have just left us alone, man?!” (Gonick, 2009; Stimson, 2006b). The missionary
position isn’t just an expression. It came from somewhere, somehow, the “right way”
to do the nasty, between man and wife, all for procreating in the eyes of the Lord.
Oh my goodness gracious, sometimes it’s just more respectful to look away. But how
can you, when Miss Chief is so delicate, and precious, and mischievously captivating?
Who can turn the other butt-cheek? Idols become the new gods, or rather,
goddesses, and Miss Chief is my idol.

Do you know グラビアアイドル (gurabia aidoru/gravure idol) or グラドル (guradoru/gradol) for short? It’s a Japlish word in katakana. Now, no need to make a
fuss about the racist sounding terminology. In Romanized characters, it is spelled as
"gravure idol" and the coined "gradol," existing only in Japan even though some form
of this fandom subculture is practised every which way around the globe. But in this
instance, it may best be translated to the present-day version of a 50’s pinup girl in
Hollywood’s imagined ol’ Wild West. Thinking in terms of political cosplaying
superfans, Miss Chief is a kind of グラドル. Why this conjecture? Well, no one really
knows that much about her, they only think they know what they demand to know,
and like any crazy オタク (otaku) or superfan, they freak right out if the pinup
dares have an actual life. Or voice. Remember that グラドル, Minegishi Minami? The
one from that girlie group, AKB48? Her fans went beee-----zerk! when tabloid
photogs caught her sneaking out of her boyfriend’s apartment in the wee hours.97

97To watch an English perspective on the Minegishi, please see the video by LinkTV
(2013): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=–XjCEwZy5c. For a Japanese perspective, please see
Seriously, google it! She was so publicly shamed for letting down her fans that she went and shaved her head in a grand gesture of repentance. Crazy! Because she had sex! And a relationship!!

But maybe something different happens when you politicize cosplay. Now, now, perhaps it’s a bit unfair to say that cosplay is apolitical. From what I’ve heard, there is a territoriality to where cosplayers can play, as in so-and-so corner is a no-go zone for this and that cosplaying team. There are also rankings and hierarchies within each cosplaying group, depending on who joined when and whatnot. But here, I am using the term political beyond rule-abidance in cosplay world. A political グラドル like Miss Chief, she keeps you on your toes. Always sneaking here and there, most of the time, fans don’t even know she was there until they see her poking around in their selfies. Miss Chief makes you rethink all the crazy demands that are put on regular グラドル, and, oh my goddess, how the world of the グラドルオタク (guradoru otaku) is so utterly heterosexually oriented and gendered. Yes, she makes you ponder how followers from a world away, say, like political オタク heap all their unspoken expectations and fan demands onto Miss Chief and Buffalo Boy and the Shaman Exterminator, so that they end up corralled into being caricatures of themselves rather than getting on with what they were going to do in the first place. Now that’s all kinds of messed up. Wouldn’t you know it too, political cosplayer, geisha gyrl has to figure out her own gender and sexuality hang-ups, especially in trying to keep up with Miss Chief. Otherwise, she just keeps tripping over herself. That’s right, how can geisha gyrl keep pace with the ever shape-shifting Miss Chief when *that* きもの makes her so rigid and set in her ways? And, oh my lord, that 帯 (obi), pretty as it is, has her squeezed in so tight, it’s no wonder she’s not going to be able escape anywhere and anyhow. Or can she?

5.3.1 幕間: Interlude III

Miss Chief is perhaps the most enigmatic of Buffalo Boy’s personae. In fact, she is so inscrutable that it makes one wonder, which came first: Buffalo Boy or Miss Chief?...or any of the other personae, for that matter. It is through performatively shadowing Miss Chief that geisha gyrl and Ayumi begin to contemplate the relationship
between sexuality and gender relations, and how they might become scripted through European and non-European colonizations. Miss Chief and Adrian also demonstrate ways to transgress those scripts, consequently raising questions about the linguistic limitations of the English language that prevent it from catalyzing a more multidimensional, multicultural sexual revolution.

In the essay, “Two Spirited For You: The absence of “Two Spirit” People in Western Culture and Media,” Adrian recollects his childhood and coming to know the fluidities of gender through play. He talks about a childhood memory of dressing up as Adrienne, his twin sister (Stimson, 2006b, p. 74). Hidden away from school, Adrienne would come out to play with the other children after class and during holidays. As Adrian explains, Adrienne existed socially for two years until she disappeared “deep within” as her male counterpart witnessed very little presence of what would come to be known as Two-Spirit ways of being (Stimson, 2006b, p. 74). It has led Adrian to ask the questions: “why is it that there are few depictions of Two-Spirit people in popular media?” and “is it a continuation of the colonial practice of cultural erasure, specifically that of Two-Spirit people?” (Stimson, 2006b, p. 75). As was discussed earlier, the term Two-Spirit is quite new nomenclature, coined to describe sexuality-gender states of affairs that exist outside the parameters of Euro-Western, particularly English Judeo-Christian conceptualizations and classifications (Stimson, 2006b, p. 77). Carrier First Nation sex/gender writer and activist, Michelle Cameron (2005) provides a cultural, perhaps Indigenous transnational or transterritorial historical context to the term Two-Spirit. According to Cameron, many Aboriginal groups had Two-Spirit members, many of who occupied positions of honour and communal status (p. 124). Two-Spirit is not limited to the balance of male and female but speaks to a continuum of multiple genders (Cameron, 2005, p. 124). Cameron suggests that Two-Spiritedness emphasizes gender over sexual orientation and with the social roles affiliated therein (p. 24). As with Adrian, Cameron argues that Christianity has disrupted and marginalized Two-Spirit people within Indigenous communities (Stimson, 2006b). Cameron contends that proselytizing of sexual mores in Indian Residential Schools has led to generations of Elders who have come to see Two-Spirit people as sinful and sexual abusers (p. 124).

Cameron (2005) lays bare a very difficult issue with regard to respecting one’s Elders in the face of intergenerational disagreements about sexuality and gender expectations. They suggest that as opposed to white gay and lesbian activists who often experience alienation from a homophobic white society, Two-Spirit activists do not
eschew their Native heritages or communities (Cameron, 2005, p. 125). I am unable to comment on the veracity of Cameron’s assessment that those identifying as white LGBTQ necessarily reject their cultural communities. It is important to recognize the limitations of their discussion in creating a specific binary between a conglomerated white Western and broader Indigenous notions of gender and sexuality. However, in speaking about Elders, she draws in people like myself, who have grown up in cultures that are steeped in honouring one’s Elders and one’s roles in a family, community, and nation.

How does one respectfully disagree with an Elder? With their respective presences, Miss Chief and Buffalo Boy replace a tone of defiance and refutation with merriment and a sense of inclusive play. Through these personae, gestures are made toward those in proximity to join in, play along, through which participants are compelled to reconsider their starting points of view. Miss Chief and Buffalo Boy normalize the fluidities of gender and sexuality, and the ways in which lived experiences continuously exceed binaristic social pressures to be male v. female, straight v. gay. Miss Chief presents a state of being that does not judge others for their current identifications; rather, her manifestations of being Two-Spirit is an ever-present reminder that someone like her also exists well alongside and contemporaneously. To some, she is a deep memory of past Blackfoot lives prior to colonial gender and sex regulation, while to others, she is a possible future, creating spaces for people to explore relationships within themselves and amongst others. Rather than dictating how one must be, Miss Chief speculates how one could be, as well as how one has been.

As a performative shadow of Miss Chief, 付け回すほど, in many ways, geisha gyrl is flung far and away from Adrian Stimson (2006b) and Michelle Cameron’s (2005) respective articulations of Two-Spirit. In Japanese socializations, gender expectations are arguably deeply entwined with longstanding gestural and linguistic habituations enacted over several eras. Meanwhile, explorations of sexuality could be considered more relaxed. Perhaps at the root of this division is the twinned concept of 表-裏 (omote-ura) or public v. private face. In terms of gender, the 表 or the presentation, public affableness is built upon unspoken expectations to be collectively mindful, agreeable, polite, and enthusiastic in one’s capacity to help. And gender differentiations of 孝行 with regard to these qualities play out differently between women and men. I cannot speak to how boys are raised to be men, having grown up in an almost all-female (with only one
male) household. But, as the youngest of four daughters, I vividly remember daily instructions on how to be a good Japanese girl: if one must speak, speak quietly; otherwise, silently pay attention to everyone senior. Don’t complain or talk back. Be ready to assist enthusiastically. Don’t take the last piece of a delicious meal or seek permission from all before partaking. Older relations are to be served first. Don’t laugh with your mouth gaping wide open or with too much volume... Although instructed along this manner, my sisters and I certainly broke all of these rules on multiple occasions. Such rebellions could be explained, in part, to cultural clashes in being raised with Japanese values and stories within a Canadian socio-political context. I cannot speak for my sisters’ rationales, nor can I speak to the values that they either grudgingly or willingly adopted. Myself, as a very earnest and obedient child, I did not intentionally rebel. Instead, clumsiness, coupled with a grave fear of violence, led to unexpected moments of challenging authority. That, and the family inheritance of being a糞たれ would become manifested in the most unexpected ways. Otherwise, from earliest recollections, I fully embraced being an extremely feminine girl, doing my utmost to abide byお母さん in particular. I have often wondered how such an ultra-femme outlook can constrain the裏 of sexuality.

In many ways, theグラビアイドルMinegishi Minami incident exemplifies societal determinations of what it means to be an attractive woman in the so-called mainstream Japanese popular imaginary. The incident expresses the collision of gender and sexuality, in that the表 of sexuality, itself deeply threaded with the表 of gender, takes precedence over the裏 of sexual preferences and practices. Meditating on the complexity of Miss Chief’s Two-Spiritedness has led me to ask these questions in the first place. However, only in performatively shadowing her, do I begin to appreciate the extent to which I have come to embody a specifically womanly sense of孝行, and the limitations of such sensibilities in the capacity to abide well by Miss Chief. In attempting to performatively shadow, I am also presented with the possibilities of creatively transgressing these gender-based habituations.

The purpose of the performance, geisha gyrl: salmon run, is to explore the power of male, female, and living in the in-between. The in-between alludes not only to the many non-male, non-female states of gender, but also refers to human-nonhuman interbeing or間柄. Up until now, geisha gyrl has resided solely within the confines of being human. geisha gyrl: salmon run is a response to the cosmic playfulness of Buffalo
Boy and Miss Chief. In trying to break past the generation upon generation accumulation of gendered abidance, which she experiences every time she puts on the きもの, made by Ayumi’s Great-Auntie for お母さん, the much too serious geisha gyrl realizes that she must move beyond human-to-human relations. She must seek guidance both in the immediacy of place and the shaping of embodied experience. Thinking of the ways in which Buffalo Boy expresses buffalo-ness inasmuch as he is human, geisha gyrl, as one who is passing through Syilx territory, begins to pay attention to Syilx teachings that resonate specifically with her history. In traditional Syilx teachings, four food chiefs gathered to determine what to do with the incoming human presence (Cohen, 2001, p. 142). The chiefs were/are: Black Bear (Skmxist), Chief of land animals; Salmon (Ntityix), Chief of fish and water life; Saskatoon Berry (Siya), Chief of plants, vegetation, and birds; and Bitter Root (Speetlum), Chief of roots and bulbs (Beeler, 1996; Cohen, 2001, p. 142; Armstrong, Derickson, Maracle, & Young-Ing, 1994). Serving as the basis for ongoing governance and caretaking of the land, the four food chiefs express human reliance upon the land for survival, as well as their responsibilities to care for the benefit of future human and non-human generations (Beeler, 1996, p. 149; Cohen, 2001, pp. 142-3). According to Okanagan knowledge keeper and writer, Jeannette Armstrong, the four food chiefs are fundamental to everything, interwoven as a spirit force to all of those who reside (permanently) on Syilx territories (Beeler, 1996, p. 149).

How does an impermanent being, who happens to be passing through, connect to the land, if only for a short while? Of the four chiefs, salmon existence is the most personally meaningful for geisha gyrl. So powerful and sumptuous! geisha gyrl is drawn in by the grand scope of their travels, thousands of kilometers in their lifetime to circle back to natal waters (Cooke, Crossin, & Hinch, 2011; Hinch, Cooke, Healey, & Farrell, 2006; Ueda, 2014). Termed anadromous, many salmon exist in three cosmologies; they live in both fresh- and seawaters, and they leap into the air, against river flows, to find their way home (Hinch, Cooke, Healey, & Farrell, 2006, p. 241). Their physiological ability to transition from freshwater to saltwater as they migrate seaward, and then reverse this process upon their returns to rivers and lakes, have fascinated local storytellers, knowledge keepers, and evolutionary and marine biologists the world over (Cooke, Crossin, & Hinch, 2011, p. 1946). And importantly, both males and females are equally powerful, utilizing tremendous amounts of energy stored up during their feasting period in the oceans to swim against the currents and avoid hungry bears and eagles, all in order to ensure their collective survival.
One of the most compelling aspects of salmon life, and in many ways, of ongoing cultural and biological mystery, is the salmon’s capacity to return to its natal grounds, as well as the conditions that lead some salmon to venture into new river passageways (Quinn, 2005; Ueda, 2014; Veale & Russello, 2017). Theories abound. Hypothesized to find their spawning river beds based on a combination of olfactory imprinting, sight, and hormonal shifts, the salmon literally might be able to smell the difference between their own and other natal streams (Cooke, Crossin, & Hinch, 2011; Quinn, 2005; Ueda, 2014). The question remains: Do some salmon deliberately seek out new river bends or is this divergence imposed upon them due to external factors? In some cases, it has been found that human-made structures and commerce have significantly contributed to the straying, diversification, and endangerment of various salmon species (Cooke, Crossin, & Hinch, 2011; Samarasin, Shuter, & Rodd, 2017; Weaver, 1997; Welch et al., 2008). For example, 1,239 dams exist along the Columbia River, 29 of which are federally run hydroelectric facilities (Ward & Ward, 2004). In a span of 100 years, from the early 1900s to early 2000s, it is estimated that salmon runs in the Columbia River basin fell from 10-16 million fish annually to 2.5 million fish annually (Dauble, Hanrahan, Geist, & Parsley, 2003, p. 641). When one of the U.S.A.’s largest hydroelectric dams, the Grand Coulee Dam, came into operation in 1941, it effectively blocked upstream migration of Chinook salmon, which would otherwise have found their way into the Okanagan Lake systems (Booth, 1989, p. 196). Built without fish passage facilities, the Grand Coulee Dam obstructed 2,245km of “highly productive salmon habitat” in the Upper Columbia River (McConnahia, Williams, & Lichatowich, 2006, p. 10). Of all of the research conducted in assessing the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the installation and maintenance of these dams, few studies have focused on the cultural impacts, including second-generational ones due to resettlement, and upstream and downstream effects of the dams to nearby communities (Kirchherr, Pohlner, & Charles, 2016).

Inundated with numbers and statistics, it is difficult to grasp the salmon’s struggle to return to its spawning riverbeds, until Ayumi is/I am intensely drawn to visit the Grand Coulee Dam on behalf of geisha gyrl. When I first walk to the edge of the dam, I am so overwhelmed by its sheer size and depth, that I have trouble breathing and feel like throwing up. Standing at 167m tall and 1.2km in length at its crest, no matter how fast the salmon swim or how high they leap, there is no way in hell they could ever breach such a cataclysmic barrier (Wehr, 2004, p. 110). In that moment, my mind races back to the image of the million+ pile of buffalo skulls that Adrian has shown again and again.
And only then do I have even the tiniest inkling of the spiritual weight of the hides adorned by Buffalo Boy and the Shaman Exterminator. In visiting the Grand Coulee Dam, I learn too about the Ceremony of Tears which was held on June 16, 1940, attended by a gathering estimated between 1 000 and 10 000 people at Kettle Falls (Harrison, 2008; Justine, n.d.). Many of those present came from different tribes, including members of The Colville Reservation, Blackfoot Confederacy, Yakima Indian Reservation, Flathead Indian Reservation, and Coeur d’Alene Tribe (Harrison, 2008; Justine, n.d.). The ceremony was to acknowledge that the 10 000-year tradition of gathering and fishing at the headwaters of the Columbia River would come to a halt due to the installation of the dam. By 1942, Kettle Falls was completely submerged under Lake Roosevelt, which itself had formed as a result of the Grand Coulee Dam (Marchand et al., 2013, p. 60). The Arrow Lakes people were displaced permanently from the land, and traditional village sites and communities were submerged due to flooding (Marchand et al., 2013, p. 59). The early to mid-20th century has come to be known as the “big dam era,” a period of time in which man was driven by his desires to conquer, control, and profit from nature (Wehr, 2004). Now, as evidence has accumulated with regard to the negative ecological and cultural impacts of such large-scale projects, scientists and Indigenous communities have been working together for several decades in a concerted effort to reinstate the salmon runs (Marchand et al., 2013; Okanagan Nation Alliance, n.d.a; Pacific Salmon Foundation, 2016; Weaver, 1997; Wehr, 2004; Williams, 2006).

Still nascent in my knowledge, the more I learn about the salmon and follow alongside their traditional routes as well as their points of disruption, the more I fall in love with them. Only at this point do I begin to have a greater appreciation of the cosmological, ecological, and gender/sexuality-based imperatives that ground Adrian’s performative practice. In geisha gyrl: salmon run, geisha gyrl walks out of a fancy condominium while playing a prayer bowl as she saunters through downtown Kelowna to reach the waterfront docks on Okanagan Lake. The ringing bowl signifies a change in a state of affairs; human walking gives way to a salmon’s pace. She reaches the end of the wooden dock, which dramatically cleaves class: on the south-facing part is City Park, where many transient and homeless people sleep and set up temporary shelter throughout the year; on the north-facing part, rows of fancy and expensive yachts are docked just outside of the newly renovated, exclusive Yacht Club. As geisha gyrl wends her way down to the end of the dock, her movements shift from step-step to windy-swirly. She hands the prayer bowl to her friend, Métis artist Amy Malbeuf who inverts it to
geisha gyrl begins to dance as she reaches deep into her きもの sleeves, taking out Celebration apples one by one, which have been harvested in one of the local orchards. Identical to the colour of salmon eggs, the apples become the eggs that geisha gyrl lays at the head of the dock. She begins to work faster to lay the eight pounds of eggs that she has carried in her journey. When they are piled high, geisha gyrl begins to move erratically and away from the eggs. She bursts into strange bouts of laughter, exhausted from her labours, and acting as if intoxicated, she strip-teases her way out of the confines of the 帯, きもの, kicking away her 草履 (zōri), and twirling her geisha wig like a basketball. Hair disheveled, and laughter booming across the lake, once the human clothing is fully shed, it becomes more apparent that geisha gyrl is, in fact, a female salmon in the midst of transitioning into a male one. Skin painted orangy/pinky/purply with blue undertones, she/they/he stops in a manga-like stance at the foot of the dock in preparation for taking a swimming sprint to fertilize the eggs. He makes a mad dash across the 300m distance of the dock back to the egg pile. Swimming and hovering over the eggs for a while, his energy is finally depleted, and he dies just adjacent to his/her/their progeny.

geisha gyrl: salmon run is an homage to salmon survival. It celebrates the power of all genders, and how salmon can teach humans about moving beyond societal, political, and cultural expectations. As a salmon, geisha gyrl demonstrates to Ayumi a creative and playful means to contest the everyday gender enactments that have been habituated, perhaps over multiple reincarnations as a woman, to the point of becoming a burden. Ayumi is/I am certain that without also having inherited the 糞たれ trait from the 後藤 lineage, it would not have been possible to defy お母さん in such a public manner. As geisha gyrl strips off the きもの, I watch お母さん out of the corner of my eye, to witness her simultaneous expressions of bewilderment, poise, and levity as she carefully follows behind to collect the discarded garments. At the same time, I do my best to abide by お母さん’s efforts to enact and enhance beauty in the everyday, 生活の美学. The life and death times of the salmon resonate deeply with her teachings. A different kind of beauty emerges in their determination to swim upstream, whether towards home or otherwise. There are physiological changes in colour, size, surface texture, and muscle

---

98 Amy Malbeuf was also dressed as a salmon. Four other women were involved in this performance. Ruthann Lee, Anne-Marie Estrada, Tannis Monkman Nielsen, and Brittany Montcrieff became fresh/seawater and moved alongside the male salmon’s upstream run.
movements. Beauty then cannot be contained within the expectation of infinitely reproducing that which has been deemed beautiful prior, but the scope and meaning of aesthetic appreciation might shift in the articulation of abiding by something new.

geisha gyrl-salmon 間柄 is a performative shadow rather than a point-per-point imitation of Miss Chief, Buffalo Boy, and human-buffalo interbeing. Adrian, as Miss Chief, activates within me a need to explore gender beyond the confines of human ways of being. Such explorations lead geisha gyrl and Ayumi Goto far away from the source, to move closer in to the place they happen to be, and to circle back again, changed by the experiences and travels. Because of Miss Chief, Ayumi and geisha gyrl learn to engage with the Syilx territory in a different way, from the point of view of salmon. These lessons performatively shadow the cosmological significance of buffalo existence in Blackfoot territories, so that the alter egos of Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, and Miss Chief take on a more profound epistemic, political, and cultural significance. In this respect, コスプレ, or direct costume imitation, transforms into cosmic or コズプレ (coz-play), replacing the “s” with a “z,” within the 付け回せられた realms of geisha gyrl. Through her gender-bending play, Miss Chief sets a course of coming to know that interlinks specific land/animal-human relations, sexuality, gender, respecting one’s ancestors, and passing through, 孝行をしながら.

5.4 Part IV: Adrian Stimson

On September 21, 2012, Adrian performed White Shame at Grunt Gallery, as part of the Gallery’s group show, Ghostkeeper, an homage to the late Cree-Métis artist, Mr. Ahasiw Maskegon-Iskwew.99 Twenty years earlier, Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew - also known as Donald Ghostkeeper - had been invited by Grunt Gallery to do his performance, White Shame.100 Very similar in content and mood, at one point, both Adrian and Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew pierce their skin with seven needles to hang seven eagle feathers from their chests.

At the time of Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew’s performance, questions were raised as to whether his actions were sacrilegious to the Sun Dance ceremony (Crosby, n.d.).

99 I refer to Ahasiw Maskegon-Iskwew as “Mr.” as an act of honorific regard. I have also shifted the font to try to emulate the radical shift in tone, which also would lead to a creative response.

100 Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew’s (1992) performance, White Shame can be viewed at: http://ghostkeeper.gruntarchives.org/video.html#lightbox.
Following the potlatch ban in 1885, the Sun Dance was banned in 1895 in Canada’s efforts to colonize Indigenous people (Crosby, n.d.; Little Bear, 2004). It was illegal to perform this ritual until 1951, when the ban was lifted on Indigenous ceremonies and cultural celebrations (Hoefnagels, 2007; Shrubsole, 2011). Described as “the ceremony of ceremonies,” the Sun Dance takes place across many Indigenous communities across Turtle Island (Ashawasegai, 2012, p.18; Cajete, 2000). And because it is considered sacred, difficult decisions must be made internally regarding one’s right to be present, to witness, and to write/make recordings about it. Although at one point, Ashok and I had been invited by an Elder to a Sun Dance, at the time, we decided that it was not the right to attend. In that case, absence was meant to be an expression of respect. In realizing that I did not know enough about the ritual, I was concerned that I would only be able to understand it as a spectacle. Until I learned more about the community and the significance of the Sun Dance to that community, it did not feel right or good to attend.

By taking elements of the Sun Dance out of the community and historical context, Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew seemed to be expressing irreconcilable ideas all at once: the sacred acts of the Sun Dance, its and the banning of other Indigenous ceremonies, defiance in maintaining the tradition, the transgression of protocols in partial enactment of a ceremony (Crosby, n.d.), the erasure and survival of Indigenous presence, being Indigenous, being non-Indigenous. Through it all, Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew showed the audience how the body, his body, was multiply encoded and imbued with such wide-ranging meanings (Crosby, n.d.). Within this array, Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew took several risks in moving through the experience in the presence of others. He risked upsetting his and other Indigenous communities. He risked breaching the line between performance art and sacred ceremony (Pechawis, n.d.). And he took risks to articulate the unspoken and unspeakable through his body.

Adrian has faced similar self-critiques in his recreation of White Shame. He reflects on whether he too crossed the same line as Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew (Garneau & Stimson, 2014, p. 85). In going through the experience, Adrian maintains that there is a strong distinction to be made between performance and ceremony and that it is the responsibility of the artist to maintain this divide (Garneau & Stimson,
2014, p. 85). At the same time, regardless of the internal heart and intellectual labour required to become clear about one’s intentions, Adrian recognizes that ideas, moments, histories... exceed the best of the artist’s intentions in moving through and within the performance (Garneau & Stimson, 2014, p. 85).

In some ways, it can be argued that performances such as *White Shame* create sacred social spaces to encounter and contemplate the unspeakable, unspoken, and the untoward. In witnessing Adrian’s performance at Grunt Gallery in 2012 and the hushed presence of the audience, it became clear that Adrian reproduced *White Shame* in respectful regard to Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew. In doing so, he opened up a place of remembering the rich life and artistic practices of Mr. Maskegon-Iskwew, as well as the controversies that accompanied many of his performances. Because of Adrian’s performative shadowing, questions again could be raised about defining the sacred, about the limits of adhering to cultural ritual and protocol, and about the risks in challenging them even in their homage.

White Shame resonates with Adrian’s installation art projects regarding colonization and the devastation that ensued to Indigenous ways of being (Stimson, 2012). The art pieces are conversations, expressed through the act of creating, shaping, and putting together. They do not lecture or demand a particular reading or singular meaning. And Adrian’s performances, in particular, articulate that which many dare not or cannot speak with words. They offer ways of learning about the self and the self in relation to others in the space of reflective speculation.

### 5.4.1 幕間: Interlude IV

What happens when two different colonialisms encounter one another? What kinds of performative shadows are cast and in which directions do they travel? Adrian Sr., attended the Old Sun Residential School in Gleichen, Alberta in his childhood (Stimson, 2012, p. 69). As an adult, Adrian Sr. went on to work for William (Bill) Starr, who had been a teacher at the Old Sun Residential School. Together, they moved between several residential schools, where Adrian Sr. assisted in Starr’s administrative roles. It was not until 1993 that Starr was arrested and pled guilty for sexually assaulting ten young boys (Napier, 2000; Stimson, 2012). Adrian Jr. never found out how much his father knew about Starr’s sex crimes across the residential schools. It is in this state of not knowing that Adrian creatively contemplates the complexities and messiness of...
colonization at the most personal level through his paintings, installations, and performances.

In performatively shadowing Adrian’s process, I am confronted with my own familial history of Japanese Imperial colonization of Asia. It is a subject that has created ongoing controversies and political tensions within Japan and between Asian nation-states (Chang & Hasegawa, 2007; Fujitani, White, & Yoneyama, 2011; Futamura, 2006; Lawson & Tannaka, 2010). On the one hand, Japan has made multiple formal apologies for war crimes across Asia, while, on the other hand, within the country, history books have deliberately downplayed or erased many of the atrocities committed by Japanese military overseas (Fujitani, White, & Yoneyama, 2011, p. 23; Lawson & Tannaka, 2010).

When I was growing up, お婆ちゃん did not talk much about her life before arriving in Canada. In fact, she did not talk much at all. お母さん often described her mother as a very traditional, stoic, Japanese woman. Nonetheless, from time to time, especially in her later years, お婆ちゃん would mention Chinese friends, maids, servants, rickshaw drivers, and her time in China. Many of the stories were full of merriment, but sometimes お婆ちゃん remembered dangerous incidents, such as when their Japanese compound was burned to the ground, or when she had to stop a Chinese thief from stealing their food stores. It was not until I happened to read Iris Chang’s (1997) *The Rape of Nanking* in my mid-twenties, that I came to the shocking realization as to why お婆ちゃん and お爺さん were in China in the first place. Hired by the Japanese government, お爺さん worked as a contractor to build bridges and the railway system in Manchukuo (Japanese colonial name for Manchuria) and across China, respectively. They lived in China for eleven years before the Sino-Japanese war broke out. At this point, お婆ちゃん and お母さん, who was only five at the time, barely escaped with their lives, while お爺さん was conscripted to remain and fight. According to お母さん, like many returning soldiers, お爺さん never, ever talked about the war. Without knowing, deep down, I know: he was extremely afraid, he had to follow orders, and he did horrendous things perhaps to the very people who had once worked for him.

I am haunted by this family history and how it shapes the way I understand collective memory and responsibility, and what it means to be good. Through the snippets of stories here and there, much remains unspoken and unknown. For instance, I truly believe that お婆ちゃん never knew why she was in China. Rather, she abided by
お爺さん as the good wife. The term 孝行 improperly conveys お婆ちゃん’s dutiful abidance, because it relays junior to senior hierarchical familial relations rather than that between husband and wife. However, the sense of abidance in one state of relations informs others. As a woman, I am disturbed to think that 孝行, which might be considered a good cultural, familial, and social quality can be used to contribute toward disastrous, violent ends. In her book, Women Adrift: The Literature of Japan’s Imperial Body, modern Japanese literature scholar Horiguchi Noriko (2011) argues that women actively participated in Japanese Imperial expansion in Asia (p. viii). She suggests that, at times, aggressive allegiance to the nation-state existed in excess of, and in some instances, in paradoxical relation to the numerous representations of women as victims, or artists and activists resisting state-sanctioned nationalism, or nurturing, sacred mothers. According to Horiguchi, the idealizations of women both on the periphery of the war-machine and in maintaining the household to cultivate strong, fighting bodies were manifested in actual women who nurtured the empire through family-based expansion of the nation-state (pp. 20-23). In the years of receiving advice from お婆ちゃん about how I should attempt to emulate the behaviour and demeanor of the crown princess, I have come to believe that part of the reason that お婆ちゃん did not question her presence in China is that she abided by the Japanese Imperial system and family. She was one of the many women who actively supported Japanese imperialism.

If the social value of 孝行, a familial and cultural good, can become an instrument of a violent movement, what recourses exist to contest dutiful abidance and blind adherence? In my case, the family trait of being a 糞たれ opens up the possibility of defying societal norms and expectations. If used well, it can be an internal counterbalance to national identity formation wrought through 孝行 and 生活の美学. As with 孝行 and 生活の美学, however, a 糞たれ faces great difficulties in self-correcting. When shit hits the fan, it becomes messier still.

In reflecting over the years upon Japan’s mission to colonize Asia, I cannot help but wonder if, unlike the British and French colonization of Canada, the Japanese government was driven by a deeply seated sense of inferiority rather than superiority. There is an unspoken awareness that throughout centuries of exchange, cornerstones of national Japanese culture such as writing, poetry, art, food, technologies, and religions had been adopted from China, Korea, India, Ryuukuu Islands, and many other Asian countries. This uncomfortable awareness could have strongly motivated the newly
formed nation-state of modern Japan to assert its power over their culturo-political relations. And unlike colonization in Canada, which I believe continues to this day, Japan as a nation experienced the cataclysmic collapse of colonization, and the collision of perpetrator and victim into a new social unit in the dropping of the atomic bombs in Nagasaki and Hiroshima, as well as the devastated aftermath from the Bombing of Tokyo. In such a grand defeat, arguably a punishment that preceded proper, legal channels of international judgment, I wonder if Japanese people (myself included) were stunned into conceding the incomprehensibility of technological superiority demonstrated in the atomic bomb. Indeed, I have a strange relationship to nuclear energy, and when I examine Japanese cultural references, I can see how nuclear power has infiltrated the popular and creative realms. Godzilla and Butoh dance are both outcomes of nuclear-human relations in Japan. I cannot help but speculate too that the ongoing fascination with nuclear energy might potentially disrupt Japanese people (myself included) from contemplating our human-to-human responsibilities to build better relationships, both within and beyond the national borders of Japan. Does the nuclear-human relationship divert attention away from examining the sharp rise of domestic violence (particularly men toward women) following World War II? Does this create a national identity of victimhood that renders the imaginary unable to conceive of the individual and collective self as an aggressor with respect to other Asian countries?

In the performance, *Rinrigaku: Collected Responsibility*, which took place in mid-October 2016, all of the above questions course through my body as I run over a period of three days, approximately a total of 45km, with a living bamboo plant attached to my bodysuit and entwined into my hair. On the second day of the performance, I begin at the University of Toronto Scarborough campus and end at the Pickering Nuclear Generating Station. Running along the northwest periphery of Lake Ontario, the purpose of this segment of the performance is to contemplate that which we carry with us as we traverse different lands. What are the stories, histories, habits, values, responsibilities, and relationships that have accumulated within us, and how do they affect the manner in which we witness or fail to witness those we unexpectedly encounter? In performatively shadowing Adrian’s own creative and interpersonal investigations into colonization and Indigenous identity formations, I am moved to consider the moments that I might unintentionally pass through another in becoming too engrossed with my own storyline. Or the moments that I might over-affiliate over terms like colonization, when in fact they could signify very different histories and divergent experiences. How can I witness
Adrian with deep respect for his history, culture, struggles, and imaginary juxtaposed with my own states of affairs? Hopefully, as with Adrian’s performance, *White Shame, Rinrigaku: Collected Responsibility* is a step toward elongating through action and movement a space to contemplate without closing-down judgment those things we dare not or cannot speak.

**5.5 パフォーマンスノート: Performance Notes**

In this chapter, I hope to have demonstrated performatively shadowing Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, Miss Chief, and Adrian Stimson as they encourage geisha gyrl and Ayumi Goto in four directions. These directions do not point toward geographical locations. Instead, they are performative in nature: Buffalo Boy’s senses and uses of humour draw people in to reflect upon his point of view and experiences as a Two-spirit person who has survived and responded to colonization; Shaman Exterminator’s ominous presence opens up the human-nonhuman realms of colonization; Miss Chief leads one to investigate the fluidities and attendant responsibilities related to gender and sexual relations; and Adrian dares to delve into the heart, to address the unspeakable and unspoken. These four directions are not mutually exclusive; rather they present different starting points that offer multiple points of entering into a conversation about colonization, Blackfoot and Indigenous ways of knowing, Elder respect, and enacting the sacred. Each direction has its own rhythm and cadence, creating performative shadows that move in response, if not seamless agreement, to its state of affairs. Such disagreements between the directions and shadows are not the result of argumentative cogitations but arise in coming to know about the self in relation to others, in living through the performatives of witnessing. In revisiting the conundrum presented at the beginning of the chapter, in retrospect, perhaps it is not a well-formulated concern after all. Witnessing is an on-going movement, perpetual shifts in proximity, timing, and pacing in relation to another. Witnessing can transform relationships, bringing to consciousness the fluidities of our respective existences and consequently our capacities to change with and for one another.
Chapter Six: Creating tactile shadows with Peter Morin: You, I, We

Peter Morin is my best friend. This said, I cannot know for certain that I am his, and believe that in fact, he has many best friends. Perhaps I do too. No matter. Specifically then, Peter is my new best friend. From my experiences of making and breaking best friendships over the years, I am coming to understand that they involve constantly balancing the give and take of emotions, experiential tumult, familial and cultural histories and responsibilities, futures both spoken and unspoken. Taking turns to speak, listen, respond, request, move far away only to circle back around, sometimes approaching closer in than before. In reaching towards this state of intimacy, like lovers, new (and old) best friendships are fragile, vulnerable to epic meltdowns, and gross misunderstandings regarding one’s expectations, levels of knowledge of one another, and breaching ever-fluid boundaries. And sometimes, like a thunderstorm, the initial intensity of the engagement gives way to a tapering mist that quietly fades away. Inversely, best friendships can emerge from seemingly irreconcilable circumstances. Foresworn enemies can shift perspectivally thereby reconstituting their former enmity into the best of friendships. I say this not merely as idle speculation but from actual experience. As a cowering child, I could never have imagined that お父さん would go on to become my best friend in the last ten years of his life.

In supposing that one knows a person very well, it could further be assumed or hoped that the deepest, darkest secrets will be divulged from such friendships. No. Wishing to respect the delicate strength of my friendship with Peter, I will do my best to direct attention towards certain interrelational precipitates that have arisen from our performative collaborations. The Japanese term for collaboration of this nature is 合作 (gassaku), a noun which means “to build something together.” Thus, 合作するほど this best friendship is a manifestation or outcome of our attempts to create cultural bridges between Tahltan and Japanese cosmologies. Reciprocally, the friendship shapes the risks and decisions that we make within a formalized performance. The basic premise of this 合作 is: what can we, Peter and Ayumi, do that would enable our mothers and our ancestors – past, present, and future – to meet? These ancestors are not limited to genetic or ethnocultural lineages but include the worlds that we distinctly have inhabited and continue to move within.

In this chapter, I wish to contemplate a creatively driven best friendship with
Peter Morin. Throughout, I will discuss how Peter and I tactiley shadow one another. In light of the previous chapters, having sonorously shadowed Cheryl L’Hirondelle and performatively shadowed Adrian Stimson, tactiley shadowing with Peter is presented as a difference in kind. With Cheryl and Adrian, witnessing is unidirectional: in both 先輩/後輩 and ロールモデル relationships, their respective practices function as calls to which my shadowing serves as responses. Whereas with Peter, I am cognizant of being witnessed even as I regard his work/life and relationships. In order to convey the fluidity and mutuality of Peter and my tactiley shadowing of one another, I will present this chapter pronominally in three parts: You/あなた, 私/自分, and 我々/We. In a similar vein to the previous chapter, although much less dramatically, each section will articulate a positional shift. In Section 1, I will describe being witness to Peter; in Section 2, I will present ways in which I am witnessed by him; and in Section 3, I will discuss performances where we have attempted to respond collectively/act in relation to others.

6.1 Toward the shaping of new language and cultural flows

Before embarking on describing what it means to create tactile shadows with Peter, I wish to provide some preliminary thoughts on the use of pronouns in the Japanese language. In keeping with the discussion of honorific-based communication and the accompanying issues of politeness, which were introduced in Chapter Three, contemplation of the multivalent translations of pronoun usage might offer some insights into Peter’s and my respective practices and the work that we do together. This topic is no small matter, traversing the field of linguistics - applied and computational linguistics, sociolinguistics, and psycholinguistics - in debates that centre upon teachability, translational and interactional issues, differentiation from word and semantic orders in other languages, and notions of the self in relation to others (Fujii, 2012; Hasegawa & Hirose, 2005; Hirose, 2014; Iwasaki & Yap, 2015; Kimura, 2015; Lee & Yonezawa, 2008; Okamoto, 2011). In spoken conversation, pronouns are often omitted or inferred with respect to the context and action (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008; Sato & Bergen, 2013). Described by linguists as a “pro-drop” language, Japanese often drops the subject or other information if they can be inferred from the context (Sato & Bergen, 2013, p. 363). In other words, the (speaking) subject and the addressee are omitted within clearly defined subject parameters (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008; Sato & Bergen, 2013). When pronouns are used, the word choice depends upon the relationship between the interlocutors, the gender of the speakers, and the social context (Iwasaki & Yap, 2015; Lee & Yonezawa, 2008; Roth & Harama, 2000, p. 766-767). For instance, in referring to
oneself as “I”, the speaker chooses between: watakushi (formal, female and male usage), watashi (formal, female and male), boku (informal, plain speech, male), watashi (informal, female), ore (vulgar/colloquial, male), atashi (colloquial, female), and jibun (private/affective self, male and female) (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 753; Hirose, 2014). This list is not exhaustive, however, and pronouns that have fallen from contemporary circulation can be applied in special circumstances (Fujii, 2012). Interestingly, pronouns have been known to switch, given the linguistic period of usage. For example, the term “ware”, which had been used as a pronominal form to signify the first person during Early Old Japanese (Nara Period, 700-790), shifted to be used to designate the second person in Modern Japanese (Edo Period, approx.1600-1850) (Fujii, 2012, p. 659). Today, “ware” is used as both first- and second-person pronouns.

In registering the complexity of pronoun usage, or their absence, in the Japanese language, it has been amply argued that such diversity reflects a conceptualization of the self that is fundamentally unstable and constantly shifting in Japanese culture and ontology. A great deal of research has been focused on contrasting Japanese collectivism with “Western”, and specifically American, individualism (Imada, 2012; Lie, 2001; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Nakane, 1970, 1974; Ogihara, 2017; Triandis, 2001; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, & Lucca, 1988). Over the years, this binary has been strongly contested, particularly in the fields of comparative cultural and social psychology (Befu, 1980; Ogihara, 2017; Takahashi, Ohara, Antonucci, & Hirayama, 2002; Takano & Osaka, 1999). While I do not have the space to present these debates to the degree to which they warrant attention, I wish to reflect upon the possible political and ethical implications of developing a national identity premised upon what I call “contrastive cultural knowledge formation.”

I have coined the term “contrastive cultural knowledge formation” to describe the phenomenon of formulating the collective cultural self, which has been built in contrast to or in rejection of the identified cultural other. Just as critics of the collectivism v. individualism binary argue, such distinctions on a grand scale lead to the gross homogenization of complex and multiply experienced lives within both designations (Hamamura, 2012; Takahashi, Ohara, Antonucci, & Hirayama, 2002; Takano & Osaka, 1999; Takano & Sogon, 2008). At the same time, it would be shortsighted to deny that many Japanese scholars, Japanologists, and citizens themselves are under the working assumption that this collectivist state of affairs contributes to a sense of national identity (Imada, 2012; Nakane, 1970, 1974; Triandis, 2001). An interesting turn in these
perennial debates is to consider the social and larger international political contexts in which such binaries come to shape one’s senses of belonging and acting within these selected ideological groupings. Indeed, noted social anthropologist, Nakane Chie argues that her early research on Japanese society in the 1970s was driven by her desire to correct what she considered to be inaccurate depictions of Japanese people (Hendry, 1989, p. 645). At the same time, she wished to divert attention away from Japanese v. Western comparisons and to draw people’s interests toward Japanese vis-à-vis other Asian cultures, such as India and Tibet (Hendry, 1989). Nakane’s investigations would lead scholars to label her a Japanologist, a title that she resolutely rejects. However, her research would pave the way for political scientists and anthropologists to further decentralize the West as a contrastive other, and to contemplate how and why the collectivist-individualist binary had become established in the first place.

It would seem that the period immediately following World War II has deeply influenced the reputation of a collectively oriented self-identity of Japanese people, which persists to this day. Korean-born sociologist and political economist, John Lie (2011) investigates why the monograph The Chrysanthemum and the Sword (Benedict, 1946) garnered popularity and longevity in Japan. Written in 1946, the author, Ruth Benedict, could neither speak Japanese nor had she ever visited Japan (Lie, 2001, p. 249). Regardless, the book would go on to sell 1.4 million copies in Japan alone, and came to be venerated by leading anthropologists as one of the most important books about the country (Lie, 2001, p. 249). Lie argues that post-war Japan was in an intensive period of infrastructural and intellectual reconstruction grounded upon “following” the clear victors, the United States (p. 256). Within this pursuit of national betterment, Lie suggests that there were no political tools to identify and discuss the obvious differences that existed between Japanese and American societies (p. 256). According to Japanese cultural and social anthropologist, Watanabe Yasushi (2000), the sense of a uniquely Japanese collective self not only emerged following defeat in WWII but also had been cultivated prior to the war in relation to China. Recall in the previous chapter, where I speculate that Japanese colonization was a result of an inferiority rather than a superiority complex, with regard to its Asian neighbours. Similarly, Watanabe argues that the collectivization of Japan into a national identity arose in response to a longstanding sense of cultural inferiority, which had become entrenched over centuries of contact and exchange with China (p. 22). He asserts that this inferiority was not dispersed; rather, it was transferred to Japan’s relationship with the West, namely American culture and
politics after the Second World War (p. 22). In describing the different stages of the Japan v. West (American) relationship, Watanabe suggests that a national sense of collectivism became inculcated both in popular and intellectual discourses.

Two major themes arise from the above discussion. First, as much as specialized academic studies may have propagated a sense of a unique Japanese collective identity, so too has this national character been shaped by relationships in the general populace (Lie; 2001; Watanabe, 2000). In keeping with what political critic and historian, Minami Hiroshi has branded as “intellectual fast food consumerism” (Watanabe, 2000, p. 23), social anthropologist, Watanabe Yasushi argues that books such as The Chrysanthemum and the Sword (Benedict, 1946) contributed to creating a collective social psyche that could withstand external and international critiques of nation-level moral bankruptcy. The popular imaginary is existentially significant because it moves through different organizational realms: the structuring of business relations and familial relationships. In our own household, I recollect the 後藤 family functioning as a collective “I,” together its membership carrying the responsibility of ensuring the success of the mushroom farm. According to modernist Japanese moral theorist, Tosaka Jun, subjectivity is relationally constructed (Shimizu, 2015, p. 12). He theorizes that everyday lives and activities serve as mirrors to reflect the nation-state on itself (Shimizu, 2015, p. 11). That is, the morality of a people is shaped bi-directionally; everyday actions not only confirm or deny intellectual postulations and governmental creeds, but they also direct and contribute to the contents and approaches of systemic analyses.

Second, self-conceptualization of a collective identity seems to shift over time. Those who have not discarded the collectivist v. individualist differentiation of Eastern v. Western cultures have incorporated time as a determinant in the individualizing of Japanese society (Hamamura, 2012; Ogihara, 2017). Both Hamamura (2012) and Ogihara (2017) argue that increasing individualism is an outcome of the modernization effect, economic growth, and, consequently, urbanization of the population (Hamamura, 2012, p. 5; Ogihara, 2017, p. 4). However, they also find that traditional, familial values persist alongside evidence of an increasing sense of individualism. Their respective research foregrounds ongoing considerations in the definition of terms. Are there different and culturally distinct characterizations of individualism and collectivism? Do instances of individualism in Japanese society necessarily indicate reproduction of American individualism and vice versa?

The current discussion about Japanese collectivism is a persistent concern for
several reasons. First, in comparing groupings of people at the nation-state level of analysis, sameness and homogeneous representations sweep over persistent evidence of contestation and difference (Shimizu, 2015). This sameness is atemporal: it has been long assumed that collectivism defines Asian cultures regardless of political era or geographical location. Acknowledgments of relational shifts over time are nonetheless discussed within the framework of the individual-collective binary in nation-to-nation comparisons. Second, in equating nation with culture, especially in contrast to other nations, ironically one’s sense of belonging becomes filtered through the definitive geopolitical centre of cultural formation: the nation-state. Those who live in the country are deemed more authentic than those who were born outside of, or have lived away from, the “motherland”. Thus, tacit social pressures abound to adhere to values and ways of being considered to be cultural features of a group of peoples in a specific environment. Third, phenomenologically, the collectivist assumption is uptaken as an unchanging cultural characteristic. In centralizing collectivism as a social value, it is further reified in the interpretation of one’s actions through that lens. I have often understood my own actions as contributing to a collective, which has been established both by direction and demonstration throughout my upbringing. I recall Japanese folk stories and fables that admonish individualism as selfish and promote one’s role in supporting the larger whole. Thus, the internalized persistence of “Japan as a collectively oriented society” is propagated and further concretized through teachings as well as self-comprehension of my actions with respect to others.

These three points together foreground an issue that has perplexed me throughout my studies. In the possible conflation of national identity and cultural belonging, how have cultural values been amassed, fixed, and determined in contrast to other nationally gathered communities? Recall in Chapter Three part of the discussion focused on the binary of Indigenous v. Western (European) knowledges. In the current context, I wish to point out that such a contrastive approach to cultural and epistemological development is not unique to Indigenous versus non-Indigenous communities. Rather, they sustain the recentralization of an ever-fluid West and Western knowledge. In formulating a sense of a nationalized cultural self that has been built upon what one is not, namely Western values and culture, “the West” serves as an extra-national starting point, at times encapsulated as a specific nation (e.g. United Kingdom, United States), to be revisited again and again from several different angles. I wish to argue that consequently, a nationally framed cultural identity formation develops an
intimacy with the grouping/nation with which it is contrasted. Intimate knowledge of the self, systematized in reaction to the contrasted other, becomes an oppositional mirror of the other, deeply entwined because of ongoing disagreements. Yet, it cannot be assumed that defined manifestations of a nationally grounded cultural self-identity, which has been built through contrastive intimate knowledge, will coincide with other cultures that have been formulated against the designated other. Just because a sense of collectivist mentality has been established in contrast to 'Western' values, it does not follow that all of the communities that have nurtured a collectivist sense of self against Western individualism will necessarily be in agreement with one another. Collectivism, as understood within a Japanese context, might be quite distinct in (self)regulation and social engagement from other nations that identify as collectively oriented. Thus, conflicts can arise from assuming sameness in contrast to Western values, in the realization that contestation of the one does not lead to a seamless agreement with the "versus-West" other. Moreover, the ongoing practice of contrastively constituting a collective self, sometimes expressed as cultural, national, and nationally cultural, might become a persistent intellectual habit: the collective self is based upon what it is not in relation to the other. The habituation of distinguishing oneself from others can profoundly influence the way we engage with new and unexpected others. That is, it might lead to subconsciously or intentionally seeking out ways in which one is different from the conglomerated incomprehensible other, discouraging further engagement. The default of leaning back into a well-established, known other, the imagined "West", might effectively keep other communities at arms-length from each other, preventing those communities from coming into each other's sight- and lifelines.

Concerns about the continuous centralizing of the "West" as a point of cultural reference have inspired cultural and sociolinguistic scholars such as Ide Sachiko to embark on analyzing languages that are historically emplaced within their cultural contexts (Hanks, Ide, & Katagiri, 2009; Ide, 1992, 2011; Ide & Ueno, 2011). According to Hanks, Ide, and Katagiri (2009), emancipatory pragmatics is the study of language, which emphasizes the social relationship of the interactants, instead of the "idealized native speaker" who has been contrasted from the homogenized, linguistic, Western other. In the pursuit to describe the complexity of polite, honorific speech, わきまえ (wakimae) in everyday Japanese usage, Ide and Ueno (2011) propose the concept of 場 (ba), a semantic space where the speech event takes place (p. 459). わきまえ is a noun that describes the social norms that are to be adhered in order to live appropriately in a
given society (Ide, 1992). In the Japanese language context, わきまえ refers to speaking in compliance with socially expected norms (Ide, 1992, p. 299). Yet, in her investigations, Ide expresses having experienced increasing frustration with “dichotomous, scientific thinking,” a methodology which could not adequately account for interactants switching from honorific to non-honorific forms in the course of a conversation (Ide, 2011).

According to Ide (2011), 场, which loosely translates into “field,” offers a different kind of analytical approach from the scientific, reductionist way of thinking about language usage (p. 462). In 场, dual functions are at work: the local state of being where one acts as an individual and the whole domain in which one functions as part of a coherent whole (Ide, 2011, p. 462). 场 prioritizes the field, which includes participants and the environment equally, rather than distinguishing self and other as basic elements in a conversational interaction (Saft, 2014, p. 116). That is, individual human bodies or minds are not given primacy but are described as beings merged in a relationship with the surrounds (Saft, 2014, p. 116). The success of the outcome depends upon the integration of the participants involved (p. 117). As a semantic space, 场 is intersubjectively rather than objectively defined, affected by the actions and interactions of the participants (Fujii, 2012, p. 657). With 场, relationality is ontologically prior to and forms the nature of the engagement.

So far, the epistemological force of 场 has been evaluated in its capacity to explicate honorific-based everyday language use (Fujii, 2012; Ide, 2011; Ide & Ueno, 2011; Saft, 2014). Interestingly, Ide’s (2011) introduction of 场 is presented as an Eastern approach, independent of Western methodologies, to expound upon language usage in one’s own traditional cultures (p. 4). In her analyses, the identifiably non-honorific English language and the honorifically oriented Japanese language remain mutually exclusive practices. Ide does not consider hybrid linguistic spaces, which are not evacuated of the English language but present in fluid co-existence with Japanese. As discussed in Chapter 2, consideration of honorifics in the Japanese language continues to greatly influence my English language usage and the semantics of idea formation. For example, the elusive use of personal pronouns and the compulsion to describe a state of affairs instead of centralizing the acting subject continuously manifest in my speech and writing styles. At this point, I wish to suggest that the performative transfer of linguistic habits from one language to another carries with it philosophical and cultural underpinnings – longstanding relationships – that potentially create new fields of
interactions. I propose that even in the translation from one type of language to another, ways of thinking and organizing the world sometimes and somehow pass through. It is perhaps in this inbetweenness or 間柄 that Peter and I come to know one another concurrently within and outside of linguistic colonial discourse.

Despite Ide’s (2011) binaristic articulation of Eastern v. Western languages, I am nonetheless compelled by the concept of 場, because it aids in expressing the ongoing formation of a best friendship with Peter. As Ide explains, her conceptualization of 場 is drawn from the research of biophysicist, Shimizu Hiroshi, who has been seeking a way to describe the “complex system of life in its living space” (Ide & Ueno, 2011, p. 461). Shimizu himself explains the logic of 場, using the model of an improvised drama in order to understand the self-organization of cells into differentiated function and organ development (Ide & Ueno, p. 462). In thinking through the relational dynamics and field created between the actors, audience, stage, theatre, and a rough scenario in an impromptu production, Shimizu determines that the complexity and ever-shifting nature of 場 cannot be reduced into smaller analyzable units. Rather, it must be apprehended and perceived as a whole (Ide & Ueno, p. 461).

The idea that all aspects, human and non-human, are equally present in relational, spatial existence speaks meaningfully to Peter’s performance works. 場 is applied in an effort to reach culturally towards Peter’s practice so that I might learn from his way of being and doing. I will refer to 場 in our current discussions regarding the multilayered and shifting use of pronouns in the creative (re)constitution of the specific field of best friendship. Of particular interest in this chapter is the shifting state of witnessing and relations between Peter and myself in the development of our collaborations and best friendship-ness. Can 場 support a non-nationally framed sense of cultural belonging and making anew? 合作するほど新し世界を出来上がるかしら? So much revealed in the practice.

6.2 あなた/You

indigenous art
remembers
You might say that the artwork documents changes in the community
Indigenous people recognize change  embrace it
Perhaps if you didn’t embrace change and you were a traveller on the land
someone in your family might die this might be why elders started saying educate yourself in the ways of the white man because they were trying to keep us from dying The artmaking reflects this organized transformation porcupine quills turn into beads turn into buttons turn into blankets turn into silver a flow like the water on the land

(Peter Morin, “Ravens Flying Upside and Other Stories”, 2012, p. 92)

あなた (anata) is used in both formal and intimate conversational settings. In honorific Japanese speech, second person pronouns are not customarily used when the speaker is inferior to the addressee (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 754). In fact, direct use of あなた in speaking to a superior can be considered a deliberate expression of disrespect (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 754). But how is one to be referred to in the indeterminations of who is superior to whom? In this section, I wish to show relational shifts from the formal to familiar, demonstrated through the subjectivities of tactilely witnessing Peter.

6.2.1 Textual Introductions

あなた can be used by way of introduction, designating the speaker as politely acknowledging a new acquaintanceship. I first met Peter Morin through the circulation of written words. In early 2012, Ashok suggested that I approach Peter to contribute to Reconcile this!, a special issue of West Coast Line. Serving as co-editor alongside my friend, Jonathan Dewar, we contacted several Indigenous and non-Indigenous artists to write about their thoughts on reconciliation. Peter’s poetical turn, “Ravens Flying Upside and Other Stories” made a lasting impression (Morin, 2012). The words move everywhere, in multiple directions, scattering temporal beats and rules of narration away from a human point of view. It is as though several stories are presented as a murmuration, a voluminous display of birds in flight, seemingly directionally unpredictable yet deliberate and full of grace. Very personal accounts of his mother attending Day School swirl into Dada’s interconnection to Tahltan language and then swiftly move into the dream spaces of what artists are politically obligated to do (Morin, 2012, 89-91). Colonization is the wind that constantly surrounds, a mainstay in much of
Peter’s practice and writings.

Editing is a collaborative act, which potentially leads to developing trust. The labour of working together in distinct roles to best present the writer’s intention produces a cyclical flow of reading, contemplation, and response. When a writer writes, the creative energy that goes into transforming thought/history/life into words cannot be underestimated. Nor can one disregard the highly subjective nature of this creative process. The editor’s tone and intent can greatly hinder or facilitate the writer’s offering. In those instances that the writer and editor’s interplay of composition and revision align, the words that pass in between taking on a conversational manner. Comments in the margins are manifestations of a witnessing stance, the tactile shadow in relation to the proffered text; someone is taking notice and compelled to respond. The private thinking self becomes the shared written self with respect to the reader, and through revisions, the text takes the shape of a new life form, which becomes central to the 场 of these relations. In editing with Peter, the formalities and intimacies of あなた are one and the same. At this point, because there is nothing other than the text, I maintain a formally distanced regard; meanwhile, his writing/our respective editing means that I might have developed insights to his practice that are intimated but not explained in the resulting publication. The words that he has written are important, worthy of multiple readings.

In poring over his writing in the course of five cycles of editing, the nature of Peter’s performative practice slowly begins to dawn on me. “Ravens Flying Upside and Other Stories” (Morin, 2012) is a gathering act. The ideas are already forms of living that have been collected in order to be activated in multiple and diverse engagements: names alongside names, stories in proximity to other stories for the first time, apparently incongruous voices presented on the same page. Until I take part in a live, Peter-in-person performance, however, I cannot appreciate that this piece of writing is a poetical translation of that which is presented in direct human-to-human interbeing. Instead, at the end of this text-based engagement, I mistakenly assume that he is at least 60 years old, has short black hair, and is rather diminutive in weight and height. Oops.

6.2.2 this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land

Although Peter would insist otherwise, I continue to believe that the first time he invites me to collaborate is premised on a mistake. On March 08, 2013, Peter was in attendance at the opening of Drawuary: Not a Day Goes By, a group show curated by
As one of the invited artists, Peter had made 28 drawings of crows by way of contributing to the show. Among the attendees were a number of newly formed acquaintances from an Indigenous/racialized artist residency, which had been held at Algoma University in Sault Ste. Marie, just six months prior. At the residency, Peter had collaborated with Bo Yeung, a Chinese-Canadian visual artist, in a series of performances, and they had worked intensively together in the days leading up to those performances. Although I too had participated in the residency, I had not interacted very much at all with Peter. I was so shocked by my grossly inaccurate preconceptions of him that I thought it would be most prudent to witness from a distance. In that time, I learned that he was neither short nor spindly, had grey-white hair, and was 35 (not 60!) years old. Face-to-face with Peter, あなた reverted to a purely formal address. Having attended the residency more or less as Ashok’s +1, and not identifying as an artist at all, I felt like an interloper amongst such experienced artists and thinkers.

Fast forward to the gallery opening in March, Bo and Peter were engaged in some type of conversation, when I bounded up to them from behind, asking, “What are you talking about over here?” In my eagerness to hang out with Bo, a good friend of mine, too late did I realize that perhaps I was interrupting a private discussion. Politely, Peter turned to me to explain that he was approaching artists to make videos for his upcoming show in Montreal, during the Truth and Reconciliation National Gathering at the end of April. And then, just as politely, he asked if I too would consider making a video for him. I was so embarrassed because by then, geisha gyrl: Commemoration was the only performance I had ever attempted. I realized rather quickly that he was making this request so I would not be left out of the conversation. Simultaneously, and habituated through 孝行 to enthusiastically affirm my readiness to assist, I felt obligated to accept his invitation. Blushing red, I agreed to make a video, but flustered by my own obnoxious behaviour, I failed to listen to the details of Peter’s performance. Something about reconciliation. Something about making a drum in exchange for the artists’ contributions. Something else about mailing the work to him.

In the days that followed, somewhere along the way, I had mashed all of the details together to convince myself that Peter had indicated he would send the drum as a way of confirming my commitment to his request. Days of waiting for the drum to arrive...
in the mail turned into weeks, and the national gathering date was swiftly approaching. This is the thing about invitations: when the context is foreign, and the person who has extended the invitation is a stranger, and the invitee is acutely aware of functioning beyond their scope of knowledge or experience, it is very difficult to determine how best to respond to the call. Following a very stressful, panicked period of not knowing what to do, and pretty certain that Peter was not actually expecting a video after all, I thought to myself, “Screw it! Quit being a chicken shit, Ayu! I can’t go back on my word to this guy. Who cares if I don’t get a drum!” Furthermore, recalling the theme of the artist residency at Algoma University, which encouraged building collaborations between Indigenous artists and artists of colour, I leapt into the unknown, pulling together, geisha gyrl drums a painting palette into English Bay (Goto & Mathur, 2013), and mailing it off to him just in time for his performance.

Ashok and I attended the TRCC National Gathering in Montreal, which was held at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel between April 24 and 27, 2013. Peter’s performance, this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land was split between two days, April 27 and 28. The day before the first performance, I offered Peter my assistance to run errands, buy last minute supplies, etc., to which he replied by asking if I would help out during the performance itself. With that damned 孝行 reflex kicking in, I hesitated only slightly before agreeing, not knowing that I would be part of the actions and movements.

On the day of the performance, Peter sits down with me to explain his intentions. Altogether, six videos have been collected and are to be played during the performance. Peter states that the videos are to be streamed consecutively and that he would be watching them for the first time along with the audience. Several pieces are laid out in an orderly fashion on the impromptu stage: curled up moccasins that had been used in a performance at the Royal Ontario Museum in 2007; a wooden culture gun, carved by Tsartlip First Nation artist, Barry Sam; 11 rattles made by Anishnaabe artist, Laura Hynds; a mask covered with hair, made by Kwakwaka’wakw artist, Rande Cook; three button blankets that Peter had made, two of which are covered with braids made of synthetic human hair; rattles created by children in foster care; a book on Indian art with the images cut out; and two drums.

102 Video and sound contributions were made by: Gordy Bear, Brianna Dick, Robin Brass, France Trepanier, Doug Jarvis, and Ayumi Goto.
Peter had constructed both drums using two kinds of hides, deer and elk, which had been sewn together to represent the mixing of races. The idea having come to him in a dream, Peter had created one of the drums with Bo during the Algoma residency. It is important to note that the main campus building at Algoma University is the former Shingwauk Indian Residential School. In following through with what he had dreamt during the residency, Peter had been compelled to build the first drum in the school, as a recuperative act. According to Peter, after residential school, the children would need to pick up the pieces and put them back together, so that they could sing again (P. Morin, personal communication, April 27, 2013).

Peter asks me what I could bring to the performance. For some inexplicable reason, I have packed in my luggage the 浴衣, 帯, and 草履 that I had worn for the geisha gyrl video. These items are placed in a pile between two of the blankets, and similar to the editorial comments in the margins of his writing, effectively serve as witnessing material presence in relation to the other gathered objects. Listening to Peter describe his wish to call into the room ancestors, the spirits of all of the children who had gone to residential school - the ones who never returned home and the ones who were able to - I become concerned about protecting ourselves spiritually. I suggest emulating Noh masks with make-up. In my youth, I had been told that Noh masks were guardians; they would absorb the energy of bad spirits, and if used properly, would shield the conscientious performer. In my childhood home, a Noh mask, which adorned the basement wall, was there to suck in evil energies and malevolent spirits, which otherwise would have wreaked havoc on the family. This mask scared the bejesus out of me, so much so that I would hide my eyes and tip-toe run by as quickly as possible whenever I had to pass by it. Based on this knowledge, I was convinced that the make-up applied masks would shield us during this performance. Applying the make-up is an unexpectedly intimate act. I find myself cradling Peter’s face between the palms of my hands, a person whom I barely know in such close proximity. In the time that it takes to powder the mask onto his skin, the seeds of a performance are planted in my mind, but I am too shy to suggest it to Peter in the present moment.103

In working with Peter, this is what I continually come to know: Peter collaborates

103 The performance, First Contacts?, which was presented at the Liu Institute, University of British Columbia, during the Performing Utopias conference (March 13-15, 2004), was borne of the Montreal performance.
with ancestors. He melds ritual and ceremony with performance art. Unlike Adrian, who makes a clear delineation between the two, Peter moves into the space of ancestors, bringing to focus the 場 in which they operate, reside, and walk alongside physical, human presence. If they exist in another dimension in the same space, then Peter’s task is to map them onto each other, to create avenues to facilitate communication between the two, three, multiple realms. For the performance in Montreal, he invites me to interact with the collected objects, and at the time, I do not understand the weight of the lives of these items. I also do not comprehend the gravitas of the intentions behind the performance. I only know that I have been asked to assist and that I will do so wholeheartedly, enthusiastically.

In the performance, Peter invites eight distinguished scholars, thinkers, and artists to sit in a row in front of the rest of the audience. In his introductions, Peter presents these individuals as important guests. What he does not say is that they are responsible for serving as witnesses, and for unwittingly being witnessed in this work themselves. Peter briefly introduces the piece; I realize long after that such prolegomena are part of his practice. Otherwise, it is often unclear why and how one might begin to engage with Peter’s actions. We work for over two hours, where there is singing, moving around the blankets, sometimes being cloaked in them, wearing of masks and firing of imaginary cultural bullets, where we play out Peter’s spiritual investigations of the memory of stolen land. This land colonized into the nation-state of Canada is the place where Indigenous peoples have been forcibly gathered and contained, where they have been coerced to reside within the body habits of White people, and where many have died or suffered as a result of not fitting in. During the performance, Peter sings into one of the drums, which he often describes as a portal or communication device to reach the ancestors. Do they come through?

According to the Tahltan Band Council’s (2014) document, Welcome Home: A Tahltan Celebration of Former Residential School Students and Their Families, when a sacred fire is lit, and the people have gathered around, “…there is no question that they (the ancestors) are here. They have been helping us the whole time” (p. 30). Peter’s welcoming of Indigenous ancestors, former residential school survivors, into the boundaries of an honouring space in Montreal simultaneously esteems Tahltan cultural

---

104 For further knowledge on the intentions and symbolisms behind Peter’s gestures and movement, please read his 2016 essay, which accompanies the performance, this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land.
practices. These ceremonies include singing and feasting alongside ancestors who have come to visit and witness, followed by bading a proper farewell until the next gathering (Tahltan Band Council, 2014, pp. 30-31). In the Montreal performances, the invisible fire is lit and fed by the pages that Peter rips out of a modern anthropological art book. The streaming videos serve as spiritual nourishment, designating survival and strength through vital acts of remembering with respect to those who have passed through. In those moments I begin to wonder if Peter himself becomes one passageway that supports the safe migrations of multiply-lineaged ancestors. Perhaps in order for the ancestors to help living humans, they themselves oblige human assistance. In the intermingling of performance and ceremony, I experience flashes of realizations that we are living ancestors and that our ancestors live within us.

Within the performance, I am a different kind of witness, a tactile shadow, doing my best to abide by Peter's intentions. The invitation to participate is a request for the one being addressed to move closer in. And, as in most cases of being an unexpected bystander, I scramble to draw on my own history and knowledge to best respond to Peter's entreaty, knowing at the same time that nothing can fully prepare me to participate in this new way. My heart/mind, 心 (kokoro), directs me to emulate his actions, reassured that the differences in our bodies and presence will shift the meaning of the movements. In this performance, the 合作 is led by Peter's objectives, which are to be carried over into the next day's collaboration with Skawennati Fragnito, a Mohawk-Italian multi-media artist. New to performance, and cognizant of Peter's plans to activate the objects that he has gathered, I rely heavily on my practiced sense of 孝行 to pay close attention to shifts in Peter's footsteps, voice, mood, and full-bodied gestures. 孝行, then, is one of the immaterial objects that I bring into the performance; it is a manifestation of multiple cycles of being that interweaves into my ancestors and pulls them into the room. Through this work, and after having sat in on the sharing circles at the Montreal TRCC gathering, for the first time, I begin having a visceral, embodied sense of witnessing the spiritual cost of the residential school system on Indigenous families, communities, individuals, Peter. Even if unseen or left unspoken, this spiritual weight is palpable, a skin that covers all of us who are present in the performance space.

While assisting Peter with this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land, I am suddenly acutely aware of knowing so little about him, about Tahltan knowledge and cosmology, his familial relations, his ancestors. I do not know until much
later that he is from the Crow Clan and that traditionally, Tahltn culture is of matriarchal lineage. I also do not know that his father is French-Canadian. Only when I stand in very close, physical proximity to Peter, do I come to know the extent to which I do not know who he is, what he does. The distinctiveness of our subjectivities is pronounced. In supporting Peter’s performance as a withness, a tactile shadow, this nascent friendship sustains the formal, honorific usage of あなた to address him. From our collaboration, the intricate considerations that go into Peter’s performances become evident, if not comprehensible. Peter, who has been engaged in performance practice since 2005, and who has studied visual and performance arts formally at the undergraduate and graduate levels, respectively, has seniority over me relating to all things art. I consider myself an apprentice in relation to Peter, whom I witness as having developed substantial mastery of his craft. And as gleaned from the Montreal collaboration, I rely on 孝行 to learn more about Peter and that which compels him to move creatively, worlding as he goes.

And yes! About half a year following this initial face-to-face performance, Peter gives me a drum. Stencilled into the hide in all caps, “SURVIVING.”

6.2.3 Peter Morin’s Museology

Peter’s gathering acts are intricately pedigreed. He acknowledges the Western-oriented training he has received in printmaking at Emily Carr University of Art and Design (ECUAD) and Master’s degree in interdisciplinary arts at the University of British Columbia – Okanagan (Morin, 2014, p. 68). By “Western,” Peter alludes doubly to the British colonization of Canada and European valuations and histories of art-making (Morin, 2011; Morin & Duffek, 2011). But the boundaries between Western and Indigenous art are not so clearly delineated. During his undergraduate studies, he falls under the tutelage and guidance of Shirley Bear, the First Nations Education Advisor at ECUAD (Bear, 2011). Shirley’s presence at the school has a profound impact in shaping Peter’s artistic practice. At the same time that Shirley directs him to explore and confront Western learning from within the institution itself, he recognizes through his movements and in the sinews of Tahltn cultural practices and storytelling, that in another way, he non-verbally speaks the Tahltn language. In his Master’s thesis, Circle, Peter discusses

---

105Peter’s first performance took place at the New Forms Festival at the Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia. Details of the performance can be found in Peter’s (2014) essay, “My life as a museum, or, performing Indigenous epistemologies.”
at length experiencing the intimate uneasiness of speaking English, the colonizer’s
tongue, while growing up within Tahlten epistemologies (Morin, 2011, p. 15). Through his
art practice, these two aspects are not kept separate but brought together again and
again in new formations, perhaps as multiple experiments in recalibrating colonial
relationships. In Circle, Peter challenges himself to conceive of ways of making a river
into a circle (Morin, 2011). Stirred and steered by Tahlten territory, and specifically, the
confluence of the Tahlten and Stikine Rivers in that territory, Peter’s imaginings manifest
into performative acts of transforming water into stone, and, concurrently, repositioning
the stones to change the directionality of river flows (Morin, 2011). For Peter, the stones
are ancestors: great-grandparents and great-grandchildren who transmit pasts and
futures into a present sense of being interconnected (Morin, 2011). These actions could
be understood metaphorically; they reference the shape-shifting nature of Tahlten-
English colonial relations. But they also speak literally to the multi-directional fluidities of
translations that leach through politically and linguistically sanctioned parameters of
social engagement. Furthermore, they demonstrate that in as much as the land carries a
person, reciprocally, humans carry the land, reformatting the 風土 or the socio-physical
climate as they pass through a space.

In Peter Morin’s Museum, a series of installations and performances, which were
held at Satellite Gallery in Vancouver between April 20 and July 03, 2011, Peter
addresses and makes art move in resistance to the glass-encased confinements of
Tahlten knowledge and life, stored within the Museum of Anthropology at the University
of British Columbia (Morin & Duffek, 2011, p. 10). Peter Morin’s Museum references
Payómkawichum-Ipi performance artist, James Luna, who in 1987, lay on naked display
within a glass exhibition case at the San Diego Museum of Man (Morin & Duffek, 2011,
p. 10). As with Luna, whose act and presence directly contests the artifactualizing and
forcible historizing of Indigenous objects and bodies, Peter challenges the unspoken
expectations of a galleried space. Unlike the stillness of Luna’s presence enforced by
the claustrophobic parameters of the case, however, Peter’s objections create the
means for different flow and movement through the gallery rooms. In effect, he brings his

**106** For a more in-depth discussion of Luna’s performance, The Artifact Piece, please see
Rebecca Gebhard’s (n.d.) online curatorial essay, “The Art of James Luna – Three
Performances,” available at: https://imagesincontactzone.wordpress.com/about/repositioning-
native-bodies/rebecca/. Luna performed several iterations of this performance between 1987 and
1990 in different locations.
Tahltan upbringing into the gallery: a house-shaped tent is suspended from the ceiling, the fabric, melton cloth often used in making button blankets; underneath the melton tent, several English tea services are set up on drum shaped melton trays, which look to have been parcelled out of a button blanket; family photos adorn the walls and Peter’s mother, Mrs. Janelle Morin is present to give a curatorial talk about them; a kitchen table and chairs become a gathering space for visitors. These gathered beings, like other living presences, shift over interaction and time. A previously blank blackboard starts to stream with Tahltan epistemology, chalky words that stream through Peter performatively writing out his personal history in relation to the land, his community, his family. And over the weeks, paper fish, bright red salmon begin to flow along the perimeter of the now memory saturated blackboard (Morin & Duffek, 2011, p. 13).

As Peter states, the blanket house is a place of transformation, and Satellite Gallery itself becomes a space for visitors to stand inside of Tahltan culture (Morin & Duffek, 2011, p. 12). In contrast to Mr. Luna’s (Gehbhard, n.d.) and Adrian’s (Stimson, 2005) respective contestations of colonization, Peter’s performances do not culminate in a denunciation of a synchronized notion of (European) colonization of the Americas, which parcels out the colonized away from the colonizer. Instead, Peter demonstrates through object placement, the gallery space as being multiply spirited in the intermingling of European and Tahltan knowledges. It could be argued that he presents a new sense of 場, a space that defies permanence and separation. This 場 is a living object-based articulation of multilayered linguistic translations: in bringing the Tahltan home into the gallery, the English language used to describe these acts is retooled to translate Tahltan into English rather than to serve solely as a continuation of colonial control over meaning-making. The convolutions of act and speech translations echo the apprehension of word-order and pronoun drops in the translation of actions from Japanese into English language contexts. This intermingling is also reminiscent of the meeting up of the Tahltan and Stikine Rivers on Tahltan territory: different passageways that run together for some time, another vocalization of how the rivers speak (Morin, 2011).

Through the continuous vicissitudes of his practice, presented as a mutating installation, Peter proposes several beginnings that concomitantly mark several endings. Similar to Adrian’s practice, Peter offers many points of entry, as well as exemplifying just as many means of engagement. However, whereas Adrian creates such opportunities through splitting and transforming his person(ae), Peter does so by
showing how the fluctuating environment leads to epistemological shifts between human-to-human and human-to-nonhuman relations. In *Peter Morin’s Museum*, profoundly, Peter’s mother has room to speak. With images and her very presence in the room, an intimate foreignness is established. Mrs. Morin’s presence prioritizes the relational inheritances and passages of artistic production. The family photos tell stories, the teacups tell stories, the blackboard tells stories. Love tells stories. According to Hawaiian scholar, Manulani Aluli Meyer (2001), someone whom Peter draws upon politically and epistemically, “[k]nowledge as a ‘sequence of immortality’ summarizes this sense of spiritual continuity, as does the notion that we, by ourselves, cannot bring about the kinds of knowing that endure” (p. 128). In *Peter Morin’s Museum*, Mrs. Morin is part of a “sequence of immortality,” withstanding colonial erasures while standing with her son. By relationally grounding knowledge, expectations of what and how the gallery is meant to house become questionable, and the gallery itself is sometimes a stranger or guest in this new state of impermanence. Through Peter’s activities to gather and to offer ancient knowledges anew, those present(ed) are living forces that contest the dispirited collation and archiving of historicized cultural objects. For Peter, the museum is as much a Tahltan idea, and distinct from European practices of documenting the past with regard to Indigenous knowledge, these ideas are heartbeats that reverberate through Peter’s body, his movements, and in the making of new living objects (Morin & Duffek, 2011, p. 10).

In terms of formalities and intimacies encoded in あなた, the you is pluralized, a meeting up with temporary stops in a sequence of immortality. The formal meeting of lineages occurs within the intimate 場 of familial relations. To meet Peter’s mother, Mrs. Morin, is to meet her ancestors, past and future. It is to meet the storied あなた of ideas- and art-making and to be presented with cosmologies of the crow and the wolf. In the transformed gallery space, Mrs. Morin is to be addressed with utmost respect, an あなた that signifies her important place in the passage of Tahltan knowledges and practices. This translates into acknowledging her in English writing not strictly as “Peter’s mother” or “Janelle” or “Morin,” but as “Mrs. Morin” to communicate legibly that the other monikers are to be contained within honorific regard. Peter’s personal あなた relationship with his mother, Mrs. Morin, is the foundation for requiring gallery visitors to address her with the elevated sense of あなた, whose life is to be cherished and remembered. At the same time, Peter introduces us to an intimate experiential
knowledge of Tahltan epistemologies, and through my own upbringing, what I perceive to be a creative expression of 孝行.

Tahltan education scholar, Edōdsi (Dr. Judith Thompson) states that Tahltan epistemology is premised upon the people’s relationships to their ancestors, traditional territories, and language (Edōdsi, 2008, p. 24). From witnessing Peter, I wish to suggest that for him, ancestors are active collaborators who can be called upon in the reconstitution of Tahltan cosmology in new situations. In conceiving of his body as a living museum, Peter carries the land and the voices of his ancestors. Peter describes the body as a resonant chamber, where experiences are articulated and amplified, and where voice awaits collaboration (Morin, 2014, p. 71). The body is a chamber that holds ancestral voices so that when Peter sings, a chorus of ancestors are manifested through sound and sown into new spaces.

Even with all of the possibilities for interactions in Peter Morin’s Museum, I do not see how お母さん and お婆ちゃん could meaningfully experience this particular show. Perhaps they would connect to the paper salmon, or admire the fancy teacups and saucers, or sense familiarities with the family photos. Would they ever even step into Satellite Gallery? Probably not unless they knew the artist. But it would be daft of me to believe that it is Peter’s sole responsibility to consider someone like お母さん and お婆ちゃん whom, at the time of the show, he has yet to have met. Rather, Peter presents the conditions, setting an example for those like myself to consider ways of accompanying my own relations and ancestors into new dwellings, novel shapings. Mrs. Morin’s meaningful presence suggests that お母さん and other mothers coming from different ancestral lineages could also participate, given that the conditions actively have been created to anticipate their arrival.

6.3 私/自分/"

As with あなた, one of the pronouns for “I” in Japanese, 私 (watashi) is used in multiple social contexts: in semi-formal self-address, it is applied more often by women than men. Actually, to describe 私 as a pronoun might inadequately translate its function in Japanese linguistic (spoken and gestural) interactions. Unlike in the English language where “I” is associated with a subjective pronouncement, it has been amply argued that the selective use of 私 reflects an objectification of the self in relation to others (Iwasaki & Yap, 2015; Maynard, 2007). This objectification is nominalizing; that is, 私 designates a noun version of the self rather than pronoun (Lee & Yonezawa, 2007; Maynard, 2007).
Interestingly, the nounification of 私 might in English presuppose a stronger sense of individualization and centralizing of the speaking subject. However, this is not the case. Within the context of 場, this nounification means that the speaker takes into consideration their place in social relationship to the listener/respondent, where self-adjustments require taking a step back from one’s individual wishes in order to blend more seamlessly into a state of affairs (Lee & Yonezawa, 2007, p. 735).

On the other hand, 自分 (jibun) refers to the private or individualized self (Hasegawa & Hirose, 2005). 自分 is often used as a way to speak about internal emotional or psychological experiences amidst social engagements (Hasegawa & Hirose, 2005). According to Japanese linguists, Hasegawa Yoko and Hirose Yukio (2005), 自分 designates the private self, which they argue functions as an absolute self (p. 242). Unlike the representation of the publicly engaged individual, of which 私 is only one of many choices for self-referencing, the expression of 自分 remains unchanged, compelling Hasegawa and Hirose to suggest that the Japanese sense of self is actually more individualistic and ego-driven than the Western (American) English “I” (pp. 245-247). Without having had formal linguistic training, perhaps I do not have the capacity to address their inferences from a professional standpoint; however, I do find this direction of reasoning equally strange, liberating, and relationally limited. First, I admire Hasegawa and Hirose’s stated desire to deconstruct the international reputation of the collective Japanese self, which foregoes recognizing any individualization expressed by the populace (p. 246). At the same time, I remain uncertain about their interpretations of communicative interactions. When using any self-referencing at all, in my own treatment of 自分 and in recalling others’ self-referencing, the term is often applied in situations where one is attempting to be accountable for a situation gone awry. This self-governance serves to assuage possible experiences of guilt or to prevent finger-pointing toward others in the shared context. In this sense, the end social result of 自分 and 私 are more similar than that found in Hasegawa and Hirose’s analyses. The two terms are differentiated on the basis of application: whereas 自分 emphasizes the self, 私 is a liquid form that shapes into the surrounds. However, both are relationally and context-driven by 場. My skepticism is an echo of Japanese linguists who suggest that the internal environment of the self is considered in tandem with one’s relationship to others in a given social context (Ide & Ueno, 2011; Iwasaki & Yap, 2015; Maynard, 2007; Saft,
Furthermore, the habit of dropping the self both as 自分 and 私 in speech and writing has become deeply engrained. From sending off casual emails to writing formal letters, if the pronoun “I” shows up too many times, my body physically repulses such self-oriented intrusions into the texts. Attempts have been made to address the overabundant “I” by replacing it with the lower case “i” or by moving the contents into a passive voice, but this challenge is longstanding and might very well be an aspect of poor translatability between Japanese and English, alongside my own lack of mastery over either language. The compulsion to pro-drop the “I” in English is not limited to spoken language, but streams through the body through gestures, positioning and placement in a social setting, and in the most private thoughts. It comes as no surprise then that theoretically, I am exploring being in the realm of shadows – sonorous, performative, tactile – for even in the most intimate settings, this pro-drop habit profoundly affects the 間柄 with other humans and non-humans. Limitations of living and working well arise from persisting only in the shadows, or at least in believing that one is doing so.

6.3.1 in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu ii: reverberations

My best friendship with Peter has provided plenty of creative opportunities to move out of shadow existence. I have learned that becoming a shadow has not been derived strictly from linguistic translational habituations, but also has arisen as a survival mechanism. By learning to be a seamless presence, one could avoid being on the receiving end of explosions of anger or violence, both in the home and in public spaces. If someone does not see you, then they cannot make brutal physical contact, throw racist epithets your way, or chase you away from their prescribed territory. Furthermore, different forms of shadowing place one in a state of preparedness: to respond, to accommodate, to escape an inhospitable environment. When Peter invites me to participate in this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land, he obliges a physical presence to which I had long become unaccustomed. This forces me to recognize a performative fallacy that I had been enacting: if one remains occupied as a witness, then they themselves are not witnessed.

As a guest curator for a group show at Gallery 101 in Ottawa, Cheryl invites me to run the distance and route that the Nishiyuu walkers had covered on the final day of their journey, approximately 22km from Chelsea, Quebec (Meech Lake) to Parliament Hill. My performance, in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu ii: reverberations, is to be added
into the group show that Cheryl is organizing, called, *Owning with the Gaze* (L'Hirondelle, 2015 October), which is to be installed at the gallery from October 31 to November 28, 2015. I begin training for this performance in January 2015, a couple of months after Cheryl has initially presented her proposal to the gallery.

In my nascent and developing artistic practice, place, space, and time have come to be very important considerations in the design and execution of my performances. What are the currents within a particular socio-political climate or 風土？What and who have passed through before, and what remains of their temporary presence? As the months pass, I become intensely aware that the day of the performance, October 30, 2015, is to occur within a politically fraught moment in Canadian history. The training for the performance coincides with the run-up to the 2015 federal elections, in which then-Prime Minister Harper is vying for a fourth term in office. Moreover, within the past year, Parliament has been stormed by lone gunman, Michael Zehaf-Bibeau on October 22, 2014, leading to the deaths of 24-year-old Cpl. Nathan Cirillo at the National War Memorial and eventually, Zehaf-Bibeau himself in the centre block of the federal buildings (Friscolanti & Patriquin, 2014; Ontario Provincial Police [OPP], 2015; Quan, 2015; Withnall, 2014). In what the RCMP consider to be a terrorist attack, this event quickly cascades into a series of actions, including: the questioning of police responses to the attack, the hasty implementation of the Anti-Terrorism Act, Bill C-51, and consequently, enhanced powers of surveillance granted to the Canadian Security Intelligence Services (CSIS) and hyper-policing of the Parliament grounds (CTV News, 2015; Forcse & Roach, 2015; Friscolanti, 2015; Roach, Estabrooks, Shaffer, & Renaud, 2015; Clayton Ruby & Hasan, 2015).

At the same time, I learn that other artistic/community events would be taking place in temporal proximity to *Owning with the Gaze*. Cheryl’s cousin, Métis artist Christi Belcourt plans to be in the city to deinstall the Ottawa chapter of *Walking With Our Sisters*, which has been on display at the Carleton University Art Gallery between September 25 to October 16, 2015. Initiated in June 2012, when Belcourt made a general call on Facebook for people to donate moccasin vamps in commemoration of the Indigenous women who have gone missing or who have been murdered in North America, the travelling exhibit grows as it moves between galleries, educational institutions and community centres (Walking With Our Sisters, 2017). Described on the *Walking With Our Sisters* (2017) website as a “commemorative art installation” presented as “one unified voice,” there appears to be a moratorium on raising questions
and criticisms about the increasingly ritualistic nature of the installation, movement through, and deinstallation of the 1800+ gathered vamps. Anishnaabe performance artist, Rebecca Belmore presents one such contestation when she decides against walking through the 2014 Saskatoon-based installation in her refusal to abide by the protocols that demand that all women wear skirts and all must be smudged prior to entering the exhibition (Garneau, 2015). Belmore’s challenge brings to mind my past conversations with Shirley Bear, where she discusses fighting Indigenous enactments of patriarchal rule that had been stitched into the Indian Act. She also reinforces the importance of questioning cultural protocols. In an excerpt from her poem, *Women, as in Gestalt*, Shirley writes:

[...]

Does not the Creator know the value of the spirit no matter what we wear?

Does not the Creator care for the daughters of Nokomis?

My mind does not intend to blow ill-will; my mind simply needs to know the truth.

Ceremony must be preserved, protocol for the ceremony observed.

My respect is limitless for this.

But

“You must wear skirts.”

“You must not be on your moon.”

give me reality.

Just speak the truth.

Do not insult my dignity, integrity, intelligence and love by using metaphor that you can’t explain, by accusing me of espousing my white sisters’ rhetoric.

“Political Correctness.”

[...]
To walk the way is to know
and the more I know
the reward for this activity,
the stronger my love will be
for

"Walking the Way."

(Bear, 2006, pp. 24-25)

In the months leading up to the *reverberations* performance, Shirley’s words reside as a persistent whisper to my ears. I have had mixed feelings about the *Walking With Our Sisters* exhibit for some time. I stand in agreement with Shirley and Rebecca Belmore, coupled with my own personal challenges of uncritically enacting 孝行, especially in light of the political harms that can be incurred from unquestioned, gendered abidance. As I train, I begin to wonder how it might be possible to creatively critique such an installation without disrespecting: its intentions, the labour involved in moving the vamps from place to place, and most importantly, the very persons being commemorated. I begin to dream up the *reverberations* performance through my runs, realizing that a large part of my discomfort with the moccasin vamps is that they are incompletely sewn shoes. When the ancestors come to visit, how can they wear and walk in them without tripping? So begins a month-long exercise of making hand-written invitations - most mailed through the postal service, some hand-delivered to Indigenous and non-Indigenous friends - urban Indians, Indigenous folks living in their traditional territory, newly arrived or multi-generated immigrants, artists, mentors - requesting a pair of their worn-in shoes. My intention is to gather and fashion them together into a shoe blanket that I will carry for a short while along the perimeter of the Parliamentary grounds.

As I prepare for this performance, I am very much afraid and uncertain. In a political climate where paranoia and surveillance are palpably present, it would not be difficult to mistake the song belt, comprised of three black, round speakers attached around my waist with the wires showing, to be a bomb belt. Although Cheryl kindly reassures me that no one will confuse me for being a copycat assailant, experience from the *in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu* performance has revealed that people can scare and anger very easily. Being seen as a visibly racialized body, I do not feel particularly safe. Furthermore, I am tentative about this creative response to *Walking With Our*
Sisters. As a non-Indigenous woman, am I engaging in the work in a respectful manner? Is there space for someone like myself to speak and act in response to it?

Once again, I am confronted with the limitations of 孝行. In childhood, お婆ちゃん set a stellar example to all of the women and girls in the household on how to 我慢, or withhold complaint and one’s selfish desires. She quietly and dutifully completed the mountains of daily chores that ceaselessly awaited her. Yet, as I run by Okanagan Lake and across Syilx territory in preparation for reverberations, later memories of お婆ちゃん come to mind. My sisters and I have distinct recollections of お婆ちゃん standing at the kitchen sink. Hands protected by bright yellow plastic gloves, they grip the lip of the sink like eagle talons, as all of the energy in her tiny, taut body is consolidated to prevent herself from screaming out in exhaustion. And another memory still: near death, her actions and behaviour reverted to that of a young toddler, wearing diapers so as not to soil her bed. At this time, お婆ちゃん became very much afraid of the dark, because whenever she closed her eyes, she would see her ancestors waiting to greet her. On the nights that I would return to the farm to visit, お婆ちゃん restlessly moved between her bedroom and the bathroom unable to sleep. On one of those evenings, forgetting that anyone else was there, お婆ちゃん cried out repeatedly, “助けて下さい!! 助けて下さい!!”, which translates into, “Please rescue me!!” I have thought about the panic in her voice and choice of words repeatedly over the years. Instead of the composed, “お手伝いして下さい,” which means, “Can you give please give me a hand?”, お婆ちゃん implored anyone who would listen to come to her rescue. As I rushed to her side, I remember thinking that for such a powerful woman, with the strength to hold up the entire family, it would take nearly her entire life to make a request for help. All of the years of not seeking assistance would culminate into a singular plea that perhaps could not properly be accommodated by those around her.

I can see that my sisters and I have inherited this difficulty in asking for help. As a performance apprentice, who am I to prioritize my personal needs, this 自分 who disrupts my capacity as 私 to unobtrusively learn from imitation and 孝行? For the longest time, I hesitate to approach Peter to assist me in this performance. However, in remembering お婆ちゃん, I come to appreciate that she has also demonstrated that it is imperative to learn when and how to ask for support, before it is too late. In her lifetime of caring for others, somewhere along the way, お婆ちゃん’s senses of 自分 and 私
became imbalanced. One was not more absolute or authentic than the other; rather, the familial public demanded that she perform in such a manner so as to override her capacity to be vulnerable to herself and others. Effectively, 我慢, perceived to be one of お婆ちゃん’s greatest strengths, also became her greatest personal burden. And those of us around her failed to witness her for who she was beyond our need of her. But close to death, お婆ちゃん’s first and last plea served to recalibrate the relationship between 自分 and 私 from within. I am deeply and unforgettably indebted to my ancestor for this teaching, and in the present moments, try to find ways to honour her by endeavouring to live in balanced relation to others, inclusive of multiple selves. I tentatively ask Peter if he would run with me, only to realize that Peter has been quietly present all along. Although he has never run 22km, he enthusiastically agrees to cover this distance with me on the day of the performance. Best friendships alchemically shift social self-regulation, if by chance one takes notice.

In the 場 of best friendship, other relational shifts occur. As a performance artist, Peter is unquestionably much further advanced in his practice. But because I have been running long distances since early childhood, I have many legs ahead of him in this regard. In the weeks leading up to the performance, I set up a rigorous training schedule for him, and whenever we meet up in the interim, we run together. Within this training period, with focus on breath and form, motivations for the performance rhythmically return to its initial intentions: to pay homage to the Nishiyuu walkers, for all of the days they walked across the land, and for that final day as they were received by jubilant crowds on Parliament Hill; moreover, to recognize the people who joined up along the way, either to walk beside or to nourish the Nishiyuu walkers’ and celebrate their accomplishment. It returns to honouring the countless steps completed by the women represented in Walking With Our Sisters. Shirley’s poem, and these specific lines succinctly capture the change in 風土: To walk the way is to know, and the more I know the reward for this activity, the stronger my love will be for “Walking the Way” (Bear, 2006, p. 25).

On the day of the performance, the sun shines brightly in the azure saturated sky. Following Cheryl’s instruction, the group that has gathered lays tobacco at the starting point. Many people are present in this journey. Cheryl accompanies us in a van alongside from beginning to end. Jewish-Mohawk media artist, Howard Adler has been assigned the difficult task of jumping out of the van at designated stops to record the run
with a video camera, which is nearly as large as his torso. Ashok serves as the van driver and is also present to keep watch. Beginning the run solo, Peter joins in at the 8km mark, and our friend, Ashkenazi-Jewish/Canadian multi-media artist Leah Decter has agreed to run from the 14km mark. Together, the team of us eventually circle onto the Parliamentary grounds. Much less frightened, my body is nonetheless shaky, as I watch police cars circling on all sides.

Waiting for the arrival of the shoe blanket, I hear お父さん’s voice in my head, “be cool.” The best advice he would ever give, “be cool,” is painstakingly grown wisdom built upon years of being unable to be cool until finally, he is somehow able to stop himself, give serious pause to reflect, and laugh tragically at his uninhibited 糞たれ behaviour. In his own daughter, he could see the same hotheaded temper, the odd switch from compliant to defiant, a matching damaging anger, so that in those last years, he told me, many, many times, to be cool. Taking heed of his advice on Parliament Hill, I turn away from the buildings and kneel until my heart stops racing. This is where being cool meets up with an intensive preparation grounded upon 生活の美学, for I have been working under the assumption that in this situation, beautifying every step of the process will quell the fear of the socio-political unknown both within myself and others. I depend on people’s instantaneous conflation of beauty and peaceful presence.

Without my knowledge, Cheryl has been busy reassuring the police officers that the group of us is present for performance work. One of the officers tells her that he thought I had been in prayer, stating that many new immigrants would come to pray at the grounds when they received landed status. The blanket, when it arrives, is heavy. I have placed Shirley’s shoes right in the centre of the blanket, and because she is now quite frail, I cradle her slippers in her partner, Peter Clair’s, who is her primary caregiver. I anchor Cheryl’s shoes to Shirley and Peter Clair’s, and from there, the blanket interlinks out, one pair at a time and grounded on all four corners with shoes provided by powerful women, mothers. As I crawl underneath the blanket, I laugh out loud because of the surprising bulk of all of the shoes gathered and cloaking my form. Yes, of course! The spiritual weight of walking and living is felt in every pair and presses down not as a burden, but as a life force that reveals its power. Shape-shifting into different configurations with the blanket, I sprint the final distance with all of the shoes lifted up like a cape. Peter and his presence, Leah and her running alongside, Cheryl and her energy, Shirley and Peter Clair in poetic word and form, Ashok in his careful attention, together are palpable in every step.
When preparing for a public performance, it is impossible to anticipate every eventuality. At the same time, one can easily become overwhelmed by all of the commotion, both of one’s own making and in the turbulence of multidirectional cosmologies, histories, and values colliding perhaps for the first time. However, the presence of trusted others marks a substantial shift in these social dynamics. Asking for Peter’s help is a self-admission that I have reached several internal limits, therefore need to seek another point of view and set of experiences. Peter’s request for a training schedule reminds me that running is an activity from which I am able to draw and give strength. Although this might seem inconsequential, in fact, the habit of training together, even in times spent geographically apart, compel our bodies jointly to move onto the grounds of Parliament with composure, come what may. By suggesting Peter run with me, I essentially ask him to become my tactile shadow. Reciprocally, my stated needs lead both to a reconstitution of calm and wonderfully unintended knowledge of Peter. Watching Peter train so diligently, I am astonished to discover that tactile shadows are not invisible at all but are undeniably present. In good company, to be seen is to invite succor and comfort.

In consideration of Peter as a tactile shadow, I come to understand that his gathered works and performances are themselves manifestations of witnessing. They are materialized consequences of Peter’s life spent sitting around kitchen tables, listening to stories, perspectives, living memories of ancestors. They are evidence of his movements through different landscapes, cultures, and families. In return, they reshape his perspectives so that in his performances, Peter presents knowledge as flexible, adaptive, and flowing like water on the land, embodies the lives of ancestors passing through multiple lineages. The reverberations performance is only one of the many times that Peter steadfastly cares. Even amidst his boisterous demeanour and booming laughter, his presence is simultaneously quiet, watchful. There is no centralizing of the self or proclamations of being the witness; rather, Peter’s focus is placed upon developing the skills to best avail himself in situations that unexpectedly befall him. I continuously learn from watching his responsiveness to those around him.

6.4 我々/We

I love saying 我々 (wareware). It rolls off the tongue playfully as if it is meant to signify a cute frog sound or a cartoon egg rolling toward the edge of a table. 我々 is actually a very formal term for “we.” Made up of two 我, it is a complex and perhaps
imperfect translation of the English “we” because as with other Japanese reference terms, it has multiple functions as pronouns and nouns. Individually, one 我 can mean both you or I, depending upon the context (Fujii, 2012; Hirose, 2014; Sato & Bergen, 2013). Used as a singular, 我 is considered old-fashioned and unusual in most conversations (Hirose, 2014, p. 114). Together, however, 我々 expresses a company or group’s humble self-presentation in relation to others. Often used in political contexts, it can also allude to a national sense of a collectivized self (Field, 1995; Kawai, 2009; Maynard, 2007; Saft, 2014; Sakai, 2000). This connection between national belonging and 我々 has been inferred, from scanning Japanese texts in which the term appears to be used in socio-political discourse (Field, 1995; Sakai, 2000). However, very little linguistic research has focused upon understanding 我々 in the English language. I cannot help but speculate that this is due to the longstanding dichotomizing of the Western (American) individual and (Japanese) collective selves, where the Japanese counterpointing selves have been articulated as numerable I’s within the specificities of the debates. In so doing, a sense of Japanese nationalism is shaped in reactive opposition to American English and its accompanying phenomenological formulation of Western knowledge. However, a number of scholars have resisted being tethered to enforcing these discussions. For example, Japanese linguist, Senko Maynard (2007) does her best to dissociate herself from 日本人論 (Nihonjinron), or unique Japanese cultural and national identity, in her theorizing of linguistic creativity (p. 288).

Maynard (2007) defines linguistic creativity as creative abilities of users of Japanese language to foreground personalized expressive meanings beyond its function to process proposition-based information (p. 4). According to Maynard, linguistic creativity, which emerges and directs discourse, includes the articulation of “intimacy or distancing, emotions, empathy, humor, playfulness, persona, sense of self, identity, historical effects,” etc. (p. 4). Maynard argues that the grammar and the designations of self and other referencing is a tool for linguistic creativity (p. 232). While she acknowledges that the creative use of language is universal, she does not forego the social and cultural particularities of Japanese language usage (p. 289). This specific interest in Japanese is expected, given her twenty plus years theorizing about the language. Yet, in doing so, inadvertently she seems to create linguistic “cultural boundaries of Japan” in contrast to Western (American) English, thereby reestablishing the East v. West dualism.
I take Maynard (2007) up on her conclusive remarks, where she states that more “studies are needed to understand Japanese discourse itself and its features that show similarities and differences with other Western and non-Western languages” (p. 289). But how might new insights into Japanese language sound, look, and move through in a non-dualistic manner? Instead of conducting a comparative study between languages based upon dividing them into one of these two oppositional categories, however, I wish to dwell in the 間柄 of Peter and my collaborations, taking into serious consideration Peter’s performatively and verbally expressed relationship to Tahltan language. In keeping with Ide Sachiko’s presentation of emancipatory pragmatics (Hanks, Ide, & Katagiri, 2009), I draw upon the 場 of Peter’s and my best friendship to concentrate on the way Peter learns and embodies the Tahltan language. His enfoldment of movement, making, and the verbalizing of language implaced in traditional territory, as well as his gathering acts to manifest and present Tahltan knowledge away from his ancestral lands, offers a different form of linguistic education. In thinking about the meeting up of the Stikine and Tahltan rivers, which pass through traditional territories, from my point of view, it would seem that the land actively instructs humans to reach for new formations and affiliations, and to acknowledge the ancestral presences that pass in between. Coming from a Japanese language usage context in which I sometimes grapple to recollect words, and continuously learn new words that become incorporated into my thought repertoire, I witness deep resonances between our respective relationships to language. Ensconced in the everyday practice of speaking, enacting, and manifesting language, these resonances are not identical but differently familiar. In this 間柄 of best friendship, English, Tahltan, and Japanese encounter one another to develop new hybrid forms of meaning and possibilities that speak to far past and far future engagements. These encounters are manifested as performances, experiments in interactions that mean more than 我々 expectations, intentions, and individuated 自分 and あなた perspectives. So then, what is communicated and what new forms arise?

6.4.1 Hair: The performance

Hair is a performance that contemplates witnessing the ancestors who attended residential school (Goto & Morin, 2015). Peter spends his time and shared studio

107 For an in-depth description of Hair, please see Peter and my essay, "Hair: The performance" (Goto & Morin, 2015).
space at the month-long Reconsidering Reconciliation artist residency at Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops\textsuperscript{108} drawing long, vertical pencil strokes over large pieces of paper, which have been taped up on the far wall. Day after day, I peek through the little studio window to see the layers of graphite darken and thicken, and the paper length increase as Peter chain-links sheets of paper together with tape, so that the drawing eventually travels across the whole wall. Peter tells me that he is drawing the hair of the children, which was forcibly cut off upon their arrival at residential schools. Near the end of the residency, the wall of hair has transformed the space.

The drums that Peter hands out during the Hair performance have spent time moving over the land. He has asked several of the artists at the residency to roam through the tall grasses surrounding the university so that each blade might beat upon the surface of the drum. At another time, the drums are hung up in a row, and artists are asked to sing into them as though they are a portal or telephone to the ancestors. He tells the artists in the residency that the ancestors are listening, inviting us to sing and speak to them.

In Peter’s groundwork toward what will culminate into Hair, the boundaries between preparation and performance become blurred. In a similar vein to his intermixing of ritual and performance, it is equally unclear when and where the one begins and the other ends. In the dissolution of such clear categories of being, Hair can be considered a temporary pause to examine the culmination or gathering of one’s particular movements through the world. This particularity is motivated by a specific intention, that is, to honour the ancestors who were made to attend residential school. At the same time, Peter’s intentions are pursued through body gestures that at times profoundly articulate linguistically and culturally embedded practices that exceed his individual existence.

Perhaps the term “performativity” may be applicable in describing the interplay between spoken intention and embodied, relational action. The meaning of this term exceeds Judith Butler’s definition(s), although her gender analyses provide important insights into the presentation of Hair and other performances. In her seminal text, Gender Trouble, Butler (2010a) originally defined performativity through a critical gender

\textsuperscript{108}The Reconsidering Reconciliation residency is the very same one in which Cheryl worked on her project, Why the Caged Bird Sings. Adrian Stimson was also in attendance, painting images of the former residential schools at which his father had been employed, and I was working on in sonorous shadows of Nishiyuu.
studies lens. She described the gendered body as being performative, that is, without a corporeal status apart from various acts that would constitute and reiterate its supposed reality (p. 185). Butler considered gender to be “an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of acts” (p. 191). Grounded in the linguistic philosophy of J.L. Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969), French socio-political philosophies of (post) structuralism, and Anglo-American gender studies, Butler’s conceptualization of performativity has garnered much critical discourse in its theoretical and practical longevity. While I do not have the space to delve into these myriad debates, I wish to address briefly how the meeting up of Japanese, Tahltan, and Cree cosmologies and language usages exceeds the phenomenological parameters of performativity as established within Butler’s gender-based conceptualization.\(^{109}\)

Butler (2010a) grounds her conceptualization of performativity upon the a priori linguistic structuring of gender roles. Her compulsion to frame actions in reaction to that of gender compliance or conscientious rebellion motivates me to move away from her usage of performativity toward one that intermixes not knowing moments with the variegated linguistic translations that occur across, through, and because of the body (and bodies) in a specific relational space. Butler’s (2010b) appraisal of how language determines reiteratively gendered acts is expressed in her ongoing engagement with early linguistic philosophers, such as J. L. Austin (1962). That is, for Butler (2010b) the relationship between language and the gendered body is one in which orally spoken, phonetically written, and conscious cognition exist ontologically prior to and often dictates embodied actions. This causal relation is at odds with both Peter and my own experiences of living with and in our respective languages. For Peter, the act of making or gathering is to speak and learn the Tahltan language (Morin, 2011). Making a drum is to learn to speak the language, beading (like drum-making) is a transnational indigenous language, drawing out the hair of residential school attendees is to speak the language

---

\(^{109}\)Although Butler (1988) herself does not wholly eschew phenomenology in her gender analysis of subject formation, her supporters have argued extensively against the compatibility between phenomenology and post-structuralism, the latter of which informs Butler’s understanding of gender construction, specifically, and feminist theory in general. For Butler’s own early analysis of Merleau-Ponty’s understanding of phenomenology and how it contributes critically to feminist theory, please see her essay, written in 1988, “Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory.” Also see Anna Petronella Foulter’s (2013) essay, “Language and the gendered body: Butler’s early reading of Merleau-Ponty.” Furthermore, Silvia Stoller’s 2010 essay, “Expressivity and performativity: Merleau-Ponty and Butler,” also argues for the affinities between Butler’s post-structuralist notion of performativity and Merleau-Ponty’s conception of expressivity.
of the spiritual colonization of Indigenous people, stones sitting at the bottom of a riverbed speak to the rushing water flows. Peter’s acting to re/create language echoes Japanese philosopher, Nishida Kitarō’s (2012) contention that conscious, cognitive thought is a by-product of the body being and acting (Cheung, 2014). In terms of the historical body, Nishida argues that the establishment of language is an outcome of the communal life of humans and society (p. 125). The inherited historical context and the self are in a constant state of creating and remaking themselves and one another through projection and negation so that linguistic and cultural norms shift over space, time, and context.

In *Hair*, descriptive words can neither wholly hermeneutically contain nor ethically prescribe how my actions encounter Peter’s movements or Cheryl’s singing and drumming. Just prior to the performance, Peter explains his rationales for the performance to Cheryl and requests her sonorous presence. She accepts the invitation. The performance begins when Peter addresses the audience to describe his process of meditating upon the moment the hair is cut off of children attending residential schools, as well as the acts of restoration that can follow. Peter offers a drum to Cheryl, one that he has made during the residency; we then hand out six witnessing drums to audience members, and Peter suggests that they play or sit quietly with them. Cheryl begins to sing an upbeat Cree song. While she sings, I tie 28 stones onto Peter’s body, a body that at once becomes: the scissors that cut all of the children’s hair; the descendants that carry the memories of those experiences; and one of the many future ancestors who contribute to shifting the meaning and practice of reconciliation (Goto & Morin, 2015). Peter becoming the scissors overtakes the other meanings as he moves solemnly across the hair, applying so much tactile pressure until the graphite transfers onto his body and the paper, like cut hair itself, begins to fall to the ground.

In this 合作, Peter initially takes the lead in constructing the 場 of the performance. In a similar fashion to how he approached me to collaborate in *this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land*, Peter invites me to work with him to redress the pain experienced by the ancestors whose hair is cut off. As usual, I consult with お母さん to communicate Peter’s performative intentions. I then ask her what I might do to counteract the sorrow. My request follows a long explanation in Japanese of

---

110 For a video of the Hair performance (Art Reconciliation, 2015), please go to: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z2SAsPiiJJo.
residential schools in Canada, and the colonization of Indigenous people, a conversation that she and I have for the first time. She pauses, then recollects a time in Japan when women would offer their hair as an act of restoration. She tells me that in a now mostly forgotten custom, historically, if a spouse or a person of social standing in the community died suddenly due to egregious acts caused by another, women would cut their hair as a means to assuage their and the community’s suffering. In her explanation, お母さん stresses the importance of cutting off one’s hair while maintaining a quiet and peaceful heart. She explains that every emotion and intention is transferred in the gift, so that if I myself am morose, then the recipient will become burdened with my negative emotions. It is also important not to cut one’s hair boastfully or as a grand gesture of care, which would serve to diminish the emotional integrity of the gift. Instead, this act of cutting is to be done as privately and inconspicuously as possible. In the course of the performance, Peter’s desolate act of moving to and fro across the drawing to cut the hair draws the audience’s attention. Cheryl has stopped drumming; meanwhile, I am in the back corner of the lain canvas, matter-of-factly bunching my hair into five ponytails, then cutting them off one by one. I quietly hum a cheery Japanese lullaby as I perform the task, imagining myself to be alone in my bedroom. Exhausted from his act of cutting, Peter kneels at the front of the canvas as Cheryl begins to drum softly, the beats increasing in speed and volume. At this point, Peter and my actions are barely gathered together through Cheryl’s drumming. Without having explained to the audience my own role of offering the hair, those witnessing may not anticipate the meeting up of Peter and my actions. The experiences between Peter’s grief and my lightness of being are so estranged that our actions could exist in parallel worlds, alternative universes never meant to interact. Once all of the hair is cut off, I wash and treat each section, place them in a newly lacquered box, then wrap everything up in intricate Japanese 千代紙 (chiyogami). I walk over to where Peter is sitting to offer him this gift. Cheryl’s voice is soft, sweet, as she sings. Peter accepts the gift and overwhelmed with emotion, he unwraps it, taking one of the ponytails to smudge his body, which is still weighed down by the stones. Once finished, he kneels down again, at which point I cut each of the 28 stones from his body. Cheryl’s voice becomes louder and lively, as she begins to sing a traditional Cree lullaby. Once the last stone has fallen, I kneel to face Peter. We look at one another, smile, and wordlessly wrap a ponytail around one of the stones that are gathered around. Witnessing ancestors. Suddenly, the stone and hair together transform into a paintbrush and Peter and I playfully dip our brushes into a bowl of black 墨 (sumi) ink, and like
school children during recess, begin freely painting the canvas beneath our feet.

In the 場 of this performance, which at times invokes specific gender roles within a particular culture – Tahltan, Cree, Japanese – our respective acts to care reach beyond those norms and expectations. In the 間柄 of these cultural practices, in the elongation of not knowing and the nonsensical, our actions exceed verbose expression of pre-established visceral action. The novelty of the context transforms the meaning and presentation of a reiterative act as well as the psychological and social burdens that might accompany it. In this 場, Cheryl, Peter, and I become 我々 with distinctive roles and movements that contribute to the presentation of Hair. Held together by Cheryl’s songs and tempo, it seems that an infinitesimal space is opened up for a brief while so that someone like お母さん might be able to consider the spiritual cost and creative labours needed to rejuvenate the thousands of Indigenous children who attended residential school. Not only is お母さん invited to contemplate, but she is also an active participant in the performatives of witnessing. In Hair, it would seem that the 我々 of Peter, Cheryl, and myself works congruously with the 私たち (watashitachi) of the gathered “I” we-ness of audience members. This suggests that 場 is not a fixed or objective state of affairs, but one that is in emotional, cognitive, and social motion. Perhaps the most that a performer can do is to get a feel for the pulse and direction of flow, and to incorporate those rhythms into the performance.

How might this integration be accomplished? Begin with that which has been inculcated. In terms of 孝行, お母さん has advised me that in order to avoid overwhelming the audience, Peter and I need to establish a sense of internal balance between the two of us. If Peter is raw with heavy emotions, then my role is to be the one who silently grounds. お母さん argues that if both of us are too boisterous, then it will serve to push the audience psychically and emotionally away so as to protect themselves from the onslaught. She tells me to consider the actions that will draw people in. Effectively, お母さん is having me consider the 陰陽 (inyō), or the ying and yang of our respective actions: my discreet gifting to Peter’s grief. The complementarity of the two is expected to invite deepening audience engagement. Confident in my abilities to abide by Peter through a lifelong training in 孝行, お母さん’s advice leads to arguably one of Peter’s and my strongest performances, because of the immaterial cultures that we bring in, which correspond with the contents of our respective acts. Amidst our
movements, Cheryl’s singing and drumming presence cannot be overstated. Her music encircles not only the 阴陽 of Peter’s and my movements, but also creates an 阴陽 balance between ourselves and the emotions experienced by the audience members. The music and the silences in between actively fold everyone because of their experiences into the temporary 場 of Hair.

However, it would be naïve to assume that the performers themselves have complete control over the 場 of the performative space. Audience members have a profound impact on vitalizing the context, so much so that Cheryl has advised me on numerous occasions to be attentive to the energies of those present, and to learn how to transform ambivalent emotions into that which will enrich the performance. Furthermore, it is not always clear until being in the midst of the performance, how different parts of one and another’s body move together or rebel outright from cognitive intention and expectation. In those moments arises the chance to catch one’s habits in the act; that is, reiterative everyday acts reveal themselves both to the performer and the audience. In some cases, it is like watching one’s gestures or movements in spite of the desire to do and think otherwise.

If a performance can be considered the pause and examination within the performatives of moving through the world, then it might be able to influence and redirect the performatives that follow. As Peter often states, each performance changes his body; some shifts are minute and invisible to everyone except for himself, while others make a visible and interrelational impact. In this regard, the performance could be thought of as a tactile shadow of the performatives in the everyday. In the pause of the performance, the meanings that precipitate have the potential to veer away from unthinkingly self-perpetuating social regulations of normative behaviour. A tactile shadow in relation to oneself is viscerally contiguous. One’s body is the subject, object, and shadow, an intimate relation that can catalyze a new state of affairs. At other times, the performance at best enunciates the limitations that can be reached in pursuing and insisting upon a certain value, belief, and ways of being, in the face of new, unexpected encounters.

6.4.2 First Contacts?

During the 2016 O k’inâdâs Summer Residency in Kelowna, artists-in-residence, Adrian Stimson, Lori Blondeau, and Rebecca Belmore were invited to be guest speakers at Kainai Nation performance and theatre artist Troy Emery Twigg’s Indigenous Performance class. I sat in on their visit as undergraduate students asked the guests about their artistic practices, processes, and sources of inspiration. When invited to
describe their respective studio spaces, I was really taken by Belmore’s response. For her, a studio was not a set location, room, or time. As a performance artist, the studio was everywhere she happened to be, if only she took the time to notice her surroundings. In the same manner, the 業 of Peter and my best friendship could be considered the studio space for our joint practice, a particular and dynamic state of affairs within which creative collaborations are explored and constructed. In the studio space of a best friendship, a whole lot of shit, good and bad, goes down. Peter and I dream big, sometimes way too big, about what we wish to communicate or accomplish in an upcoming performance. We try to consider all of the possible readings and interpretations, debate at length over what actions might best convey our intentions, and what might inadvertently distract from the overall objectives. Sometimes we get into heated arguments, while at other times, we laugh our asses off about our respective ineptitudes, using humour to work through difficult topics and personal histories.

In First Contacts? our aim is to challenge and complicate colonial first contact narratives that dwell upon the meeting up of Indigenous people and European settlers (Goto & Morin, 2017). We wish for the audience to imagine other contact stories that have yet to be told, specifically, Indigenous and Asian exchanges, trade, and persistent interrelations along the Pacific Northwest. Furthermore, we want to confront the ways in which our respective bodies, Peter as an Indigenous man and me as an Asian woman, have been fetishized and stereotyped in media and history, through anthropological gazes. Throughout, we concurrently toy with the idea of tactile “first contacts” between two bodies, from the perspective of cellular regeneration (Goto & Morin, 2017, p. 96). Our overall intention is not only to foreground cultural stereotypes, but we also wish for all of us present together to overwrite these tired narratives with new stories that emerge from far past and far future moments of intimacy.

Because our bodies will be sensually engaged, we spend a lot of time in preparation for First Contacts? Over the course of nearly a year, we have multiple phone and face-to-face conversations about bodies, talking about our relationship to our own bodies, working through histories and experiences of physical violations, and recounting beautiful instances of embodied care and resilience. We contemplate how racism, sexism, and heteronormative expectations have affected our bodies, and speculate as to how our own prejudices have caused harm to others. On the numerous occasions that we meet up to practice and plan, our discussions intermix with experiments in touching one another well, instigating conversations about establishing respectful boundaries
between friends, lovers, within and beyond familial, cultural, and political contexts and expectations. By the time the performance date comes up, Peter and I feel quite self-assured that our extensive preparations will enable us to communicate our wide-ranging intentions.

The best laid plans…We have been invited to perform First Contacts? to close down the Performing Utopias conference, held at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver between March 13 – 15, 2014 (Beauchesne & Santos, 2017, pp. 8-10). The performance is to take place at the Liu Institute for Global Issues, a centre that houses interdisciplinary scholarship on social justice issues worldwide (Liu Institute for Global Issues, n.d.). In the context of the conference theme, which is to bring to scholarly attention the interplay between utopic imaginings and performance art, Peter and I are perhaps overconfident in our collaborative capacity to straightforwardly present our case for reimagining first contacts. We hope that the venue will provide a political framework for audience members to envisage old and new encounters between Indigenous and racialized communities. While Peter prefers to introduce his performances, I tend to favour making performative interventions without explanation. For this collaboration, however, given the multiple meanings that at times might work at cross-purposes, we have written a little précis, which is to be read prior to our actions. In consultation withお母さん, I am directed to move in counterbalance to Peter’s fiery presence. Her advice, familiar, that I should be陰 to Peter’s陽.

An impromptu stage using a blank canvas fabric is set up along the far wall of a meeting room in the Liu Institute. Peter is kneeling on the floor and facing the audience, applying red ochre mixed with Petroleum Jelly onto his body. Red skin. I enter the room clothed in an unsashed浴衣, an帯wrapped around my hands, which underneath are bounded together with a red velvet rope. A noh mask covers my face. Yellow skin. From我々perspective, the labelling is so blatantly clear one could consider us to be flirting along the edges of kitsch, or so we hope. All of our talks of intimacy, the sexualizing of touch, the Orientalizing gaze…I approach Peter, and he slowly removes my mask and浴衣, untying and casting aside the velvet binding, so I remain standing only in my undergarments. He sits back down, and I carefully begin to wash the red ochre off of his body with a cloth. We wish to make the audience uncomfortable about witnessing our tender acts, which tend to take place in the privacy of one’s home. We anticipate that some might choose to look away.
At this point, in the middle of washing Peter, I begin to feel like laughing and crying simultaneously. The goddamn ochre jelly mixture is so hydrophobic, no matter how much I try to wipe it off of Peter, the slick goop just transfers from one place to the next. We both become completely sodden with the slippery shit that one moment of imbalance would have us collapsing into a messy heap of bodies. And Peter closes his eyes throughout. In Tahltan cosmology, there is a story about how the Crow brings the light into the world, the sun, moon, and daylight (Morin & Duffek, 2011, pp. 24-27). In clarifying his performance practice, Peter has frequently spoken about trying to imagine the time before light. He does not explain what the darkness signifies, and at various times, I have speculated that it represents the ongoing period of colonization, a subject that profoundly influences his practice. In most of his pieces, Peter is blindfolded, and perhaps it is from the enclosing of the self that he is able to concentrate on bridging ritual, performance, and ancestral presence.

Yet, in this setting, after the many months that we have talked about being open and unwaveringly witnessing one another, I experience Peter's closed eyes as a rejection of our 我々 objectives. In the way Peter’s body falls to the ground so that he lies very still, I am emotionally and physically overwhelmed with memories of bathing countless people’s bodies and cleaning their homes: those living with and/or dying from an infectious disease, those who have been born with various congenital conditions, which incapacitate their movements, those who are very young and very old. I realize that the manual labour of caring for others has become so ingrained that I intuitively turn Peter’s limbs and torso carefully and without hesitation until every last bit of ochre goo eventually is wiped away from his body.

Peter’s body habit of closing his eyes and my practised compulsion to provide physical care respectively reach their limits in relation to our objectives in First Contacts? After the performance, we find out that in fact, no introduction had been provided to contextualize our actions. The title, perhaps the bare minimum descriptor for our presentation, also had not been announced to the audience. This means that the only way people could make sense of our actions was to go by what and who we were to them. We discover that many audience members do not know that Peter is Indigenous. As a result, they have just witnessed a small Asian woman submissively tending to a big, White man. I become mortified with the realization that 孝行, the basis from which I have learned to abide well and to care for others, is the very quality that also presents my body as the passive, obedient Asian woman: the imperturbable nanny, the compliant
wife, the dutiful daughter. To be honest, at various times in the past, I have practiced 孝行 to try to fulfill all of these roles. And with Peter closing his eyes, which on its own is an act of immersing himself to honouring Tahltan history, cosmology, and ancestry, his action can be understood as entitled gratification.

お母さんの advice to create balance between 陰 and 陽 begins to haunt me in reflecting upon Peter and my collaborative practice. At the time of First Contacts?, March 2014, I am still very tentative in my approach and understanding of performance work. Up until this point, I have steadfastly held on to the belief that the enactment of 孝行 in and of itself will sufficiently express my respect for and enable me to learn from Indigenous knowledges and cultural practices, which has been a major motivation behind leaping into performance work in the first place. As a performance apprentice, I defer to Peter's actions, who takes the lead in shaping the contents and overarching themes of our collaborations. In this relational state of affairs, I consistently become the 陰 and Peter, 陽. It is understandable and not inaccurate to read Peter's actions and vocalizations as overpowering my quiet demeanour. Within the larger socio-political context of Euro-Canadian colonial directives, and subsequently, collective social habits to silence and erase Indigenous culture, histories, and embodied presence, I take it as a personal duty to try to counter the continuous cycles of discrimination. Furthermore, in terms of artistic practice, I abide by his example, given the many years he has been making performance art works. However, in the temporary 場 of First Contacts?, my habit of deferring and stepping aside concurrently takes on a different meaning altogether, ambivalent and conflicting in relation to 我々 political and aesthetic intentions.

Rethinking through the idea of two rivers meeting, the Tahltan and Stikine, they have much to teach in terms of coming to understand new cross-cultural and linguistic encounters. If ever you have the chance to witness two bodies of water meeting as they move at different rates and directions of flow, temperatures, and sedimentary presence, you will see, feel, and hear that as they come into contact, they respectively swirl in upon themselves, until they merge molecularly and collectively. In their meeting up, there is an initial turning away before a new balance, 陰陽, is established. This lesson presents an ongoing collaborative challenge for Peter and me. What would it mean for Peter to open his eyes and to take on the position of 陰? What would it mean for me to speak out and turn away from performing 孝行 in relation to Peter? Perhaps the inculcated compulsion to swirl in upon ourselves protectively could have us reach a collaborative impasse. Our
particular ways of connecting to ancestry, of expressing relational responsibility, and of creating a sense of cultural belonging have become so integral to how we see ourselves in the world; it is not possible simply to extract and abandon these instilled values. Beyond Judith Butler’s (2010a) presented argument that a negative hegemonic external force, patriarchy, imposes the performatives of gender roles, Peter and my values are interwoven with the 間柄 of other values in relation to multiple communities. Thus, asking of us to simply excise these values from our senses of self could mean to disvalue cultural belonging irrevocably. The continuous challenge then is to learn to be mindful of the interrelational contexts in which they are presented and to recognize when a particular way of being reaches its limit in its capacity to do and be good with and for others. In the precarious moments of a value becoming an instrument of harm, a moment that reverberates acutely through the body (if only one is alerted to it from within or from external critiques), arise creative opportunities to transform the value so that it can reach beyond its past social accomplishments and meanings. This transformation may render it unrecognizable, given the molecular modifications it faces in intermixing with new ways of being and doing.

In the 我々 presentation of a performance, the self is greater than the consolidation of the individual parts. Rather, it is a coming together of different cosmologies, histories, linguistic and cultural heritages to create new and/or old forms. There are moments in First Contacts? that Peter and I temporarily are an altogether different being, one that casts tactile shadows upon the audience and vice versa. In tandem, Peter, I, and the audience merge into another formation that casts tactile shadows upon the walls of the Liu Institute, the cedars surrounding the building, and the wider public. And simultaneously, the canvas sheeting, that goddamn red ochre jelly, and the cedars meld together with humans to cast the most unexpected shadows. These shadows are tactile in that they are viscerally experienced: skin to skin, human to concrete, the heat and humidity settling upon witnessing humans and lightbulbs, chairs, passageways. Tactile shadows expose intellectual and embodied habits that contribute to both comfortable and distressing interactions. As bodies contort into new arrangements, they evade immediate cognitive apprehension and exceed wordful rationales.

Tactile shadows are multidirectional and residual. Sometimes, it is difficult and perhaps unnecessary to determine cause and effect, an important lesson in appreciating that a singular source does not have the omnipotent power to dictate socio-political
meaning or to prioritize and reiterate certain collectivized relationships. Performance work teaches that bodies, both human and non-human, are active agents that exist despite, outside, and oftentimes in conflicting relation to conscious human intentionality. If nothing else, the work of performance is to draw attention to the complex and often contradictory meanings and movements that are unknowingly propagated in the everyday.

In all of our performances, beyond our stated intentions, Peter’s and my friendship is put on show. At the beginning, our friendship is tentative; certain subjects and emotional outpourings are circumvented so as to avoid unexpected injury or breaching of boundaries. In the disordered cause-and-effect casting of tactile shadows during a formalized performance, the performatives of our friendship can become intermixed with people’s sometimes acerbic feedback. Such judgments might presage a state of affairs to come between Peter and me; overall, these criticisms have an impact on our relationship. It takes a great deal of concerted effort, care, and mutual interest to develop a trust, which enables friends to have periodically emotionally trying conversations that test one’s political, social, cultural positions, and historically situated worldviews. A performance and resulting feedback have the potential to trigger unanticipated and ill-prepared levels of intimacy, thus the chances of the friendship reaching a cataclysmic end increase significantly. At the same time, in an adaptable friendship, the collaboratively created 場 can be a space in which the very same difficult negotiations can shape-shift, breathe, and create bountiful laughter, beyond the inflexibilities of unquestioned protocols, allegiances, and social order.

In the 我々 offering of a 合作, space and time are at variance with one another. Throughout all of our collaborations, the main objective has slowly shaped into creating a space so that our mothers can meet. Peter and I are occupied with imagining ways to bring past and future ancestors together through the 場 of the performance. In this regard, space collapses the linear conception of generational presence through time. We are compelled to bring in our ancestors perchance that it will rearrange the spiritual experience of a place, such that our mothers could comfortably pass through. The visibly individualized body is no longer just one’s own. Instead, multiple lives exist in each gesture, expression, movement. Peter’s body is his Great-Grandfather’s sitting for a black and white photo in front of his home. It is also his mother’s hands canning sockeye salmon with her siblings after a big fish haul and washing her brothers’ jeans in the Stikine. And Peter’s arms are his father’s, Mr. Morin, guiding his granddaughter as she
toddles from room to room. My body houses 曾祖母’s eyes, who looks around bewildered at previously unimagined landscapes as my legs pass through different traditional territories halfway around the world from her home. My hands are also お爺さんの, cooking gigantic batches of food for the different farmhands that temporarily labour on the 後藤 property in 阿蘇郡. These reverberations do not strictly pass through bloodlines, but also in unexpected social configurations that shifts one’s embodied experience and point of view. 我々, Peter and I occupy space as a new alignment, one that is reiterative at the same time that it reorganizes memory, past and future. In this temporary configuration, we learn that our memories are not our own. These creative assemblages can seem monstrous, perhaps frightening to some of the humans present, who may try to maintain the independence of a single person’s body, gender, thought processes, and emotions. Yet, in Peter’s and my uncertain 合作, such collisions are not necessarily evidence of unprecedented occurrences, but merely a demonstration of the timelessness of human interdependence.
Chapter Seven: Culminations

In this chapter, I wish to gather together the spaces, people, undertakings, and knowledges that have been variably covered in the previous chapters. First, I will reflect upon the ways in which relationship building has driven this research, and duly consider the limitations that potentially develop as a result. Second, I will discuss how prioritizing relationality might encourage researchers such as myself to reconsider the spacing and pacing, ordering, and organization of our investigations in our efforts to come to know within an institutional setting. Third, upon thinking through the performatives of witnessing Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, I will suggest that collective responsibility is socially more meaningful if understood as being practice/incipulation-based rather than as an a priori deontological ethical imperative. Finally, following from the discussion on the practice of ethical regard, I will return to the topic of reconciliation with respect to that which has materialized in the shadows of witnessing.

7.1 Relationality: Love

I love the land and love Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter. In the different ways that I have come to learn of their practices, histories, cultural and linguistic inheritances, and especially how they each actively witness the worlds they inhabit, I have developed a deep appreciation for their ways of being and doing. But love is strange, isn’t it? For in the name of unconditional love, the greatest acts of self-sacrifice compete with examples of utter human debasement. A declaration of love does not guarantee that one will treat the other well, nor can it be presumed that a person will always or should even fall into indiscriminating agreement with those whom they love. Conflicts will arise, and in the actions that exceed one’s intentions, outcomes and motivations may be misunderstood. A great deal of hermeneutical ambivalences manifest in the movement from intention to enactment. Perhaps then it is of value to consider some of the possible limitations of the dynamics established in those relationships.

7.1.1 Limitations in running the land

Running the land is an intimate engagement yet, at the same time, it is oddly disaffecting. You can run the same route thousands of times, but by taking one step to the right or left, your foot meets unfamiliar ground. Running to exhaustion is a humbling process. Time is rendered meaningless in the attempt to cover an endless terrain, pushing the body and spirit to their limits. Sometimes the two kinds of breakdown coincide, while in other cases, they abandon the presentation of individual kinetic composure in distinct ways. Despite the vaporization of spirit, the mechanical habit of
placing one foot in front of the other can carry the body onwards seemingly infinitely. Conversely, regardless of a strong will, a leg muscle cramp, rumbling stomach, acute dehydration, heatstroke can all lead to physical collapse. Mind you, there are instances that the inner resolve has the power to force the body to stand back up and hobble to the intended destination. If the destination is not a geographical location but a state of affairs or perspectival shift, then running as a means to better understand the world is relationally restrictive.

Running as a social practice, which stems from engrained physical training, relies upon and is regulated by corporeal routine. In other words, a well-trained body finds the pace at which it runs most efficiently. A habituated pace imposes a speed at which interactions can or cannot take place. Experiencing the world at the same speed means that one might pass through while failing to take notice of spatial presences, refraining from moving closer in beyond making a cursory acknowledgement of human, plant, cloud, sun-flecked insect beings. Furthermore, runners’ bodies are notoriously known for becoming stiff and inflexible. Certain muscles are overworked while others are neglected, prone to developing into repetitive strain and wastage-related injuries, respectively. In keeping with Nishida’s (1966) suggestion that thought follows rather than precedes bodily engagement with the world, perhaps embodied inflexibility educates the mind to work through ideas and relationships in a similarly unyielding fashion. Creating new human-land requires manual and intellectual labour in equal measure. What if the land speaks at a different tempo than the speed at which a person passes through? And what if the sky, wind, scattering seeds, and leaves demand a different orientation in order to create an interrelation than the one prescribed by the swiftly moving form? For as much as can be learned in a pedagogy of running, the limited range of motion encourages bodily adjustments in response to the apprehension of unexpected encounters.

7.1.2 Limitations of a relation

Mentorship, as was discussed with regard to sonorously shadowing Cheryl, is an ever-shifting state of relational affairs. Because of the extraordinary socio-political and cultural range of Cheryl’s practices, it is a rather daunting task to try to figure out where and how to follow her lead. Without conceit or knowing that she has even done so, however, she takes on the role of with aplomb, demonstrating through her actions and words how one might enter into complex conversations about Indigeneity,
emancipatory movements, and personal responsibility. I have a vivid memory of Cheryl carefully walking me through Steve Loft’s (2013) curated show, *Ghost Dance: Activism. Resistance. Art.*\(^{11}\) as she explains the importance of acknowledging and learning from activist and creative works that have come prior to one’s own attempts to make or do something of social value. Through the discussion of momentous political and artistic events and the ways in which they had personally informed and impacted her own creative pursuits, I believe that Cheryl was setting an example of being mindful of the life of an idea or work of art, which exceeds individual artistic intentions and containment. To put it bluntly, Cheryl actively abnegates the centralizing of the star artist. Instead, she encourages those around her to think and act collaboratively with due respect to works that have contributed to the easing of one’s own practice, and to anticipate how one’s works might do so in kind for future generations.

At best, the 先輩-後輩 relationship creates a learning environment in which the 後輩 witnesses, consults with the 先輩, then practices through repetition and critical assessment of the 先輩’s examples. However, there are many points at which the 先輩-後輩 association can break down. First, recall that in Chapter Four, I encouraged the 後輩 to choose the 先輩 rather than vice-versa. I made this suggestion, because of the hierarchical relationship inherent in the 先輩-後輩 dyad. I do not mean to disparage the wide varieties of mentorship programs that exist in business and social work settings. And there are occasions in which learning to command attention is a laudable pursuit, especially for those who tend to shrink away from centralizing themselves, even when they might need to step up to and for someone or something. My primary concern is that the self-appointed 先輩 might be susceptible to dictating the terms of the relationship. Perhaps there is a lack of humility in those who designate themselves to be a 先輩 as if to make a pronouncement about the importance of their points of view and ways of doing things in the world. Remember that in the Japanese linguistic articulation of the 先輩-後輩 relationship, both are active learners, with the one in senior relation to the other. If mentoring is understood in this way, the balance of power occurs, in part, exterior to the specific 先輩-後輩 bond to include the 先輩’s role as 後輩 in another relation. In other

\(^{11}\text{Ghost Dance: Activism. Resistance. Art} \text { was exhibited at the Ryerson Image Centre, Ryerson University, Toronto, between September 18 – December 15, 2013. This exhibit was discussed earlier in Chapter Two of this thesis.}\)
words, 先輩 themselves are in a perpetual state of learning. Yet, 先輩 too intent on
guiding and grooming the 後輩 can become inflexible and dogmatic in their methods,
with expectations that the 後輩 will unquestionably abide by the 先輩’s orders.

Second, in a 先輩-後輩 relationship, the 後輩 can also generate problematic
interactions. In informal settings and in the randomness of forming a 先輩-後輩
collection, the 後輩 can just as much become demanding of the chosen 先輩’s time and
ways of being. The 後輩’s initially honourable intentions of following a person whom they
admire can be the very grounds for building up unrealistic (and often unspoken) hopes of
who the 先輩 will be for them. Alternatively, in situations where the 先輩 does not wish to
be considered a mentor, undue pressure is placed upon them to perform to the 後輩’s
expectations. That is, the 先輩’s life becomes instrumentalized for the benefit of the 後輩,
who may struggle to appreciate the 先輩 outside of their need of them. In such cases, an
imbalance occurs between the proximities of engagement; as the 先輩-後輩 relationship
develops, it is easy for distal witnessing to give way to sustaining intensely close
interactions that can become claustrophobic for both parties.

Third, it is difficult to negotiate conflicts and disagreements that arise within
increasingly rigid 先輩-後輩 interactions. How is one able to disagree in a respectful
manner? In martial arts and in art practice in general, the concept of 守破離 (shuhari) is
of central importance. Each ideogram describes a different step in the process of moving
from student to master. 守 means to watch over or protect (Kodansha’s Essential Kanji
Dictionary, 2011, p. 229, entry 466). This character represents a student who protects a
legacy or teaching by learning or emulating it so that it will survive into the future. 破
means to break or destroy (Kodansha’s Essential Kanji Dictionary, 2011, p. 617, entry
1401). In the context of art practice, this character speaks to the point at which the
student learns to be innovative or creative, and to break from the master’s instruction.
Finally, 離 means to separate or leave (Kodansha’s Essential Kanji Dictionary, 2011, p.
798, entry 1857). Within the discipline development of 守破離, this character can refer to
transcendence. In other words, in order to master the craft, one must learn to acquire a
critical purview that exceeds the immersive trial and error of training. This transcendence
is not meant to be understood as the student surpassing or outgrowing the teacher, but
to signal an alternative way to engage with the craft. Within the 先輩-後輩 relationship,
the challenge is to leave the mentor’s methods as an honouring act rather than discourteous rejection. If either the 先輩 or 後輩 try to wield too much control in the relationship, it becomes very difficult to resolve a conflict in a respectful and caring manner.

The concerns raised above underscore the need for creating an atmosphere within the 先輩-後輩 relationship that will allow for ongoing perspectival and experiential shifts between the mentor and mentee. Without the inculcation of interrelational flexibility, a mentorship can easily break down due to unspoken and unresolved expectations, (unintentional) invasion of personal space, and conflicts over creative license and direction.

7.1.3 Limitations of a ロールモデル relation

More detached and one-sided than the 先輩-後輩 relationship, the identification and adherence to a ロールモデル, nonetheless begins similarly to a mentorship. With both Cheryl and Adrian, their work and practices draw my attention, and in their reaching out to connect with those around them, I attempt to reach back. However, in looking up to Adrian as a ロールモデル, he might never know that he is being thought of in this manner. Discussed at length in Chapter Five, Adrian’s practice teaches the importance of reaching inwards in order to build relationships with others in a deeply meaningful and heartful way. This reaching inwards at times turns the focus away from Adrian due to abidance to rather than a rejection of the relational example that he has set.

In following through with Adrian’s paradigm, perhaps one of the most pressing concerns regarding the ロールモデル relation is the unexpected ease with which Adrian’s life can become objectified. One need only recollect the グラビアアイドル Minegishi Minami incident discussed in Chapter Five to consider the swift transformation from admiring someone into idealizing and creating one’s perfect vision of them. Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, Miss Chief…all iconic figures, larger than life. They each have the power to inspire their audiences to think and act differently toward European colonization, gender, sexuality, and human/non-human relations. At the same time, this very power can be used against them. It is possible that a fan, excited by one or all of the personae in some way – whether intellectually, emotionally, politically, creatively – might unknowingly begin to build up expectations as to how each icon must continue to be. In the オタク fan’s mind, the icon effectively can become fixed in the time and space in which the life-changing impression was made.
Idolized objectification is disquieting for a number of reasons. First, it can creatively freeze the practitioner from moving beyond that which has been popularly consumed. In Adrian’s case, audience demands for sightings of Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, and Miss Chief can distract creative attention away from the exploration of new content and states of affairs. Second, the freezing up of these personae may lead to a fan-enforced immobilization of Adrian’s political and ideological expressions. What happens if Adrian changes his mind about the reach and processes of colonial control, gender fluidities, human/animal interbeing? What if he disagrees with or shifts his perspective because of the possibly transformative nature of his performances? As an immovable object of a fan’s admiration, such modifications might either go unnoticed or be rendered meaningless, if they do not subscribe to the narrative demands of the preoccupied fan. Moreover, any creative shift could easily be perceived to be a personal affront to the オタク fan, where the icon sits accused of not appreciating or feeding into the fan’s adulation and, consequently, insistences. Third, the grand gestures of the performer might lead audiences to conflate public personae with private musings. Perhaps in the current social-technological milieu, such confusions are to be expected, given the increasingly blurred boundaries between the 裏 and 表. At a time when anything said and done can be recorded, uploaded, go viral, amass a following or elicit vast outrage, what is constituted as private or public is becoming one and the same. Under the influence of perceived public scrutiny – even if exaggerated to be larger and more far-reaching than in actuality – it could be that the presentation and preservation of a socially accepted self comes at the cost of trying out (and perhaps failing at) new things, seeking out new acquaintanceships, and changing one’s movements through political ideas and ethno-culturally inscribed community spaces. In other words, social expectations and pressures could oblige the ロールモデル/アイドル to self-surveil, thereby delimiting their own capacities to change, grow/shrink, and take on other points of view.

It is important to raise one’s awareness of ロールモデル objectification because, with such attentiveness, one can begin to appreciate how initially good intentions and admiration of another can transmogrify into the control and containment of that other. By thinking through these limitations, hopefully, it will create enough of a pause to be sensitive to the human potential to control and objectify one another.
7.1.4 Limitations of a best friendship 合作

The challenges of collaborating and presenting within a best friendship are daunting, possibly insurmountable, and sometimes very playful and funny. In effect, the 場 of our developing best friendship is the studio and performance space. This 場 negotiates through and sometimes confronts other established fields of human and non-human being. In the midst of a performance, it is possible to pinpoint the moment that it all begins to unravel, things veer far from 我々の initial intentions to unexpected ends. As was covered in Chapter Six, meaning-making and social interactions are not nor should they be under the complete regulation of the artists. Instead, a creative presence can be thought of as making a suggestion or a shift in the 風土 of a temporarily demarcated space. A growing best friendship serving as the 場 of a performative interjection can lead to further obfuscation of the boundaries between private and public, performance and performatives, self and other knowledge. Several limitations may arise as a result of a best friendship-based 合作.

First, whether experienced as the best, worst, or a middling performance, the performers can easily become overwhelmed by their and the audience’s activated emotions, interpretations, and movements. In presenting as 我々, the challenge is to take responsibility in a meaningful and respectful way. For those situations in which the performance has unravelled, it is not uncommon for the performers to take a defensive stance, creating a strong “we” versus all of the misunderstanding “yous,” which comprise the audience. In other words, the compulsion to protect a 我々 self can lead to the creation of rigid boundaries that exclude those perceived as threatening the pre-established ordering of ideas and relationships. The defensive 我々 might resort to counter-arguing that the confusion or affront was not intentional; however, this reaction shuts down the possibilities of generating discussions about the manifestations that have exceeded conscious and tacit expectations. A performance judged solely on the performers’ intentions does not register all of the other actions that arise alongside the set plan. The audience’s criticisms oftentimes bring to the fore the reiteration of the performers’ deeply engrained, embodied habits, which might work counter to their rationalized intentions. It is important to be cool, listen, and then reflect, in order to ensure that the friendship can be one that welcomes the presence of unexpected others.

Second, as a best friendship develops, it becomes surprisingly easy to overestimate how much the friends know of one another and to forget to inquire about
that which is not known. The subjectivities of a best friendship are such that it can lead one to assume that who they are to one another is replicated in who they are to others. Yet, the 間柄 between two friends is circumstantially unique; no two friendships are identical. It becomes difficult to remain socially fair when one becomes a witness to conflicts between their best friend and others. As an act of filial allegiance, or to maintain a state of relational affairs, or to seek approval and reassurance of belonging somewhere, the witness might unquestionably side with their best friend. They make this choice without pausing to think about the identified adversary’s experiences, life situations, and specific interactions both with and beyond the best friend’s viewpoint. A person who hermeneutically seals their understanding of the other wholly based on their best friendship with them effectively dehumanizes them. The 風土 of the best friendship can stifle one’s appreciation for the grand scope of the existential other, who in different times/tempos and interpersonal contexts, can be a downright 糞たれ, more or less generous, changeable… in short, uncontainable. Furthermore, fixation on one’s assumed knowledge of the intimate other can lead to the dehumanizing of others who are overlooked and cast aside in one’s dyadic preoccupation with only those who fit well within one’s world and relational views.

Third, in perceiving a best friendship to be a new subjectivity that exists in excess of the individuals involved, those individuals might be disposed to presenting themselves in a continuous state of “we.” This “we-ness” can become problematic in that one can easily fall into the habit of speaking for the other, presenting a homogenous front when in fact, there exist differential histories, political stances, and interpretations of their social engagements. Moreover, the line between “speaking on behalf of us” and “speaking for the other” can blur quickly and without notice. Depending on the relational dynamics between the best friends, one can consistently be too 隆, and the other too 阴 in the public presentation of the relationship as well as in private interactions. Straightforwardly put, unequal power relations can build up in the best of friendships, even with the noblest of starts and intentions.

Despite the limitations discussed above, there is much to be learned from prioritizing relationality in search of a more nuanced understanding between Indigenous and non-Indigenous interrelations. By focusing on specific relationships – 先輩-後輩, ロールモデル, and best friendship 合作 – it is possible to viscerally experience the socio-
political limits of depending upon a normative Indigenous/non-Indigenous division. As well, one can better appreciate the complex lives of those who have been subsumed in one of these categories. My overarching motivation for centralizing relationships is to inhibit the potential to objectify Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter in my efforts to learn more about and from them. And in this process, I become increasingly aware of the intersubjective nature and subjectivities involved in the shaping of living knowledge.

In the following discussion, I will revisit topics introduced at the beginning of and throughout this dissertation. Space and time, research methodology, ethics, and reconciliation: each will be addressed with respect to that which I have learned in the performatives of sonorously shadowing Cheryl, performatively shadowing Adrian, and tactiley shadowing Peter.

### 7.2 Relational ontologies of space and time

Relationally driven knowledge construction transforms the experiences and conceptualizations of space and time. In *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) expresses concern over the European, imperialist, modern industrial, and scientific structuring of time and space. She argues that in Euro-Western academic thought, space is often viewed as static and divorced from time (p. 55). Whereas, in many Indigenous cosmologies, space and time are indistinct categories (Smith, 1999, p. 52). Smith states that in the Maori language, the word for space and time are one and the same (p. 53). Reflecting upon Smith’s dualistic comparison between Euro-Western and Indigenous knowledges, I am much too novice in my grasp of Cree, Blackfoot, and Tahltan cosmologies to state with any sense of authority time-space relations. I do recollect, however, the thoughts of specific scholars and knowledge keepers that resonate with my own upbringing with regard to space and time, which may create alternate valuations to modernist, labour-centric imaginings.

In *Research is Ceremony*, Cree philosopher and education scholar Shawn Wilson (2008) suggests that different Indigenous research methodologies have in common the notion that relationships form reality (p. 137). Wilson’s assertion is echoed in Smith’s questioning of the individual as the basic social unit from which other levels of social organization take shape (Smith, 1999, p. 51). Likewise, in describing the Siksika language, Blackfoot knowledge keeper and scholar Leroy Little Bear (2004, 2012) explains that language emerges as an event, a manifestation from a wider reality, which is in constant flux. Within that temporary appearance, existence simultaneously remains unbound, so much so that according to Little Bear, only the present is of significance.
If any temporal meaning is to be derived, it could be suggested that time within different relational contexts transforms into tempo. Each relationship has its own rhythm and pacing, creating a spatial shaping that exceeds physical proximities. Cheryl L’Hirondelle, Kym Gouchie, and Joseph Naytowhow’s voices create a larger spatial, and thus temporal presence in passing through the land. As the visible human body takes on a sonorous shape through reverberation and echo, so too is time shaped and manifested as sound. Cheryl’s artistic practice is politicized. Instead of showcasing her multiple skills as personal accomplishments, Cheryl utilizes them resourcefully to establish a space where people can come to know one another. Her extensive works – music, performance, interactive media – demonstrate the interconnectedness between Indigenous activism and art production. Yet her reach extends beyond Indigenous-only communities and art worlds to be radically inclusive of those who tend to be overlooked, whether they are members of groups that have been stigmatized in some way or personally timid about speaking up amongst strangers. Because Cheryl discloses the associations between far past and far future politico-artistic moments, the present moment is imbued with social significance and meaning; past and future events are contained in the present. Cheryl’s careful efforts to make sense of multiple lineages, which are in perpetual historical and epistemic flux, transform space into something that can be traversed recurrently if need be, until one reaches a better understanding.

With Adrian, time and space scatter beyond visible measure. His alter egos playfully dare their audiences to follow suit, not through identical impersonation, but in the spirit of developing more politically and socially nuanced relationships with their multiple selves. Through his own investigations, Adrian exhibits the actions through which parallel worlds open up, creating innumerable chances to be differently engaged with others – historically, temporally, and spatially. Due to variations in human-to-human/non-human arrangements and interactions in each world, living occurs at altered states of pitch, vibration, and population densities and content. This could mean that the shapes and sizes of these separate realities are so incongruent that they might pass through each other without notice. Then again, they could periodically exist in states that resemble one another enough to coalesce and intermingle. Adrian demonstrates the metaphysical existences of time and space. Spiritual and physical presences can be in multiple places at once, challenging the linearly imagined predictions of human and non-human extinctions, survival, and transformations.

Peter renders multiple generations into the present moment through his gathering
acts. Peter’s embodied practice invites past and future ancestors to reside together in one place simultaneously. Time travel is instantaneous in the darkened proficiencies of the intuited body. Peter shows that these intuitions manifest in the spaces of acknowledging one’s vulnerabilities and fluidities, much beyond the visual apperception of individual existence. His work is a performative translation of the Tahltan and Stikine: one can reside in two rivers concurrently. In collaboration with those of dissimilar ancestries, Peter’s training offers a means to collapse the seemingly impassable spaces in between. Old acquaintanceships are received anew, and new relations reiterate ancient memories. Throughout, memory is the intangible precipitate of space and time travel as experienced within the sinews of being.

Time and space continuously shape-shift within relational states of affairs. These changes can be revolutionary, reiterative, and habituated, depending upon the specific interactants involved, how relationships are sustained, and the intersubjective spirit of thought formation. The relational organization of space and time affects how one approaches and defines the parameters of a research methodology in an institutionalized academic setting.

7.3 Methodology: In the shadows of witnessing performance

Am I proposing shadowing to be a type of research method? At the beginning of all of this, I believed that I was working toward formulating something akin to a politically informed methodology. Taking Smith’s (1999) unease with the functioning of time and space in institutional learning spaces to heart, and in thinking about the academic structuring of knowledge, I grew concerned about the ways that an overly deterministic methodology could direct my newly developing relationships to Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter. I was cognizant too of the larger political context: the national project of circulating reconciliation discourse; ongoing divisions and tensions between Indigenous, White, and visibly racialized communities; and the binaristic cultivation of Indigenous versus Western knowledge. Furthermore, I could not forget what I had learned from the Aboriginal Healing Foundation’s publication, *From Truth to Reconciliation: Transforming the Legacy of Residential Schools* (Castellano, Archibald, & DeGagné, 2008). Contained within this first anthology of a three-volume series on reconciliation in Canada were contributors from various types of social organizations – child welfare services, Christian churches, education, law enforcement – all of whom discussed the need for making systemic shifts, so that Indigenous people and communities would not continually be
confronted with colonially-based systemic discrimination in Canadian society. This is such a pressing concern. As an individual graduate student, how could I address their call?

The pursuit of a Ph.D. with regard to these wider social considerations becomes an ambivalent affair. Whereas contributors to *From Truth to Reconciliation* (Castellano, Archibald, & DeGagné, 2008) are appealing for organizations to transform, the Ph.D. is about producing and justifying knowledge within a particular discipline so as to reconstitute those disciplinary parameters. Yikes! At the beginning of this investigation, you could say that I was a bit too binaristic and 糞たれ in my thinking as in, “Yah, yah, bring down the system! Indigenous, 1 point, Western, 0…raaaaaahhh!” (steaming face emoji). But as I have reflected over the years, I have come to identify what I admire about learning institutions: those moments when people of various disciplines and knowledges gather to work through difficult ideas together. The challenge then is not to vilify the institution as though it were an anachronistic, immovable boogyman, but to consider the limits of what can be produced within its walls, to identify the porous and flexible parts that are more vulnerable to systemic shifting, to consider how individuals such as myself have benefited from passing through this particular organization of knowledge, and to reflect upon how we/I might involuntarily contribute to the reconstitution of British colonially premised educational bodies. I have come to appreciate that sizeable transformation in the structuring of institutionalized knowledge is a step-by-step and multiple-approach process. Even that which might be considered to be the minutest shift away from academically ingrained habits may contribute to change that will benefit everyone, leaving no one behind.

In decentralizing methodology and prioritizing my relationships to Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, I hoped to avoid objectifying them in the very process of meditating upon Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations. Somehow the relationships needed to exist in excess of university and Communication Studies requirements. And each relationship was so distinct, exceeding the Indigenous and non-Indigenous binary of social engagement. This is what I have come to learn so far.

When I first became interested in examining the relational dynamics between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities within a nationally instituted reconciliation discourse, it was not my intention to engage in performance art practice. Yet, circumstances were such that I kept finding myself in the company of Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter. By listening to their perspectives, watching their performances, and walking
through their art installations at galleries and in public spaces, I was profoundly moved to respond. I was in awe of how openly they shared the impacts of residential school, colonization, and ongoing discrimination in their personal relationships, hearts, and beliefs. The discipline with which they honed their craft so that more people might become interested in listening to the narratives told from their perspectives, left a lasting impression. In their separate ways, it felt like they were asking the audience not to remain as passive bystanders, but to answer their call, to take the risk of reaching back toward them while investigating with sincerity one’s own past, political dispositions, and socio-cultural senses of obligation.

In moving closer in, I have come to learn that the call and response of witnessing is a full-bodied, full-spirit endeavour, in excess of intellectual ruminations alone. I realize that in their performances, Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter themselves are witnesses, sharing what they have learned in: the multiple communities that they inhabit; the innumerable risks that they have made in testing the boundaries of cultural and political belonging; and the flows of histories and narratives that pass through them. In the embodiments of these teachings, their respective performance works carry a sense of authoritative knowledge as well as urgency. In their own ways, Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter have much to teach. As such, much time, conversation, and reflection are required to try to figure out what kind of shadow best corresponds with the relationship that has begun to take shape. Knowing why, but unable to pinpoint exactly when, I begin to shadow their respective practices.

Recall Little Bear’s (2000) contention that no one person can ever fully grasp the collective whole; rather each reporting is that which has been subjectively experienced (p. 79). The intersubjective sharing of subjectively established truths can be gathered into a sense of collective knowledge from which new truths continuously emerge. This collective knowledge could seem fully immersive and complete in and of itself, and distinguishable from other cosmological orderings of knowledge, specifically, ideas and ways of being that fall under the designation of “Euro-Western”. But as has been discussed in previous chapters, the binary between Indigenous and Western knowledges does not encompass other ways of knowing that both coincide with and differ from either constructed worldviews.

In keeping with Little Bear (2000) and other Indigenous scholars who describe Indigenous knowledges as subjective and intersubjective, a collective responsibility arises in coming to understand the complex multiplicities of colonial experiences that
lead to different conceptualizations of the colonizer, colonized, and the system within which both positions are subsumed. In *Location of Culture*, Homi Bhabha’s (1994) theorizing of hybridity reverberates with Little Bear’s (2000) contention that everyone is somehow intermixed, and capable of experiencing and knowing in multiple ways. Bhabha describes hybridity as an “interstitial passage” or “third space,” where fixed identities have the potential to experiment and entertain difference beyond the imposition of political hierarchy (p. 4). For Bhabha, hybridity signifies a strategic reversal of domination, unsettling colonial demands for fixing the identity of the colonized and colonizer (p. 112). It would seem that Bhabha sees the third space as a location in which culture reaches beyond prescriptive political containments of identity formation, and that one can exist in excess of one’s intentions, expectations, and control over meanings that arise from the act (p. 70).

Unforgettably asking, “Can the subaltern speak?”, post-colonial, Marxist feminist scholar Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1994) goes on to present a less optimistic perspective on the potential for socio-political transformation within the “third space.” By examining women’s capacity to be witnessed and heard, specifically from a post-colonial, national Indian political and economic context against Eurocentric ideologies, Spivak reaches the disheartening conclusion that the subaltern cannot speak (p. 104). In her influential essay, the subaltern is a woman’s space, a location of culture that has become heavily imbued with politically, psychologically, religiously, and class-based gendered social habits and expectations. Overloaded with verbalized meanings that are imposed by multiple patriarchal sources upon women’s bodies and activities, it would seem that representations of women are far beyond their own control.

Contemporaneous with the publication of Bhabha’s (1994) *The Location of Culture*, Spivak’s (1994) analysis is similarly contained within a visually based theorization of identity formation and representation. Discussed in Chapter Three, I wish to reiterate the idea that by centralizing the visual imaginary of colonization and the colonizer/colonized positions, the who being investigated becomes a what, an object of study. This what is visible, identifiable, describable. Upon retrospection, deconstructive strategies to pick apart the ways in which colonial hegemony heterogeneously imposes upon bodies to create colonized identities are more methodologically related to modern, social scientific measures than anticipated or desired. It is possible to consider that deconstructionist methods present a mirror image of sociological positivism; both are dependent upon visually identifying and fixing into categorical place ways of being and
acting in the world. Thus, the third space or subaltern comes to be known as visible locations and stable designations of cultural, national, and colonial identities. Prescribed political and social roles regulate where and how one resides.

Moreover, in both methodological forms, language constitutes social reality. Spivak (1994), rather than Bhabha (1994), tends to align with Judith Butler (1988) on this matter. Spivak’s presentation of subaltern existence and Butler’s conception of performativity coincide inasmuch as language has primacy over the meaning of the act. In linguistic determinism, language succinctly inscribes meaning to human actions, thoughts, and interactions (Enfield, 2015; Hussein, 2012; Lucy, 2001).

To be honest, my own project is premised upon a type of linguistic determinism, or specifically, linguistic relativism so far as I argue that 孝行, 生活の美学, 糞たれ, alongside other Japanese terms, and the language itself shape the way I interpret and interact in the world. However, my approach can be distinguished from Spivak and Butler, and affiliated with Bhabha, through the notion that being and actions precede language. Words have meaning because of the actions; they are felt through the body, a shadow presence that in turn reconstitutes one’s understanding of moving in-between, through, and in relation to others. I am attracted to Bhabha’s theorizing of excess and ambivalence, that somehow living cannot be contained by the words that are said to describe the acts, and that emotional and embodied experiences often precede attentive cognition. Have we each not had experiences where we have stumbled to reach for words that still do not quite capture the feeling or moment?

The idea that being exceeds language brings to mind modern Japanese philosopher, Nishida Kitarō’s (1966) concept of “acting intuition” (p. 95). Recall from Chapter Four, that for Nishida, the body rather than intellect is central to understanding oneself non-dualistically in relation to the world (Krueger, 2008, p. 213). Simultaneously subject and object, the body acts upon the world just as it is acted upon by the world (Yuasa, 1987, p. 67). The self-contradictory body is fluid, a dynamic unity of acts between the formed and forming. This means that meanings are in flux, positions can shift, and one’s sense of agency is an embodied experience. What binds Spivak (1994), Butler (1988), Nishida (1966), and Bhabha (1994) together, however, is their adherence to describing how the visibly individual subject addresses and/or is subjected to great
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112 As American linguist and psychologist, John A. Lucy (2001) explains, no “serious scholar” subscribes to a strict sense of linguistic determinism (p. 903).
hegemonic duress, and to the historical precipitates that specifically weigh down upon them, fastening them (and intellectual imaginations) into a specific place, time, and sets of movement.

Despite this critical discussion regarding the visual and, in Spivak’s (1994) case, linguistic limitations of a sophisticated post-colonial critique of lives in the subaltern, I am greatly indebted to Bhabha (1994) and Spivak, for they have brought to critical and creative attention a third state of affairs. The task now is to move this third space beyond the mind’s eye, to unfix it, and to contemplate how it exists fluidly, through the body, in relation to others, whether the other is understood as multi-directionally split senses of self, or it is inclusive of unexpected others that continuously pass through.

Shadows are the third space found everywhere and nowhere, depending upon their relationships to or disconnections from all else in the surround. Under the right conditions, they appear, and under the right conditions, they disappear. Ontologically substrative, other beings must be present before shadows can form. The relationships created or existing in between affect the scope, shape, movement, and the very meaning of shadow and non-shadow, reciprocally.

In following Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, I slowly begin to experience shadows not metaphorically but as an actual non-visual state of being. Sonorous shadows vibrationally extend beyond the visibly individual human form. Cheryl’s songs cast shadows that produce co-extensive land-human forms so that I alone am not a shadow but part of something larger than my expected self. Sonorous shadows transmogrify through sound, providing evidence for the non-material nature of space and time travel. It could be that this is how ancestors travel, as memory reconstituted into thought. In adhering to Adrian’s practice, meanwhile, I learn that performative shadows can become or be perceived to be politically ambivalent. Disagreements can arise, not due to combative rational discourse, but due to the revelations that occur from deep investigations into one’s own history, values, and socio-culturally enforced habituations. Taking Adrian’s directions to shape-shift how one passes through the land, I realize that the labour required to meet up again after foraying anew into one’s assumed knowledges and alliances is much more intersubjectively arduous and politically nourishing than imagined at the outset. And in tactilely shadowing Peter, in the quick switches between shadow and non-shadow being, I become aware of the simplicity with which one can unintentionally overtake another’s voice, narratives, and ways of being. I also become viscerally attuned to the presence of past and future ancestors, and how
they can travel between differently lineaged bodies when those bodies develop interrelational movements that will welcome them. Upon reflection, in becoming sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows, and in my attempts to abide well by Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, I am literally moved to consider the vital, spiritual circulation of knowledge. Spiritual knowledge is invisible to, therefore cannot be contained by visual measure. Living in excess of categorized nomenclature, it can be wordlessly experienced and has the potential to remain untethered to ideological directives. These in-between existences create breathing space so that the examination of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations can be an exceedingly creative, playful, and process-based endeavour rather than a teleologically determined directive.

Although substrative, I wish to suggest that the human becoming shadow nonetheless brings their own sets of cultural knowledge, experiences, values, and historically imbued meaning. That which is carried by the shadow will, in turn, affect social and creative practices and interactions, institutional and otherwise. This shadow might resound with rather than drastically contrast from distinctive and transnationalized Indigenous epistemologies. For instance, the prioritizing of relationships over the objectification of knowledge formation as espoused by many Indigenous scholars is not foreign to me. Raised within a Japanese value-laden and multi-Asian cultural and political context, relationality has been inculcated both within the family home and in the mushroom farm community. I am not so astute as to declare that all Asian cultures are infinitely relationally motivated and communicative, just that in a specific time and place, the meeting up of multiple Asian lives seemed to best reside together within the interrelational practice of 孝行. Because of this upbringing, I have come to appreciate the usefulness and reaching the limits of 孝行 in my attempts to abide well by a stranger, friend, teacher, idea, or value. And in following Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, I come to experience the conflicts and ambivalences that can arise in the interrelationships between 孝行, 生活の美学, and being a 糞たれ.

Sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows are relationally specific and subject to my developing connections and disconnections to Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, respectively. A highly subjective and intersubjective experience, in their absence, and in adhering to others, my comprehension of these inter-specific shadows would shift dramatically. Were someone other than myself to abide by Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, their own historical, cultural, bodily, and relational states of affairs would again radically transform the meaning of being and casting these non-visual shadows. That person
might not choose to apprentice in performance practice. Even if they self-identify as Japanese, such as one of my sisters, they may not consider 孝行 and 生活の美学 as formative to engaging with Indigenous ways of knowing. The over 200 languages spoken in Canada might be indicative of the many other shadows that are present and arising from the multiplicitous 間柄 of Indigenous and non-Indigenous engagements. These inter-perspectives are yet to be heard, experienced, felt, and imagined in a sustained manner. No one voice or interrelation is meant to speak on behalf of homogenized others or to select and canonize that which is deemed most worthy of protecting. Rather, from this multiplicity perhaps one can better come to value shadow existences and the lessons afforded therein.

At this point, the most I can say about sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows is that their embodied meanings come prior to cognitive understanding. Gerald Vizenor (1999) explains more succinctly when he states:

The shadows are the prenarrative silence that inherits the words; shadows are the motions that mean the silence, but not the presence or absence of entities. The sounds of words, not the entities of shadows and natural reason, are limited in human consciousness and the distance of discourse. Shadows are honored in memories and the silence of tribal stones.

(p. 64)

The question is: what does it mean to witness and engage with others from this third space, this location that eludes wordful containment? In these spaces, shadow presence is of a difference in kind; it exists in decentralized, substrative relation to something or someone other. This third space is one in which one’s sense of political and social identity does not end with the self but considers how that identity affects one’s interactions with someone or something other, especially when least expected. In other words, the subaltern is a witnessing stance, one that demands a lot of relational experimentation in the midst of not knowing moments. I am not saying that certain groups should always reside in the subaltern; rather, I am suggesting that depending upon the focus, the subaltern continuously shifts. If one were to find themselves in this third space, it gives them the chance to shut up and listen, to imagine outside of their own will, intentions, plans, and habituated ways of viewing the world.

In centralizing specific relationships, established, disciplinarily invoked research methodologies are scattered, and become one of many kinds of knowledges that can be drawn upon in the attempt to build better relations, hopefully for the benefit of all those
concerned. A method then might emerge too as a shadow in the spaces in between the self and other, an outcome or precipitate rather than an a priori procedure in knowledge creation.

At this time, I am still unable to determine whether or not these relationally catalyzed ruminations are indeed indigenist. Shawn Wilson’s (2008) presentation of an indigenist research paradigm in Chapter Two might resonate with ways in which I have shadowed and performatively responded to Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter’s respective calls. In becoming a shadow, I have attempted to ground the performatives of witnessing in Indigenous epistemologies, supported by Elders such as Shirley Bear and those in Indigenous/racialized artistic communities that have invited me to participate. And throughout the thesis, and in the development of a performance practice, I have tried to reach toward Indigenous languages and cultures through the Japanese language, familial and transnational socializations, and post-colonial thought. In these attempts, Indigenous thought continues to be witnessed as living and thriving processes, as articulated by Indigenous scholars and knowledge keepers alike. Ultimately, however, perhaps it is not for me make the assessment that this research has turned out to be indigenist after all. It could be that more than one instance of a researcher becoming a shadow in contemplating Indigenous ways of knowing is required. As knowledge developed in the specificities of relational space and time, the accumulation of many more voices that emerge from their own experiences of coming to know might fulfill Wilson’s methodological expectations.

7.4 Intentional into practice-based ethics: Collected, collecting, and collective responsibilities

In situations where relationships regulate the spaces, time/timing/pacing, and practices of engagement, ethical considerations, like research methodologies, are profoundly affected. A customary approach to investigating an idea is to plan methodologically far and deeply in advance. Once the ontological, epistemological, and specific research methods have been selected, in studies involving humans, the next step is to draft up a plan for review through the university’s ethics committee. To get researchers to try to anticipate all of the potential ways in which their investigations can cause harm is such an important endeavour because it gives pause for students and tenured scholars alike to ponder the motivations behind and selected methods for pursuing an idea. Furthermore, the practice of laying out strategies in order to avoid or rectify those missteps prompts researchers to protect the rights and well-being of
recruited participants.

Through a developing performance practice, I am constantly reminded that best-laid plans do not guarantee good and respectful outcomes. This lesson has contributed to my wariness around the relational value of applying for ethical approval at the beginning of an investigation. So much cannot be anticipated at the outset, and then when things do go awry, it is easy to become defensive. Since a great deal of time, thought, and care have gone into submitting a study for ethical approval, I can understand why researchers might hesitate to take responsibility for the unimaginable consequences or dodgy social dynamics that sometimes transpire. There are many ways to address this. For instance, in a Sociology/Anthropology methodology class, Simon Fraser University Anthropology Professor Dara Culhane suggested that contracts could be revised and revisited between the researcher and participant throughout the entirety of the research process, serving as check-ins, to circumvent simmering, unspoken conflicts (personal communication, Spring, 2011). While I think that Culhane offers a caring solution, I am not convinced that it necessarily prepares the researcher to address the unexpected.

When things go surprisingly awry, judgment of the researcher’s good intentions becomes conflated with critical analyses of unexpectedly poor results. What I have come to learn is that the formulation of consent forms and application for ethical approval is grounded primarily upon a deontological ethical approach. Put simply, deontological ethics considers one’s duties and obligations, and tries to answer the question, “What ought I to do?” (Kant, 1785/1993; Rawls, 2009; Thomas, Waluchow, & Gedge, 2014). That is, one’s ethical duty is prospective, anticipative, and contractual, based upon one’s cognition of the knowable. Swayed to examine through the rationalized lens of what one means or, retrospectively, what one is meant to do, deontologically driven ethical discourse insufficiently addresses one’s relational responsibilities in the myriad situations that exist beyond the expectations of all those involved.

Imagining the university as a supra-human body, each and every researcher subjectively contributes to the inculcation of a sense of ethical responsibility that is driven by prospective cogitation. A collation of applications for ethical approval, meant to precede and ethically ground the investigation, en masse can be presented as a show of institutional good faith to outsiders who are asked to participate in a study. At the same time, I question whether the institutional performance of meaning to do good can adequately take collective responsibility for the ongoing experiences of living, being, and
interacting beyond cognitively contrived, intentional measure.

Ever since my studies toward a Master of Arts in Philosophy, I have been puzzling over the term “collective responsibility.” It is one of those sweeping ideas that means too much and not enough simultaneously. Coming across the term for the first time in an undergraduate ethics course, the debates seemed to centre around differentiating and understanding the relationships between individual/particular and group/collective duties to redress the past and plan for the future (Barry, 2003; Dmitrijevic, 2011; Downie, 1969; Erskine, 2003; French, 2013; Goldberg, 2017; Held, 2002; Isaacs, 2006, 2014; Khoury, 2017; May, 1990, 2005; Souffrant, 2013). Although I do not have the space here to delve deeply into these debates, I wish to point out that similarly to the discussion above, a sense of collective responsibility brings to mind an atemporal and interminable duty imposed upon a group to act and be a certain way in relation to the designated other. This obligation is premised on the capacity of institutions to exhibit intentionality, moral agency, and therefore the ability to accept praise or blame (Dmitirjevic, 2011; Erskine, 2003; French, 2013; Held, 2014; Isaacs, 2006; Khoury, 2017). That is, in many accounts of collective responsibility, institutions, nations, organization, and businesses take on a form of moral personhood, accompanied by the qualities afforded a cogitating human subject or floating brain. Much attention has been placed upon asking the question, “What can and ought the individual and collective do?” Attempts to answer this question leads to discussions on the kinds of principles and regulations that should be put into place in retrospective consideration of past failures and in imagining good prospective outcomes (Barry, 2003; Held, 2014; Isaacs, 2014). This line of questioning is deontological, duty-based, with careful rationalizing of how and where praise or blame can be ascribed.

Whereas much less energy has been placed on questioning the interrelational and social underpinnings for the conceptualization of the individual and collective in the first place (Souffrant, 2013). In Identity, Political Freedom, and Collective Responsibility, African studies and philosophy professor Eddy Souffrant (2013) suggests that modern theorizing of collective responsibility is grounded upon a notion of the individual as atomistic and self-interested (p. 2). According to Souffrant, such atomization leads modern moral philosophers to make abnormal, social acts of care and concern for others. He argues that individual identities are collective, and identity (self-)inscriptions, ephemeral (p. 6). Souffrant continuously warns against atomizing and individualizing collective responsibility, the latter of which is diverse in agency, membership, temporal
and spatial identities, and levels of participation (p. 161). Ultimately, he wishes to show that collective responsibility is meant to support the integrity of the collective in its entirety, whilst recognizing the multiple collectives and groupings that compel or deter people from acting (p. 180). I am very grateful for Souffrant’s critical analysis of the atomizing assumptions that limit the ethical imaginary from regarding the complex, supra-human organizational formations of collective responsibility. At the same time, I am mindful of the deontological and retrospectively speculative nature of his investigation.

What happens if collective responsibility is released from rational normative discourse? I wish to propose a relational and practice-based approach to developing a fuller understanding of collective responsibility. Specifically, I would like to move consideration of collective responsibility beyond normatively ethical spaces of intentionality and moral agency by parceling it out into “collected” and “collecting” responsibilities. I will explain each, as well as a practice-based expression of collective responsibility, in terms of shadowing Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, respectively. At the beginning of thinking through Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships, never did I imagine that I would enter into debates around collective responsibility from a relational point of view. But in following Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter’s examples, I have been directed toward a practicable and less theoretically and ethically restrictive understanding.

**Collected responsibility.** In the many hours spent running to Cheryl’s voice, there is a lot of time and space to contemplate passing through such diverse landscapes. Making and listening to music are collaborative acts. The sounds of her, Joseph Naytowhow, and Kym Gouchie’s compositions, as well as the animated voices of the Secwepemc storytellers, change the shape and scope of the visibly individual human form. Sound travels through, creating new body formations that surpass surface appearances. I cannot be certain if I am only imagining that sonorous shadow being softens the soil, pavement, or causes swarms of aphids to swirl away from my moving form. But this lack of certainty does not prevent the soil from caking onto the soles of my shoes, crumbling pieces of asphalt from lodging into the crevasses of my trainers, or errant insects from catching often fatal rides on my sweat-slickened chest, face, shoulders. Despite the best of my intentions, unexpected beings become attached because of the movement, creating a new state of being and depth to the meaning of one’s acts. Cheryl as a 学長 teaches both by example and instruction that one’s actions in the world become imbedded with past and future actions. Indeed, the creative and
social longevity – in effect, the shadow – of the act depends on how it entwines with other meanings that might at times become unintentionally attached. When Cheryl carefully walks me through Steve Loft’s (2013) Ghost Dance exhibit at Ryerson University, she continually emphasizes the importance of recognizing the legacies of political activism and art, and the labour of all of those involved. These legacies and labour, in part, create social pockets and spaces for an artist, activist, citizen to do what they can in the present. Through Cheryl, I learn that collected responsibility is a post-action-based accounting for that which one has inherited by virtue of having performed the action.

Collecting responsibility. Because of Adrian, I am running under so many directions that I need to become more than one person just to keep up! As a ロールモデル, Adrian and his alter egos provide living proof for the reality of parallel existences. The self is not atomistic and solipsistic but differentiates into multiply relational beings relative to the ways that they become preoccupied in the world. Performative shadows can conflict or pass through at tempos so that they might never encounter one another, or in other situations, seamlessly amalgamate in a flash. Through performatively shadowing Buffalo Boy, Shaman Exterminator, Miss Chief, and Adrian, I learn that one’s identity is in a constant state of flux and can be socially ambivalent depending upon how the self co-exists in relation to others. One might be a complete 糞たれ to one person, then turn around immediately to abide faithfully through 孝行 in favour of another. However, Adrian does not encourage his audience to remain socially impassive until they are forced to react. Instead, he teaches the importance of becoming an active agent in pursuit of who one is and who one can be with respect to others. Adrian demonstrates how to live in a state of collecting responsibility, that is, to put one’s selves out there, and to become vulnerable and purposefully receptive to the human and non-human conditions. Collecting responsibility is an intentional practice, an active search for life beyond one’s politically, socially, and habitually insulated imagination. Collecting responsibility is full-bodied, laborious, eventful, often unpredictable and a priori unknowable, and spiritually enthralling. Through these multi-directional excursions, new communities and surprising affiliations arise, creating changeable levels of social, ideological, and filial levels of intimacy with the one who has cast the performative shadows in the first place. Thus, collecting responsibility involves finding the paths back, to address the collected responsibilities that have accrued along each way.
Collective responsibility. In a best friendship 合作 with Peter, it is surprising to learn the force with which singular and collective intentions collide with the performative consequences of those intentions, and then some. In the studio space of a best friendship, immersed in the quietude and intensive practice of an idea, one never can fully anticipate how the established plan will move through other social spaces. In tactfully shadowing Peter and being shadowed by him, I learn that he is a reassuring presence, a compassionate guide who endlessly demonstrates through his own practice ways to abide and move with respect to one’s ancestries. Friendships, like other relationships, are unique, and in a constant state of emotional and interpersonal movement. Different aspects, both strengths and weaknesses, and the limitations of being good, emerge in the 間柄 of the friendship. In this inbetweenness, one becomes intimately aware of the habituated embodiment of cultural and political values, and that in particular social dynamics, whatever might have been conceived as praiseworthy can become problematic, and whatever might have been considered shameful can become a saving grace. Thus, the ongoing challenge in a friendship is to learn to balance creatively being: bad and good, quiet and boisterous, passive and active, witnessed and witnessing, collected and collecting. In the 我々 presentation of a performance, not only is the collective intention expressed but so too do all of the attendant precipitates from a moment of time in the friendship become exposed for public consumption and evaluation. Collective responsibility then is an ongoing relational practice, the “ought” continuously and cyclically refiltered through the “is.” It means that when things go horribly askew (because they often do), the collective is not necessarily meant to be dismantled and abandoned outright. Instead, those mistakes signal possible areas between the self and other that might need to transform in order to prepare to pay better attention to the presence of unexpected others both internal and external to the originating collective. At the same time, it is to keep in one’s mind that sometimes things just need to fall apart or end. In those times, the question remains: how can we treat each other well while passing through great periods of relational tumult?

The movement of conceptualizing collective responsibility from a space of outlining speculated duties and contracts to a place of collaborative practice may shed some insights into what constitutes reconciliation discourse with respect to Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships in the Canadian context.

7.5 Reconciliation revisited

The land is so vast, it is impossible to reach an absolute understanding that duly
accommodates the rich experiences and relationships that are enclosed within. The land exists in a constant state of excess, living, breathing, and being beyond human containment, measure, and conceptualization. Similarly, as a singular command, the duty for the populace to reconcile may be too daunting, personally incomprehensible. People might back away in abjection, or become convinced that it is not their concern, because they are simply passing through. Conversely, they might be compelled to overstate the scope of their responses and demand that others do so with the same vigour and methods, all in order to be assured that they are indeed inherently good individuals, despite inheriting and benefitting from an appalling colonial legacy. What is one to do?

To think and talk about reconciliation as a collective duty insufficiently relates the complexity and specificities with which the one and the many might respond. Throughout my thesis, I have been concerned that in the face of such an enormous undertaking, panicked and intimidated, we each will resort to our historical, cultural, and political body habits, relying upon established categories and binaries of regarding one another as a means to pacify our anxieties. Experts who have been experts in the past will continue to be recentralized, while those in the periphery, the unknown and unimagined, will remain disconnected from the flurry of political and intellectual activities that go through the motions of doing good. I think specifically about お婆ちゃん, お父さん, and お母さん, and all of the people at the mushroom farm, how hard they worked, and how little they have been witnessed while words like settler, non-Indigenous, colonizer, racialized have been mapped onto their bodies for sake of theoretical expediency. But like the land, each and every person exceeds categorical thinking and political containment. It is not my intention to be anti-intellectual; I am just appealing to scholars, public servants, and educators to be mindful of reaching the limits of the way they interpret the world. There is so much more than what words alone can say.

Can there ever be an expert on reconciliation as a living practice? お母さん might not be able to pronounce “reconciliation,” but hands down, she is a much nicer person than I. She counsels me to be compassionate, to think about a person beyond who they are to me, and she regales me with so many stories about our family, living both close in and far away. お父さんは such a bewildering mix of philosopher, farmer, 糞たれ imp, philanthropist, and a fairly recovered family aggressor. Because of him, I have had the chance to contemplate the 陰陽 and the artifice of divisions made between good and
bad human values. And he hilariously set innumerable examples of good intentions gone
astray – oh the crazy things that he has done! お婆ちゃん, who rarely spoke at all,
demonstrated throughout her life the need to ask for and receive help. She was the land
beneath our feet. The family unit’s historical inheritances and ongoing interrelational
linkages to Japan, and their associative values and habits have profoundly shaped my
social engagement with people in new landscapes. I continue to contend with the ways
that my own nationalism and culturo-centrism might profoundly hinder my capacity to
understand Indigenous calls for nation-to-nation agreements at all levels of Canadian
governance. At the mushroom farm, I have witnessed histories and personal stories
interweave for a short while, and then dissipate, so that mostly the visceral feeling rather
than cognitive memories of animated gatherings, comings and goings, and the cycling of
seasons remain. All of these people – family, acquaintances, extended communities –
have so much to share, to bring forth unexpected and unimagined knowledges that may
shake intellectual and political complacencies, and offer, perhaps more modestly, ways
to reconcile. Simultaneously, I am repeatedly reminded about the multiple spaces that
we each inhabit, which exceed our familial, cultural, and transnational expectations.

When someone makes a specific call to witness, (how) will we take notice? (How) Will we respond? Cheryl’s practice is a persistent meditation on ways to involve
and include as many people as possible. Informed by Cree worldview, nêhiyawin, she
sonorously constructs teepees as she moves through the land, ready to house
temporarily all those who are interested. Wrought through her practice, Cheryl’s
conceptualization of “radical inclusivity” means that she is persistently reaching beyond
the familiar, with the off chance that she will catch someone who might have been
overlooked prior. Compassionate and interactive, Cheryl is inexhaustible with the artistic
innovations with which she attempts to draw in unexpected others.

Adrian transforms the burden of colonization into a state of cosmological play. He
tantalizes, spiritedly admonishes, and provokes those around him to respond in kind.
Through his alter egos, he sets multiple examples of the manners in which European
colonization of Canada can be confronted and addressed. Adrian also calls attention to
how European colonization itself endures in its own fluctuating state of restructuring and
reconfiguring to adapt and to absorb newly arriving bodies and lineages. In his culturally
grounded, intimate affiliation with buffalo-being, Adrian’s performances point the
audience’s attention back toward the land, centralizing for prolonged consideration
humanity’s dependence upon and consequent duty to protect their host.
Peter’s practice is in the presence and presentation of his ancestors, past and future. His vulnerability is his strength; in the porosity of his regard toward his ancestors, Peter opens himself up to the possibility that each encounter is with next of kin. Taking guidance from the meeting up of the Stikine and Tahltan Rivers, ritual and performance abide by and through one another in Peter’s state of being. Ancient knowledges are reinforced anew; these memories surpass cognitive consciousness, residing instead in the musculature and movements that have been instilled through social engagements in the everyday. For Peter, decolonizing strategies extend far beyond deconstructing colonial structures of power, knowledge, and interpersonal relations. They involve the reconstitution of the far past and far future through the present.

Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, they express generosity of spirit, creativity, and knowledge production. In their works, decolonization and reconciliation are not addressed in terms of a priori ethical imperatives for how all must remember, act, and be. Instead, their approaches are more propositional and allusive. From their specific histories, socio-political commitments, and cultural perspectives they show: this too has happened, this too is possible, this too might result. In effect, they create spaces in between to breathe and collaborate, to reach new ways of being that surpass idiosyncratic body movements imposed upon by the administration of decolonization and reconciliation discourses.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC) has accomplished a great many things. They have brought to general public consciousness the traumatic legacy of residential schools. Through national and provincial gatherings, they have set up spaces and opportunities for residential school survivors and school employees to tell their stories. They have scripted a list of demands regarding how different organizations, systems, and the Canadian nation-state itself are to move forward. Extraordinary and eventful, my fear is that despite all of these efforts, the public performance of good will and best intentions may not be properly responsive to the ongoing tensions and complexities of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations on these lands. So many aspects are left unconsidered; too many, unintentionally disparaged. It could be, though, that the TRCC is not trying to have the final say on these matters. Instead, it has made initial calls. But given the gravity of the political past and present, in the midst of the everyday, how does one begin to respond?

In my lumbering attempts to shadow Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter, I hopefully have become a little bit more attentive to the whole-bodied, whole-life efforts with which they
each make their call. As well, I am made increasingly conscious of the training that is required to respond to them in kind. Shaped by my beliefs, senses of history, and social behaviours, these sonorous, performative, and tactile shadows are expressed from merely one intersubjective point of view. I continuously am confronted too by the limitations in my approaches to engage with and abide by others, and therefore seek different perspectives that might significantly alter and develop ways of doing and thinking. Whose calls have compelled you to respond? What kinds of shadows have you cast? Through your labours, what have you come to know? I am not stating that everyone ought to engage in performance art practice (although, swears that you will have loads of fun if you just try!). Rather, I wish to propose that reconciliation is an ongoing ethical practice. This practice brings to bear the values, beliefs, and histories that have been collected along the way, and the purposeful acts of collecting one’s senses of self, belonging, and political agency. We are not being asked to start from scratch, but to recognize those in our midst who set stellar, if sometimes unusual, examples of what it means to pass through well with respect to others. Perhaps that which will emerge in the unique and unexpected inbetweennesses of being, collectively and intersubjectively, will answer to living better together.

共同生活 (kyōdōseikatsu) means “communal living” or “to live together.” A common phrasing, it does not make the practice of living with respect to one another into a singular, historical event or a homogeneous collective intention. Instead, it articulates the daily cultivation that goes into witnessing and caring for one another. In those moments when we become the shadows, in the spaces in between built up expectations, identities, intentions, and senses of culture and belonging, it just might be possible to shape-shift social relations across this land.
Afterword

When I began doctoral studies in Communication Studies, I did not understand the multi-disciplinary parameters of the field, nor did I have knowledge of the kinds of research that were conducted under this umbrella category. I scrambled around a lot for the first while to try to get a firmer footing in the field. One of the most memorable assignments I had was for a graduate course called Radical Media taught by my future supervisor Zoë Druick. I was inspired by the scope of what could be discussed in a classroom setting, and of the intellectual contributions made through politicized artistic pursuits of knowledge, ethical regard, and community development.

For my first assignment, I decided to write an essay about Shirley Bear’s entwined activist and artistic practices. I cannot be certain what exactly compelled me to write about Shirley, but by working through her art works and writings, I began to witness the fully embodied and fully spirited efforts with which she has developed her craft and political voice.

At the start of this dissertation, I could not apprehend the broad, social and artistic impacts that Shirley has had across different cultural and activist communities, Indigenous and non-Indigenous. It was only in the writing that Shirley’s name and her specific relationships to Cheryl, Adrian, and Peter were revealed. As the chapters started rolling out, I laughed with surprise, wondering if this thesis has been about Shirley Bear all along.

Shirley’s discreet, persistent influence makes me wonder if this is how Elder knowledge works. An Elder is sometimes a mentor, at other times a role model or best friend. In idealizing an Elder to be far removed from the tedium of human foibles, miscommunications and misunderstandings, one risks dehumanizing him/her/them. Who can ever recover from a hard tumble from such an exalted status? An Elder is not a perfect form, and not meant to be objectified for the purpose of being fixed in time and place as a pristine example of what it means to be a good human. Instead, they each have something to teach, to advise, as they pass through life and the lives of others, if only those others would pause to listen.

Over the years, Shirley has said two things to me that have made a lasting impression. One time, Shirley came to visit Ashok and me in Kamloops. During that visit, I was rushing around in the kitchen, cooking and engaging in small talk with her, when she suddenly just stopped me and said, “Ayumi, the past is the past.” For some reason, I burst out crying, as though my body could instantly fathom what my mind could not. The
past is the past. I have spent hundreds of hours thinking about this phrase, often while running the land. It means so many things, depending upon the subject matter, the thinker’s life and intellectual history and perspectives, and one’s senses of time. The past is the past. In terms of reconciliation in Canada, I have heard people say this, at times, in either a disparaging or ahistorical way, as though they cannot understand how the life they lead now is connected to life prior to their existence on these lands. But if time is cyclical rather than linear, it means that the past will continue to repeat itself, systems will reiterate themselves, and social habits will become entrenched, unless we learn to pass through differently, develop new relationships, and gather ourselves to learn from the presence of unexpected others in our midst. “The past is the past” is a koan. It cannot be fully appreciated from cognition alone but requires the whole body. It continues to teach me new things.

Unforgettably, on another occasion, Shirley said to me, “you sure talk a lot!” Yes, haha!, I talk too much sometimes, and need to shut up and listen more. I have talked far too much in this dissertation so just wish to end with this. There is no expert in the everyday cultivations of reconciliation and of living beyond such politically categorical imperatives. Every voice counts, every person’s perspective matters. Everyone’s mothers, fathers, grandmothers, ancestors and descendants can be present in these conversations. And when you speak, I will draw upon all that has been learned so far to listen with respect to your stories, teachings, and insights. さて、始めましょう．
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