A "CINEMA OF SOVEREIGNTY": WORKING IN THE CULTURAL INTERFACE TO CREATE A MODEL FOR FOURTH WORLD FILM PRE-PRODUCTION AND AESTHETICS

by

Dorothy Christian

B.A., University of Toronto, 1999

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

In the
School of Communication

© Dorothy Christian 2010

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2010

APPROVAL

Name: **Dorothy Christian**

Degree: **MA**

Titles: **A "Cinema of Sovereignty": Working in the Cultural Interface to Create A Model for Fourth World Film Pre-production and Aesthetics**

Examining Committee:

    Chair: Dr. Jan Marontate, Associate Professor

Dr. Kirsten McAllister
Associate Professor
School of Communication

Dr. Zoë Druick
Associate Professor
School of Communication

Dr. Gregory Young-Ing
Assistant Professor
Indigenous Studies
University of British Columbia Okanagan

Date: May 6, 2010

ii

Abstract

TITLE: A "Cinema of Sovereignty": Working in the Cultural Interface to Create A Model for Fourth World Film Pre-production and Aesthetics

This thesis examines the Indigeneity of Indigenous films/videos in an era of globalization. I explain the challenges of an Indigenous filmmaker writing within a Western institution that does not recognize Indigenous systems of knowledge. I take Barry Barclay' theme of "Dance With the Other" and use it with Martin Nakata's work on cultural interface and Indigenous standpoint theories to develop an Indigenous methodology for this thesis and for a production framework guided by Barclay's operating principles. Using Canada as my example, I include theoretical frameworks of Indigenous and non-Indigenous theorists for Indigenous production in George Manuel's Fourth World and Barclay's Fourth World Cinema, and Randolph Lewis's "Cinema of Sovereignty." I use four models to understand an innovative visually sovereign practice: Indigenous writers' model, Abadian's cultural healing paradigm; Roth's co-development model and Mills' model for de-centering Hollywood as center of global cinema.

Keywords:
 Indigenous Film Studies; Cultural & Critical Studies; Fourth World Studies; Indigenous Knowledge Studies; Cultural Identity

Table of Contents

Figures

Cultural Advisors

Mike (Brian) Myers (Seneca), Cultural Advisor

Sam and Marlene George (Squamish), Coast Salish Witnesses

Alannah Young-Leon (Anishnawbe-Cree), Spiritual Director/Advisor

Art Leon (Chehalis), Spiritual Director/Advisor

Acknowledgements

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my Ancestors of the Splats'in (Secwepemc) community, all those who walked the land before me, providing a pathway for me to be able to do this work. This work also dedicated to the people of my community who continue to work on, and walk the land maintaining our relationship with all the beings (seen and unseen), who we co-exist with so that our generations to come have a place to "see," "do," "act" and "listen" the way our peoples have always done.

The act of writing this thesis is to honour and extend the highest level of respect to Barry Barclay (2003), Maori filmmaker who self identified in the following way:

> My whakapapa is by mountain (Taranaki), and by River (Rangitikei) and by tribe (Ngati Apa) and by hapu or extended family, which is most immediately Marumaru: from this, my make-up, my whakapapa, is Maori (p.2).

It is the work of this Maori trailblazer that shaped this thesis and whose work continues to motivate and inspire me to create Sites of Exuberance in Fourth World Cinema.

Introduction

The Problem before the Research Problem

[April 1990] I see a never-ending parade of masks, each coming right up to my face then quickly moving to allow the next one to come. They bring their faces so close I can see their penetrating eyes. They're telling me something but I am not "getting it." I am not frightened but I don't know who or what they are. I phone home and ask, "Do we have secret mask societies that I don't know about? I am told, "No, the West Coast people have masks." I've seen West Coast masks and they didn't look anything like the ones in my dreams. I would meet the masks of my dreams in ceremony during the summer of 1990.

On July 11, 1990 my phone rang at 4 a.m. A voice says, "The army has gone in."[1] I was enrolled at the University of Toronto working on my undergraduate degree. I was on summer break. The Canadian government had mobilized its' military against the Mohawk peoples at Kahnesatake. Thus, the Mohawk peoples of the Iroquois Confederacy were at war with the colonial powers-that-be in Canada.[2] Throughout July, August and into September, I dedicated my time to making sure the people behind the lines in Mohawk territories were not massacred. My people, the Secwepemc (Shuswap) and the Syilx (Okanagan) of the interior of B.C. initiated a Spiritual Peace Run where men and women warriors from our communities carried an Eagle Staff that touched every inch of the land from British Columbia to Iroquoian territories. One of the spiritual teachers on the Run told me it was the realization of a prophecy. The Elders and Spiritual people asked me to manage some of the front end communications of the Peace Run. For me that meant being in touch with all the Nations whose lands we were criss-crossing as well as negotiating for protection for our runners with the

provincial and federal security forces that have jurisdiction within those regions. The parents of some of the younger runners were concerned about their safety and they had every right to be worried because the normalized polite face of Canadian racism showed its ugly side across the country and at Oka that summer.

Within my organic job, I also facilitated spiritual ceremonies in some of the Anishnawbe communities to strengthen the Runners and wrote press releases. The mainstream media in Canada largely ignored our communications because our news media did not sensationalize the violence. In fact, we had a "peaceful, spiritual message" to deliver to the people held under siege by the Canadian military at Kahnesatake. The only broadcaster that picked up on our press releases was Rita Shelton Deverell of Vision TV, which is purported to be the only multi-faith television broadcaster in the world, based out of Toronto. She is one of the founders of the station's national network and at that time, Rita was Vice-President of Production and Presentation. Finally when the Peace Run arrived in Iroquois territories where the people were under siege at the Treatment Centre in Kahnesatake, my job description morphed again. I sat in a hotel room and used my calling card to communicate with many Indigenous people of "Turtle Island," an Indigenous term for North America, using our "Moccasin Telegraph," an Indigenous term for our communications systems, asking communities and individuals to do ceremonies of protection for the people so no one else would be killed[3]. I called upon allies on Turtle Island, in Europe and in Mexico to raise consciousness about the Indigenous land rights issue. I worked directly with Jeannette Armstrong and Marlowe Sam, the spiritual people of the Syilx (Okanagan) Nation and two of the negotiators of the Iroquois Confederacy, Mike (Brian) Myers (Seneca) and Bob Antone (Oneida) whose networks I utilized in my phone calls.

That summer, I sold my diamond rings to pay my rent. And, I ended up with a three thousand dollar phone bill that I couldn't afford as a student – but in spiritual terms, it was very small "giveaway" (offering) to put up, so that no more lives were lost.

As an Indigenous woman who participated in a very direct way during

what some have described as a civil war (Hornung,1991), is it possible for me to see the portrayal of the Indigenous peoples – who stood up to protect the burial grounds of their ancestors – the same as the general population in Canada? From my point of view, "we" were portrayed as "racialized criminals" in the international media, and, I say "we" from a collective consciousness because I was a part of the collective body of Indigenous peoples who stood in solidarity with the people who were defending their lands. In this context, after confronting the Canadian state, in writing this thesis, there is what I call, "the problem before the problem." The challenge I face even before I outline the research problem is that as an active participant in the story I cannot stand back and objectively analyze the problem as if I had no investment in the research topic. It is widely accepted that researchers can be participants/members of communities they write about with political and cultural investments in that community. Moreover, there are other complexities in presenting my Indigenous perspective in a western institution because Indigenous knowledge and ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and listening" in the world are just beginning to be recognized in the academy.

Scholar Martin Nakata (2002), the first Torres Strait Islander (near Australia) to achieve a Ph.D, is currently Director of Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning, observes that the,

> whole area of Indigenous knowledge is a contentious one. From what constitutes 'Indigenous' to whose interests are being served by the documentation of such knowledge there lies a string of contradictions, of sectorial interests, of local and global politics, of ignorance, and of hope for the future (p. 281).

In presenting an outline of Indigenous Knowledge, Nakata further explains that three academic disciplines, that is, anthropology, sociology and geography plus development studies are the only areas, which discuss Indigenous Knowledge to 1980. However, Nakata (2002) continues, "Like colonization, the Indigenous Knowledge enterprise seems to have everything and nothing to do with us" (p. 282). The humanitarian and scientific interests are "overwhelmingly driven by research into sustainable development practices in developing

3

countries" (p. 282). Nakata (2002) observes that *indigenous knowledge* has become an

> umbrella term, not limited to Indigenous peoples but inclusive of those in the developing countries who struggle to survive and who still rely on traditional forms of knowledge whether they be Indigenous within developed and developing nation-states, formerly colonized, or distant or recent immigrant groups in developing countries. One estimation of this group of people is some 80 percent of the world's population who rely on Indigenous Knowledge for either medicine or food (p. 282).

Although Indigenous knowledge has gained some acknowledgement in various disciplines, interest is driven by capitalists who see Indigenous Knowledge as "merely another source for potential profit" and by scientific interests who recognize its importance and want to "record or validate if any of it is to be incorporated into the scientific corpus and utilized." And the result is that Indigenous Knowledge has become "more fragmented and specialized as scientists and humanitarians pick at the bits and pieces that fit with their interests and disciplines" meaning "different things in different places to different people" and several terms are used interchangeably, including, "local knowledge, traditional knowledge (TK), Indigenous knowledge (IK), [and] traditional environmental or ecological knowledge (TEK) or Indigenous technical knowledge (ITK)" (Nakata, 2002, p. 282). One important aspect that is overlooked in some definitions is that "Indigenous peoples hold collective rights and interests in their knowledge" (p. 283). To add to these complexities,

> . . . along with its oral nature, the diversity of Indigenous knowledge systems, and the fact that management of this Knowledge involves rules regarding secrecy and sacredness (Davis, 1997, 1998; Janke, 1997, 1998) means that the issues surrounding ownership and therefore protection (see Hunter, 2002) are quite different from those inscribed in Western institutions (Nakata, 2002, p. 283).

It is within this context that he theorizes a "cultural interface" as an in-between space where Indigenous scholars have an "Indigenous standpoint" where they can meet non-Indigenous scholars in a place of interfacing with rather

than a place of "cultural clash or cultural dissonance," which is the usual manner of presenting the intersection of western and Indigenous systems of knowledge (Nakata, 2002, p. 285). Nakata (2002) developed his theories over a period extending from the early 1990s to 2008, researching and writing about Indigenous systems of knowledge(s). In the beginning he applied his theories only to Torres Strait Islanders; however, over time he expanded his theories to apply to all Indigenous peoples. However, this notion of a global Indigenous perspective raises many issues. Murray (2008) observes that the articulation of

> any sense of a global Indigenous self-expression is an inherently complicated process, one plagued by the potential pitfalls and contradictions that accompany any attempt to describe so many different peoples. The multiple range of cultures, languages, societies, knowledge systems and cosmologies that make up the worldwide Indigenous presence seem, in their diversity, to present insurmountable barriers to the notion that it might be possible to talk of Indigenous peoples as a global collective. Yet, at the same time, there are strong political and social arguments for the need to develop an idea of *Indigeneity that* can span geographies and cultures (p. 11).

It is within this "inherently complicated process" that this thesis is being written. From my perspective as an Indigenous researcher/scholar presenting my arguments in this arena is similar to finding a safe pathway through what can be described as a political-cultural-intellectual mine field. Because of this, I choose to navigate this highly charged area by presenting "the problem before the problem" in four voices that provide insights into my worldview and the lived experience of an Indigenous film/video maker offering one distinctive voice from the "multiple range of cultures" that Murray speaks of. Nakata's (2002) theory of "cultural interface" provides the context for the "strong political and social argument" whereas he states,

> I have called the intersection of the Western and Indigenous domains, the *Cultural Interface*, and theoretically I have been inclined to begin there and have argued for embedding the underlying principles of reform in this space. This is because I see the Cultural Interface as the place where we live, and learn, the place that conditions our lives [...] and more to the point the place

5

where we are active agents in our own lives [...]. For Indigenous peoples our context, remote or urban is already circumscribed by the discursive space of the Cultural Interface (p. 285).

This "discursive space" of the "cultural interface" is a complex space, with conflicting discourses, that Indigenous peoples deal with on a daily basis. In discussing the "cultural interface" he qualifies some of the characteristics that define the parameters of the discursive space; they are "the everyday lived experience, identity, oppositions, primacy of the present, agency and continuity (p. 285)." This "cultural interface" is a place that offers opportunities for producing new knowledge relevant to Indigenous issues and interests and that both Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars have a responsibility to read (Nakata, 2002, 2006, 2007).

I concur with Nakata (2002) that lived experience needs to be theorized within any analysis of the cultural interface between Indigenous peoples and other cultures because the *indigeneity* of any issue under discussion is lost in the oppositional colonial binaries that does not recognize Indigenous knowledge(s) or theories as legitimate knowledge. In a critical look at the concept of indigeneity, some scholars have revealed (Brown & Sant, 1999; Kolig & Muckler, 2002; Maaka & Fleras, 2005) that the colonial binaries of "them-us," "traditional-Western," "Indigenous-mainstream" (Nakata, 2002, 2007a, 2007) locks Indigenous peoples in a passive victim mode who do not have the ability to act in their own self interests because of what Sutherland (2005) identifies as the oppressor-victim paradigm.

The "Indigenous standpoint" theory that Nakata (2007) developed is concerned with the validity and coherence of Indigenous knowledge. Nakata (2007) argues that in order for the cultural interface to be understood there must be a priori knowledge of historical specificities of Indigenous experience, otherwise the Indigenous voice will remain as the objects of study and relegated to the prescribed narrative of the dominant society where on a theoretical level Indigenous voices do not have the power to interrogate the larger narrative. In

the dominant narrative, the Indigenous voice(s) is/are reduced to an advisor role so that other peoples may understand them (p. 210).

Three points to describe Nakata's (2007) Indigenous standpoint theory are:

1. Indigenous peoples are entangled in the complexities of the Cultural Interface and are discursively constituted within and constitutive of complex social relations manifest in the social organization of their everyday [lives] (p. 215).

2. Indigenous agency is shaped by what can be known from this position within the Cultural Interface. It is often experienced as a constant request to be continuous with one position and at the same time as being discontinuous with another; the experience of constantly being asked in any given moment to both agree and disagree with any proposition on the basis of a constrained choice between a western and an Indigenous perspective (p. 215).

3. Tensions of this tug-of-war are physically experienced, and the corporeal sense and the memory of the feeling, help to inform the choices in the everyday (p. 215).

It is from this place of "complexities" and "tensions" of the "tug-of-war" that I exercise my agency as a sovereign, autonomous Indigenous woman film/video maker and researcher to present the argument of this thesis. To ensure clarity, I clarify my use of the term *Indigenous Knowledge* in this thesis. When discussing the visual narratives of film/video and new media, I refer to the "private" intellectual property that includes the oral stories, songs, designs, and medicine knowledge owned collectively by families, clans, societies, and Indigenous Nations. Thus, when referencing the Indigenous knowledge in the following (Figure 1, page 8), I am accessing public Indigenous knowledge that is shared.

Figure 1: Indigenous knowledge – communicative modalities

Permission to reproduce this figure was received from Dr. Michelle Pidgeon. Source: Archibald, J., Pidgeon, M., & Hawkey, C. (2009). Aboriginal transitions: Undergraduate to graduate studies. AT: U2G Phase I Final report. Unpublished Research Report. University of British Columbia.

Before I can formally begin the argument addressing the problem of my research question, I will explain how I integrate the holistic approach of my Indigenous worldview into this thesis. This encompasses my social, political, economic, and spiritual positioning as an Indigenous woman filmmaker in these lands geo-politically recognized as Canada. Figure 1 (See, p. 8) depicts the fundamental assumptions that shape my Indigenous way of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and listening." It is important to note the following,

> Each Indigenous group has developed its own cultural content for the holistic circle symbol; however, a common goal has been to attain a mutual balance and harmony among animals, people, elements of nature, and the Spirit World. To attain this goal, ways of acquiring knowledge and codes of behaviour are essential and are embedded in cultural practices; one practice that plays a key role in the oral tradition is storytelling (Archibald, 2008, p. 11).

My adaptation of the model is as follows: The individual is at the centre and includes four parts: the mind, the body, the heart and the spirit that are represented by the four arrows of "intellectual, physical, emotional and cultural." The "cultural" aspect of the individual is what I deem "the spirit" part of who I am. The person is surrounded by two concentric circles representing family and community and I add a third circle to represent the Nation(s) I was born in to; therefore I am representing my family, my community and my Nation(s). The diagram displays four operating principles of respect, relationship, relevance, and responsibility, which are applied specifically to the research the model is sourced from. The 4R's first appeared in the discourse when discussed by Ray Barnhardt and Verna Kirkness in 1991 when they researched Indigenous higher education. For the purposes of this thesis, I adopt Jo-ann Archibald's (2008) operating principles from her book, *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit,* because she adapted these principles specifically for storytelling and they are most appropriate for this thesis. The operating principles are: respect, responsibility, reciprocity and reverence. In Archibald's (2008) Chapter One, she draws on the words of Elders, oral Storytellers and a number of well-known Indigenous writers[4] to arrive at these principles. She speaks of a

"Collaborating: Between people, between languages" and of an "Interrelatedness between Story and Listener, and Between Text and Reader" (pp. 1-33). It is important to note that there is a dynamic interchange between and amongst all the principles in the Indigenous way of knowing rather than a passive, one way exchange.

In this thesis, I indigenize the set rules in academic writing by integrating some Indigenous concepts into conventional academic practices to deliver the argument. Thus, I incorporate four voices (three vocal and one silent) of my humanness into the argument, and the format is as follows: my spiritual/ dreamscape voice (the spirit) is in Papyrus 13 point font (1.15 spacing and right margin alignment), my storyteller/filmmaker voice (the body) is in Garamond 13 point font (1.15 spacing and right margin alignment), my scholar voice (the mind) is in Arial 12 font (double spaced) and my heart voice is silent and invisible within the subtext in the delivery of my critical analysis. It is the emotional voice of *the heart* that synergizes the other voices and represents me as a whole human being. Although the emotional voice appears silent, it is the energy of this voice that enables the full expression of the other three voices. These four voices are deeply informed by the Indigenous knowledge of my worldview and influence how I interrelate to my environment as a human being.

Calling The People Together

To begin this thesis, I call the readers to an imaginary traditional *c7istktn* of my people, the Secwepemc (Shuswap) and the Syilx (Okanagan) to discuss an important issue. A *c7istktn* is the name for our winter homes in my Splat'sin dialect of the Secwepemc language.[5] Traditionally these underground homes were used as homes for family groupings during the winter season. And, in contemporary times we use this structure for important cultural meetings. The structure is round with the bottom half in the ground and the top half (the roof) blending unobtrusively into the landscape. There is a hole in the middle of the

roof that has a ladder and serves a dual purpose: as an entrance for the men (the women have a ground level entrance) and as an escape for the smoke from the central fire (Williams, Rosalind, personal communication, May 5, 2009).

At the beginning of any important meeting, there is a prayer with a burning of sacred medicines to remind all attendees of the sacredness of the process and the interactions. I state the cultural purpose of this thesis is to honour Maori filmmaker Barry Barclay, who passed into the spirit world in February 2008 at the age of 63 (Murray, 2008, p. xi). He was the first Indigenous person to produce a feature length dramatic film, *Ngati* (1987), to be recognized at Cannes in May 1987 on the international screen.[6] Barclay is a highly respected filmmaker who had over 35 years of experience in the film and television industry. I burn sage in an imaginary conch shell as I go around the circle to each individual to acknowledge your presence and your participation. Once that ritual is complete, I ask the drummers to sing an honour song for Barry Barclay. We all stand.

Within my culture, when you are honouring a person you are holding him up to be seen by the people, to extend the highest form of respect to an individual for what he has done for the people. Although I did not meet Barry Barclay in person, I am recognizing his stature as an individual and acknowledging how his thinking and persistence in looking for the *Indian way* in his production work has contributed so powerfully to my research. This term, *Indian way*, is used here as a colloquialism. It is often used amongst Indigenous peoples when referring to ourselves and is linked to the Indigenous knowledge and the holistic approach to the world.

Within my cultural protocols, I would normally sit with Barry Barclay to explain the intent of what I am doing and seek permission to use his work. I would present him with an appropriate cultural gift. However, because Barry Barclay is in the spirit world, I chose to acknowledge our relationship through a ritual of my spiritual practice known as fasting in the mountains.[7] In this way, I sacrifice of my person to be able to use his work and to extend my respect to the Maori man who inspired me throughout the production of this thesis.

Then for the formal discussion to address the research question, I explain

the basic operating principles of the talking circle, which are as follows:

> Everyone in the circle is treated equally. Not everyone agrees with each other, but everyone agrees that anyone who wants to speak should be given the opportunity. A speaker talks without verbal interruption until she/he is finished. Each person who sits with the Elders in this circle of learning assumes a responsibility to either listen, to share, to teach, or to learn (Archibald, 2008, p. 63).

With your participation (reading of this thesis), you are sitting in the imaginary circular c7istktn (kekuli), and you make a commitment to "listen, share, teach, or learn" about the critical issue of how Indigenous peoples "adapt and modify" and/or indigenize the tools of technology to create Indigenous aesthetics in the pre-production (funding and scripting) of the filmmaking process to represent themselves in a globalized world. The discussion begins by extending respect to all in attendance, by honouring the relationships between and among peoples, by taking responsibility for our words and actions and by speaking only about relevant issues that are connected to the issue on the floor.

However, before formal discussion can begin, there is another aspect of the "problem before the problem" that has to be addressed: how to maintain integrity in the process as an "insider/outsider" researcher or filmmaker in our communities? It is critical to understand that as Indigenous peoples, we encounter complicated issues when working within our own communities. As Barclay (2005) states,

> There is a good case to be made that when outsiders such as researchers, authors, photographers, filmmakers like myself and others collect material from elders and others within the Maori world, it is a form of theft, no matter how sensitively the terms about use and future access are drawn up (p. 97).

This thinking around theft of Indigenous cultural knowledge is still not fully or adequately recognized or comprehended because the complexities of the politically hot issue have just emerged in the past few years. There is a significant amount of international work done by contemporary Indigenous scholars such as Dr. Gregory Young-Ing (Cree-Chinese)[8] (University of British

Columbia, Okanagan) and Dr. Debra Harry (Paiute),[9] surrounding the issue of intellectual property rights.

The notion of cultural theft of Indigenous knowledge directly impacts Indigenous filmmakers/researchers because Indigenous cultural norms include a responsibility to be accountable to the communities while working within western institutions and structures. To add to the problematic nature of the cultural status of the material they (we) are "taking" from the communities, many Indigenous peoples do not understand the distinction between the private domain of the collective intellectual property rights and the public domain of shared cultural information.

Two critical questions arise: Firstly, how do we represent the "traditional, spiritual, and intellectual treasures special to the people" of whatever community we are working with in an ethical way (Barclay, 2005, pp. 94-95) and still get the job done? Secondly, how do we as Indigenous filmmakers/researchers honour the cultural protocols, yet ensure that future generations have access to this precious knowledge? The latter question is pressing because with rules around secrecy, I have observed in my Nation(s) that some of the Indigenous knowledge is dying with the Keepers of special knowledge.

In addition to the issue of intellectual property rights and other cultural protocols that govern writing about Indigenous knowledge whether as a scholar within a western academic institution or as a film/video maker capturing visuals and recording sounds/songs for a film, the issue of accountability to the people is paramount. As Hopi filmmaker and scholar, Victor Masayesva, Jr. states:

> A Native filmmaker has… the accountability built into him. The white man doesn't have that. That's the single big distinction. Accountability as an individual, as a clan, as a tribal [member and], as a family member. That's where we're at as Indian filmmakers (Masayesva cited in Leuthold 1998, p. 1).

When I travelled all over Turtle Island as an "insider/outsider" film/video maker, it was difficult to negotiate the privileged position of having an inside view of the people or culture I was representing because I felt accountable to the

people while simultaneously being accountable to my employer, a national broadcaster of the dominant Canadian culture.

Although the speciality network that I worked for was inclusive of the Indigenous perspective at that time, I could not explain the "accountability" issue and the issue of "private/public" domains of Indigenous knowledge (intellectual/cultural property) to my Senior Producers. For example, when I was in the pre-production phase of *Memorial Feast & Giveaway* (1995/96), a Syilx (Okanagan) story about the Joe Pierre family celebrating and memorializing the life of one son who had passed on one year earlier, I had four or five family meetings with the whole family, mother, father, and six remaining siblings to get permission to film. Because of the spiritual nature of the gathering, I had to agree to specific instructions of what I could or could not film. Needless to say, this caused me internal angst about how I was going to meet my production mandate and deadlines since I was usually allocated only two to three weeks for pre-production. The four or five meetings I had with the family took much longer than two or three weeks. Plus, I had to educate the non-Indigenous crew about the cultural sensibilities.

The balancing act that I conducted as a film/video maker is also one that I bring to the university. In the case of this thesis, I am an Indigenous researcher working within a western education institution as a scholar, representing one Indigenous perspective. My experience resembles Archibald's (2008) description in that there are numerous layers of concerns.

> First Nations people are encouraged by Elders and local community to 'get more education.' But becoming educated in mainstream institutions can create a chasm between the person who is university educated and others who are not educated in this way [...]. Being university educated, I have to work hard at showing others of my community that I still share their cultural values and that I am still at heart a First Nations person – that I have some form of harmony and balance (p. 40).

It is imperative to acknowledge that I walk the very thin edge of a blade as an Indigenous woman who is educated in western institutions because from an Indigenous perspective, the implicit assumption is that as a successful scholar, I

must "think like the white people."[10] Therefore, I must balance the paradox of my Grandmother encouraging me to get educated within the overall collective consciousness that is suspicious of western education.

The fact that I am an Indigenous woman researcher with experience in producing and directing visual narratives is a definite strength when writing scholarly critiques of the representation of Indigenous peoples because the experiential enhances the theoretical; particularly as "critical and post-modern genres… assume that all knowledge is political and that researchers are not neutral since their ultimate purposes include advocacy and action" (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 72).

Certainly, I was advocating for the Indigenous voice during my years of field production because it was my personal and political mandate to put as many beautiful brown faces as possible on the screen culture in Canada, telling their unique stories in their own voices, from their perspectives. And, in this thesis, I have a stake in developing an Indigenous model for film and video making that honours Indigenous ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and listening." I am simultaneously balancing the tensions of being a media artist who creates visual narrative with acting as a scholar who must analyse the intuitive process of artistic production in academic, technical language. Presenting this thesis with multiple voices alleviates some of the tensions of having to constantly balance my Indigenous worldview with my educated western mind.

Beyond technical language, there is another problematic area that arises in negotiating our arguments in the English language. A prime example of this is in the opening chapter of *Our Own Image*, Barclay (1990), compares the making of a film to the calling together of a *hui* at a traditional *marae. Hui* is a Maori word that describes a traditional gathering to discuss important issues in Maori culture. In this evocative parallel, he applies Maori concepts to the filmmaking process and suggests desirable characteristics of the filmmaker. Barclay (1990) describes how the cultural protocols influenced how he, an individual filmmaker of Ngati Apa descent who lived at Omapere in the Far North's Hokianga district, related to the collective Maori community. He explains how the quality of the gathering is

"determined by the quality of the voice" calling the meeting, which is demonstrated by the "response to that voice" that is, who attends and who is prepared to intellectually engage with the stated purpose of the gathering.

From my Secwepemc-Syilx perspective, Barclay's (1990) use of the word "quality" adds three distinctions to the meaning of the English word. When he speaks of the "quality of the hui," "the quality of the voice" and the "quality of the response," (Barclay, 1990, pp. 12-13), I believe he is referring to a very abstract notion, which is no doubt captured in the Maori language. I interpret his use of the word *quality* in this multi-tiered application to mean a number of things. The "quality" of the gathering will be measured by who attends, out of respect for the person calling the meeting (quality of voice) and the "quality of the response" will be demonstrated by those who choose to intellectually engage with the issue on the floor. A deeper level of respect is extended to the core essence of the person who called the meeting when a participant of the gathering articulates any thoughtful consideration of any aspect of the question on the floor because it is a sacred interrelating, from the mind of one person to the mind of another person (M. Myers, personal communication, June 29, 2009).

Barclay (1990) says, "You have to be a brave person to call a hui" because "Your credibility is on the line in a most personal way (p. 12)." From his perspective, making a film is like calling together a traditional gathering because

> It takes guts to stand up and say, 'This matter is important and I want you to participate.' Any worthwhile film involves a certain arrogance – the arrogance to call a hui, especially as a young person (under 50). If you are not brave enough to call a hui, you do not have much right to be handling the extraordinary resources it takes to make a film. Then again, the process involves humility, the humility to bend the technology to the rules of the hui – to allow the people, the whole people, to speak (Barclay, 1990, pp. 12-13)

He identifies "arrogance" and "humility" as important qualities of a person's character but there is a danger in assuming that Barclay's meaning of these two words is the same as defined in the *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (Sykes, Ed., 1982), which are as follows,

16

"Arrogant: a. Overbearing; presumptuous, aggressively haughty; hence or cogn. ~ ANCE ~ ANCY, ns., ~antly"

and

"*humility* is defined as "humbleness; meekness; humble condition" (1982, p. 48; p. 486).

However, I believe Barclay indigenized the meaning of these two words, "arrogance and humility" because he wrote *Our Own Image* (1990) as a dialogue between and for Indigenous peoples; therefore, this changes the assumptions of the text. I interpret Barclay's use of the word arrogant to be outside of the *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (Sykes, Ed., 1982), which has pejorative connotations. From my Secwepemc (Shuswap) and Syilx (Okanagan) perspective, I understand his meaning to be, 'you better damn well have done your ground work and gathered enough information to bring forward to the people. You better have confidence in what you present because these people have come to dialogue with you and you better not waste their time'. For humility, I understand his meaning to be, 'you better be respectful enough to the people to accept any new thoughts or insights the people may bring to this discussion because it may change what you are putting forward. Although there is a literature by linguistic experts documenting the complexities of how Indigenous peoples employ the use of the English language, I did not research the linguistics domain for this thesis.

These double meanings for English speaking Indigenous peoples reveals tensions that an "insider" filmmaker or researcher of Indigenous ancestry/ worldview faces when looking through a culturally specific lens in order to maintain a cultural identity and to respect cultural protocols while interfacing with the contemporary forms of language or film technology in a commercially driven industry.

To summarize the challenges that I as an Indigenous film/video maker and scholar encounter before I outline the research problem, they are as follows: the location of Indigenous knowledge(s) in Euro Western academy; location of

myself in the cultural interface as described by Nakata (1998, 2007); maintenance of cultural integrity as a Secwepemc and Syilx researcher; and the indigenization of the English language to show culturally-nuanced meanings.

Considering the multifaceted layers of naming and locating myself within the academy, I embrace Barclay's (1990) words when he says, "It takes guts to stand up and say [t]his matter is important, I want you to participate." (p. 12-13). I am drawing on my brave nature and what "guts" I have to call people to a meeting on paper to discuss a very important matter. The point of calling the people together is to discuss how we as Indigenous peoples indigenize the pre-production funding and scripting processes of filmmaking to create culturally specific aesthetics in our films and videos. It is within Barclay's Maori sensibilities and my interpretation of an indigenized characterization of the two words, "arrogance" and "humility" that I as an Indigenous cultural producer bring my words to the discussion about Indigenous filmmaking to explore the possibilities of an Indigenous production model.

Naming and Locating the Researcher

In my Secwepemc (Shuswap) and Syilx (Okanagan) culture(s), it is respectful to introduce yourself, your family and your community to assist other Indigenous peoples to locate you and what traditional territories you were born to. In that way, I situate my privileged place on the land, which was passed down to me by my ancestors.

> I am of the Secwepemc (Shuswap) and Syilx (Okanagan) Nations from the interior lands of British Columbia. The anthropologists have categorized us as Interior Salish. I carry three tribal names, Cucwla7 from my Secwepemc Splats'in home community, Kwash Kay from the Syilx, my grandmother's people and Animikibinesikwe from the Anishnawbe peoples who adopted me into the Otter Clan when I lived on their territories.

> I am the daughter of Delphine Christian and Parke Dong. I am the granddaughter of Emily Christian (nee McNeil) and Alec Christian, the great granddaughter of Domenic Christian and On (Ann) Haskett and

the great-great granddaughter of Joe and Chobie (Sophie) Dominick. My colonial name is Dorothy Christian. I am the eldest of ten; one of my brothers is Chief in our community and Tribal Chair of the Secwepemc (Shuswap) Nation at the present time. Another brother sits on Council at home. I have one daughter and over forty-five nieces, nephews and great nieces and nephews.

My Syilx grandmother who did not speak English raised me in my early childhood years so the Okanagan language is my first language. Today, I understand some conversations but do not speak the language. I am from the Splats'in community, one of seventeen communities of the Secwepemc (Shuswap) Nation. My community sits at the territorial boundary of the two Nations.

I practice my cultural and spiritual ways. I tell you this because these practices shape my self-identity as an Indigenous woman on my homelands and was put in place by my ancestors. I choose to identify outside the state imposed "categories" of Indigenous peoples in Canada. The question of who is or is not Indian is very problematic when Canada asserts its' 'power over' the original peoples by naming who can or cannot be "Indian." Some of Canada's official identifiers are: Status, non-status, on reserve, off reserve, Métis and Inuit. These categories tend to be a divisive force amongst Indigenous peoples.

I currently live and study as a guest on Coast Salish territories I outline my professional background in storytelling format to inform the reader of my production and other related experience in the industry.

[June 1990] I am fasting at Bear Butte, in the sacred black hills of the Sioux people under the tutelage of a Sioux Medicine man. I go up the mountain to ask the Creator, "What is my purpose here? What am I supposed to be doing in this life?" In the first dream I have, two men carry a TV into my sacred space and I get really upset. I tell them, "get that TV out of here, it's not sacred or spiritual!" I tell the Medicine man about my dream when I come down the mountain, he smiles, nods and tells me I will see what the dream means in due time.

My meeting Rita Deverell in 1990 (during the so-called Oka Crisis) was an auspicious moment in my life because little did I know she would have a profound influence on the development of my career in the television industry. After Oka, Rita invited me to be a panellist on a weekly program called *It's About Time.* This is where I learned to be comfortable in front of the camera as I vehemently argued my Indigenous point of view on whatever topic was being discussed. She opened many doors for me in the broadcasting industry. Rita Shelton Deverell is an African-American (now Canadian) who was born in Texas in 1945 and who had a significant role in my contributions to the Indigenous Screen Culture in Canada.

My professional background includes working as a segment producer, director, and writer of over seventy-five mini-documentaries during eight television seasons while I was contracted by the national broadcaster Vision TV, the only multi-faith network in the world. Also, I have freelanced for CTV's, *First Story,* and the Aboriginal People's Television Network's (APTN) National News. I directed one season of two television series*, Art Zone (2003-2004) and Creative Native (2003-2004)* and one segment for the 2003 *Venturing Forth* series. I produced one corporate video, *Combining Our Strength: Native Women's Leadership (2006)* for the Minerva Foundation for BC women.

Although I do not own copyright of the mini-documentaries I produced for Vision TV, my informal agreement with the broadcaster included permission to submit my works to film festivals and to accept invitations to exhibitions. As a result, some of my works have screened internationally, nationally and regionally and some have received awards. The most notable is the Gemini Award in October 2000 for the "Best Talk/New Information category" when my short *Walking The Talk (2000)* was included in the half hour of the news- magazine program Skylight submitted by Vision TV. However, because I do not control the distribution of the work I produced, it is difficult to access my productions.

I worked at a non-profit media arts organization as the Executive Director and Film Festival Director for the Indigenous Media Arts Group for one year in Vancouver. I programmed the first ever drive-in

film festival, *REDSKINS Drive Home* (May 2004) at one of the two remaining drive-ins, which is located in my home community of Splats'in (near Enderby, B.C.). I have curated the Indigenous program in the 2005 Vancouver DOXA film festival and in the 2006 Victoria's MediaNet film festival.

While I lived in central Canada, I served on the Ontario Film Review Board (OFRB) for five years as a board member (1987-1991), then as the Chair of the agency for my final two years in Ontario (1992-1993). This provincial regulatory body screens and classifies all films, which are commercially distributed in the province. The OFRB consists of thirty-five community representatives from the diversity of the Ontario populous. I moved back to British Columbia in 1994 and to Vancouver in 2003, where, I taught entry level production process at the Digital Filmmaking Program at the Native Education Centre. In the same time period, I facilitated a workshop on how we create images for the screen for the Indigenous Arts Service Organization/BC Festival of the Arts In 2006, I completed my first independent video, *a spiritual land claim* (Christian, 2006) which was supported by the Canada Council for the Arts and the BC Arts Council. [11] This work has screened in film festivals in Bolivia, South America, London, England, and in various venues in BC, Alberta, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Riverside, California. This production was bestowed with the "Best Experimental Film Award" at the 2007 *Dreamspeakers Film Festival* in Edmonton, Alberta.

With my productions, I have travelled throughout Turtle Island and into Mexico. I have had the privilege of giving voice to many Indigenous peoples' stories. I have travelled internationally to the following countries: Russia, Kenya and Uganda in Africa, Mexico, Jamaica, Hawaii, and Germany and Switzerland in Europe.

Certainly, my cumulative life experience as well as my years of experience in the following areas informs my contemporary ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and listening:" administering the distribution of commercial film in Ontario, field producing in the film and television industry, programming film festivals, curating Indigenous programs for film festivals, being a Film Festival

Director, executive directing an Indigenous media arts organization and teaching entry level production process in Vancouver. However, the worldview of the culture I was born into provides the fundamental framework of how I conduct myself in the world. My ways of "seeing, "doing," "acting" and "listening" has been interrupted and distorted by the socio-political consequences of colonialism, which in turn affects the health and well being of my intellectual, social, political, economic and spiritual states. I will substantiate these points in Chapter 1.

The Problem, Research Questions and the Purpose of this Thesis

Research Questions

In this thesis, I will critically examine how Indigenous film and video makers do their work in representing themselves, their people, their concerns and visions by addressing four questions:

1) What are the aesthetics of Indigenous film elements?

2) What do the aesthetics of Indigenous screen culture look like, feel like, smell like, and sound like?

3) What are some of the culturally specific processes that determine Indigenous aesthetics?

4) How do they shape the notion of a Fourth World Cinema?

I look closely at the filmmaking process to examine how Indigenous peoples' ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and "listening" adapt and modify and/or "indigenize" the tools of technology to represent Indigenous aesthetics in the pre-production (funding and scripting) phase of the filmmaking process in a contemporary globalized world. I explore viable ways of transforming (indigenizing) production practices by identifying culturally specific operating principles to guide the process.

Purpose of this Thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to explore how the Indigenous worldview

informs the production process of Indigenous film and video makers in shaping the elements of their films thus creating Indigenous aesthetics. The secondary purpose is to identify how Indigenous operating principles shape the codes of conduct of Indigenous film and video makers to formulate a theoretical framework for culturally specific production. Then I recount where these principles may have influenced some of my productions and I look at some elements of Barb Cranmer's (Kwakwaka'wakw-Namgis) documentaries, which may reflect Indigenous storytelling styles (See: Appendix I).

Significance of the Problem

The significance of how Indigenous peoples represent themselves is of paramount importance to the survival of their cultures. The concept of *Indigeneity* sits at an intersection between discursive paradigms in the academy and cultural politics at multiple levels for Indigenous cultural production and Indigenous knowledge(s) thereby having direct implications to culturally specific Indigenous film production. This requires me to document what a culturally specific production process is to assist in understanding the nature of Indigenous media at local, national, and global levels (Ginsburg, 2002,1994; Halkin, 2008; Murray, 2008; Wilson & Stewart, 2008). The multiplicity of Indigenous cultures suggests that the experience of each Indigenous group is unique to their history, location, and where they are in the process of decolonizing their experience.

The intersection of "many discursive paradigms" is further complicated by how quickly the processes of globalization are changing the parameters of communication and interrelationships between countries, cultures and peoples. In this context, all things "Indigenous," including the visual images of Indigenous peoples, are a desirable commodity for the multinational stakeholders in the global market place (Smith, 2002; Wilson & Stewart, 2008).

It is in the financial interests of the multinational corporations to disprove, distort, erase or eliminate any efforts of Indigenous peoples to exercise political, social, or cultural sovereignty that affirms their Indigenous identity (thus

Indigeneity), which gives recognition of their a priori place on the lands. Land as well as natural resources and many other cultural facets of Indigenous cultures are being turned into marketable commodities that corporate interests seek to make profits from. As the "[t]he 'Indigenous Industry' is a global phenomenon that is worth billions and billions of dollars annually," it is "imperative to examine fundamental assumptions about what actually constitutes Indigeneity" (Wilson & Stewart, 2008, pp. 5-6).

There are many philosophical discussions about whether or not there are Indigenous aesthetics in the visual narrative and some even put forward aspects of what may constitute Indigenous aesthetics (Leuthold, 1998; Raheja, 2007 Todd, 2005); however, there is no focused study of what Indigenous aesthetics are. Therefore, this thesis will add to the limited literature produced by those in the communications and film and media arts disciplines (Ginsburg, 2003; Murray, 2008; Roth, 2005).

Outline of Chapters

I have identified the challenges I have faced in writing and thinking about this thesis. By outlining the "problem before the problem," I explained the following: the challenge of locating Indigenous knowledge(s) in a Euro Western academy; the challenge of locating myself in the cultural interface as described by Nakata (2002, 2007), the difficulties of maintaining integrity as a Secwepemc (Shuswap) and Syilx (Okanagan) researcher and how the indigenization of the English language gives culturally nuanced meanings outside Western definitions. I explain how this requires me to develop a unique approach to my research problem, which some Indigenous scholars may also encounter in the Academy. By providing an illustration of the Indigenous worldview and explaining the key concepts that will be used throughout the thesis, I have defined the epistemological context for my research.

In Chapter One, I review the literature and films from the time period of 1990 to 2009 (See: Appendix B for list of films screened for this research).[12] I review and draw on the work of Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars in order

to examine the (mis)representation of, or erasure of Indigenous knowledge and peoples in Western institutions, and the (mis)representation of Indigenous peoples in the global and national media. I recount a meta-narrative from my personal experiences in the mediascape of Canada and go on to discuss the history of what has interrupted the Indigenous ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and "listening." Then, I put forward my argument as to when Indigenous peoples started taking control of their own images. I examine the concept of *Indigeneity* and I argue this concept is central to the historical and contemporary conflicts between Western institutions and Indigenous peoples. I conclude by identifying gaps in the discourse and provide a summary of key points of the chapter.

In Chapter Two, I discuss where the concept of the Fourth World (1974) came from and link it to Barclay's *Fourth World Cinema* (2003). I draw on the works of Barry Barclay (Maori) (2003), Loretta Todd (Cree-Metis) (2005), Michelle Raheja (Seneca) (2007), Randolph Lewis (2006), Steven Leuthold (1998) and Jane Mills (2009) to make an argument for the importance of defining a standalone Indigenous Cinema/Fourth World Cinema. I explore in detail, the two concepts of a "Cinema of Sovereignty" and the "sovereign [Indigenous] gaze" that Lewis (2006) discusses in his documenting Alanis Obomsawin's film works. I argue that Indigenous peoples do create culturally specific film aesthetics, substantiated by Todd (2005) and Barclay's (1990, 1999, 2003, 2005) philosophical discussions. I introduce my notion of culturally congruent aesthetics through my production experiences.

In Chapter Three, I look at how critical stories are to the cultural healing and cultural decolonization of Indigenous peoples by drawing on Sousan Abadian's (2006) on-line journal article, which includes a paradigm of toxic/ reparative post-traumatic narratives. To provide a context for Indigenous stories, I look in-depth at how the Indigenous writers transformed the oral stories to the written form and put their innovative model forward as the framework for a multitude of Indigenous visual narratives. I juxtapose this model with Lorna Roth's (2005) theoretical development model and explore the implications to the cultural interface. I argue that Barclay's Maori perspective (1990, 1999, 2003,

2005) and approach has the same qualities that Lewis (2006) identifies when discussing a sovereign Indigenous gaze. I identify some of Barclay and Todd's (2005) guiding principles, which I argue are similar to Archibald's (2008) storywork principles of respect, responsibility, reciprocity and reverence, then look at how these principles determine Indigenous codes of conduct that are adapted for a culturally specific production processes. Thus, I provide the theoretical framework for Indigenous production. I complete the chapter by looking at how these principles have affected my production experience and may have affected the storytelling style of documentary maker, Barb Cranmer.

In the conclusion, I explain how a traditional meeting is brought to a close. Then I turn to academic protocols in bringing a thesis to a close by explaining the contemporary reality for Indigenous peoples in Canada. I provide an overview of the scholars works used and explain their importance to the argument of the thesis and look at the broader implications of this research. I put forward some considerations for future research. I outline a number of questions this research raises for Indigenous film/video makers. Also, I raise two questions for the policy makers and for the academy in terms of how the relationship is to develop, given the findings of the research and the contemporary reality. I conclude with a dream.

Chapter 1:
Sites of Exuberance: Indigenous Communications in an Era of Globalization

Introduction

In this chapter I recount a meta-narrative (story beneath the story) (Abadian, 2006) of my personal experiences with Indigenous media (mis) representation in Canada. I look at the obstacles Indigenous film and video makers encounter in developing Indigenous ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and listening." This is followed by a critique of some contemporary films. Then I provide a brief history of how regional, national, and global Indigenous peoples have taken control of their visual narratives and communications systems, which Barclay (2003) names as, "Sites of Exuberance." A place where he proposes, "going back to the beginning and working through, to try to pick up on where we changed and how we changed" (p. 1). By going back to the beginning, Indigenous film/video makers can discuss innovative ways of culturally specific production, rather than, simply reacting to and resisting colonizing societies. It is critical to write about why as well as how Indigenous peoples have stepped forward to take control of how they tell their stories because this provides insights into culturally specific storytelling styles, as well as the elements and aesthetics of their films. I discuss this further in Chapters 2 and 3.

To understand the geopolitical context of Indigenous People in the contemporary world, I discuss the concept of Indigeneity in the context of globalization, examining how the literature on globalization formulates (or fails to formulate) the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the nation-states where they live. I identify the gaps in academic studies on Indigeneity in this context and identify the differences between the approach of Indigenous and

non-Indigenous analyses in order to look for new thinking that may move the dialogue forward (Nakata, 2002, 2007).

Before I present how mainstream media has historically presented Indigenous peoples, a "hidden narrative" needs to be recounted (Abadian, 2006, p. 6). Abadian (2006), a Harvard scholar, explains, in her article, "Cultural Healing: When Cultural Renewal is Reparative and When it is Toxic," that her cultural (Persian) and spiritual roots (Zoroastrian) originate in the geo-political nation-state of Iran, formerly Persia. She describes Zoroastrianism as an "earth honouring spiritual tradition that holds all elements – earth, air, fire and water – as sacred and imbued with consciousness." Furthermore, she says, "the great Persian Empire" was "invaded and occupied 1,400 years ago by newly converted Muslim tribes of Arabia" that reduced their numbers through "a millennium of genocidal acts" (pp. 6-7). With this background, Abadian conducted research on Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island where she looked at why poverty persists with the original peoples. She argues "that healing collective trauma necessitates cultural and spiritual renewal – of institutions, narratives and relationships" (p. 8). Abadian examines how trauma deeply affects the narrative(s) of Indigenous cultures in the "reparative or toxic" healing process and defines *meta-narratives* as the

> deeper level; the stories beneath our stories; the melodies beneath the words; the deeply held ideas and beliefs that are the hidden scaffolding for our stories, songs, ceremonies, rituals, traditional and religious observances, even our laws (p. 9).

Like the Persian peoples, Indigenous world(s) have been profoundly affected in the social, political, spiritual and economic domains since the onset of colonialism, at the time of first contact. Generations of colonial policies and practices have disrupted the Indigenous reality on Turtle Island and have distorted the narratives of Indigenous peoples, thus creating meta-narratives. The complexities of cultural healing are a necessary part of the decolonization process because colonialism continues to influence how we as Indigenous peoples give meaning to, and understand our current realities. The visual

narratives we create collectively as Indigenous groups and individually as Indigenous film/video makers reflect where we are in our reparative or toxic healing process. It is within this context, I present the story of my personal experiences as an Indigenous woman engaged in creating a counter-narrative to the colonial narratives of national and international media.

A Meta Narrative: The Hidden Story

(August 1995) I was invited to be a driver on a marathon road trip with Marlowe [Sam] and Jeannette [Armstrong] to Portland, Oregon. They got a call that the Medicine Man who originally brought the Sundance ceremony to Secwepemc territories (in the interior of British Columbia), was on his death bed. When we arrived, I sat outside on the hospital grounds because I didn't know the man personally. There were many non-Indigenous peoples and some Indigenous peoples who had set up prayer circles for him on the hospital grounds and I sat with them praying for a man I didn't know because I had heard of good things he had done for the people.

(August 1995) In my dream, I am standing at a grave site, someone is being buried. I look at the faces of the people in attendance and I don't know anyone. There are a lot of non-Indians there. I wonder what I am doing here. I look into the grave and I don't know this person. This voice to my left says, "You must pray for life."

(Summer 1995) I am living in a log house on the Penticton Indian Reserve, way up in the mountains. This is my sanctuary I return to after travelling all over the country attending to my productions. I have a satellite dish so I can keep up to the latest world news. All summer I anxiously watch the local and national news because some Secwepemc people are under siege at what mainstream media called the Gustafsen Lake standoff. I shudder at the memories of five years previous when the whole of Indian country stood up to support the Mohawk and their supporters around their land rights issue.

29

(August 1995) In mid-August I see Armed Personnel Carriers (APC's) rolling in; once again the Canadian government had mobilized its military forces against the Indigenous peoples of these lands. We were at war again. The news is sketchy about the details. I'm media literate enough to know that the "Indian" side of the story isn't being told. Our Moccasin Telegraph is talking about a video done by the people behind the lines, that was being distributed and I want to get a copy. I ask two of the guys from the rez[13] to come with me to Secwepemc territory to hunt down a copy. We leave Penticton and as we are rolling into Vernon, my cell phone rings. Marlowe [Sam] says he and Jeannette [Armstrong] are driving up to Gustafsen Lake and they ask, "Do you want to come along as an extra driver?" Quite honestly I was dreading this call. I knew I would be doing more than just driving. My mind goes back to when I saw the APC's rolling in and this voice in my head said, "You have to go help out." After all, this was in my own territory and these were my people. I agreed to meet Jeannette and Marlowe at the Westbank Rez. The three of us drove non-stop and we arrived at Gustafsen Lake in the dead of night. We had no idea what was happening on the ground.

The next day we met with the Shuswap Liaison Committee and offered our help in whichever way they needed us. Marlowe and Jeannette end up on the negotiating team and I helped out in the communications area, just as I did during the so-called 1990 Oka Crisis. We attended another meeting held in a Church to get updated on what was happening. At that meeting, I listened to everyone who spoke in the Circle and I got really upset because I heard Chiefs and other peoples speaking about bringing the people out in body bags. I stood up and spoke in a highly charged emotional voice, "I didn't come here to help bring the people out in body bags. Those people behind the lines are my Uncles, my Aunties, my Brothers, my Sisters, my Nieces, and my Nephews. We can't speak about bringing them out in body bags, "WE HAVE TO PRAY FOR LIFE!" [Years later, I understood the significance of the dream that told me I had to "pray for life"].

The next twelve days are a blur. I worked out of a make shift office in a garage next door to a motel in 100 Mile House that functioned as command central for military, police and journalists. The powers-that-

be scrambled my cell phone so I was forced to use the pay phone in the lobby of the motel. I knew my calls were being monitored by some invisible ears and by the journalists who stood close enough to hear the content of my calls. Once again, I was managing communications from the front lines of a land rights fight to the Moccasin Telegraph of Indian Country. For the last twelve days of the siege, I slept in cars, on floors, and sometimes a motel bed. We worked twenty hour days. I had two sets of clothes and sometimes didn't get to bathe for days! Tupac Enrique Acosta, who was the international Indigenous observer for the UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues arrived. Arvol Looking Horse, Sioux Spiritual Leader and nineteenth generation Keeper of the Sacred White Buffalo Calf pipe, came in to speak to the people behind the lines because the stand-off was happening on sacred Sundance grounds.

I attended press scrums held by the RCMP and their Media representative, Sgt. Montague tried to exclude me. At the first scrum I attended, he looked pointedly at me and said, "This is only for accredited media" and I shot back, "I AM accredited media, I work for a national broadcaster!" I was the only person of color there. Montague ignored my questions, so I asked women reporters from the CBC, Global or CTV to ask my questions. I saw firsthand how the RCMP manipulated the press and how they racialized and criminalized our people. As one specific example, the national news reports were saying that the people behind the lines were just "criminals" and they listed three men's names along with probable bogus criminal charges. One of the men they focused on was Johnny Guitar from the Adams Lake Indian Band. Johnny was working security for us and was on wake up detail for me and others, so I knew he was with us and NOT behind the lines as the RCMP claimed.

On September 4, 1995, across the country in Ipperwash Provincial Park (in the geo-political land known as the province of Ontario) the Indians from the Stoney Point reserve occupied their ancestral lands that were expropriated before the Second World War through the War Measures Act with a promise that the land would be returned after the war. One man, Dudley George was killed.

At one point, during the last twelve days at Gustafsen Lake, I arranged a conference call with some of the negotiators of that land rights fight at Ipperwash with the negotiators at our end of the country because we knew what the mainstream media was reporting about both situations was not covering the "Indian" side of the story.

On September 17, 1995 the people came out from behind the lines at Gustafsen Lake. No one was killed.

The Medicine man who had originally brought the Sundance to Secwepemc territories died just after the standoff.

Given the lived Indigenous experience of being an active participant at two modern day Indian wars (the so-called Oka Crisis and Gustafsen Lake standoff), it is clear that my way of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and listening" is outside the Euro-western perspectives of the mainstream media; however, it is incumbent upon me within Nakata's notion of the "cultural interface" to understand the discourse from the dominant society's perspective, as a part of cultural survival.

The "Interrupted" Indigenous Way of Seeing, Doing, Acting and Listening

Insofar as our way of seeing, consciously or unconsciously, gives meaning to visual images and are determined by the political ideology and the social conditions of the culture in which we are located (Sturken & Cartwright, 2003, pp. 10-43), then it is necessary to discuss some of the historical aspects of the representation of Indigenous peoples. This history informs the contemporary environment and in turn shapes the visual narratives created by the dominant society about Indigenous peoples. According to Sturken and Cartwright (2003)

In common parlance, to gaze is to look or stare, often with eagerness or desire. In much psychoanalytic film criticism, the gaze is not the act of looking itself, but the viewing relationship characteristic of a particular set of social circumstances (p. 76).

The gaze can be understood as the relationship between the looker and what is looked at. They argue that as "the image conventions have changed so have the ways of understanding traditional images" (Sturken & Cartwright, 2003, p. 83). One of the conventional ways of looking is through the institutionalized gaze that developed through the 1800s with the modern capitalist organization of society where visual images can be used as a function of institutional power, as well as an instrument of power (Sturken and Cartwright 2003, p. 93). They explain that the

> tradition of institutional photography, in, which prisoners, mental patients, and peoples of various ethnicities were photographed and catalogued, can be related to the traditions of visual anthropology and travel photography as well as to the tradition of painting peoples of so-called exotic locales. All function to varying degrees to represent codes of dominance and subjugation, difference and otherness (p. 100).

Since the time of first contact between the invading Imperialists and Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island, the "codes of dominance, subjugation, difference and otherness" of the binary colonial relationship are well documented in various mediums, and I argue this has not changed substantially since the 1880s.

The most recent contemporary Hollywood film example of "otherness" is James Cameron's highly successful film, *Avatar* (2009).[14] In the overused story line, the blue Indigenous peoples with tails are still referred to as "hostiles" and "terrorists" by the alpha white male mercenary who is leading the military action against the people on the aptly named planet of Pandora. The visit by the Earthlings to Pandora opens a box of issues that reveals the greed of the corporate interests who are seeking the 'unobtainium' held in the tribal lands of the Na'vi peoples.

While the story has an important environmental and spiritual message that acknowledges the Indigenous worldview, the film's hero Jake Sully is still a white guy, albeit a transformed Marine who becomes a mixed blood Na'vi warrior through genetic manipulation and predictably falls in love with Cameron's Pocahontas character, Neytiri. Through the implications of the subtext, the Indigenous male characters, the Na'vi warriors' leadership skills are once again undermined in their own society by a white guy. Their ability to protect their people is effectively neutralized.

As one online reviewer, who remains anonymous and self identifies as a White guy, states, "Critics have called alien epic *Avatar* a version of *Dances With Wolves* because it's about a white guy going native and becoming a great leader. But *Avatar* is just the latest sci-fi rehash of an old white guilt fantasy" (Unknown, 2010, p. 1). The anonymous White guy goes on to say,

> Think of it this way. *Avatar* is a fantasy about ceasing to be white, giving up the old human meatsack to join the blue people, but never losing white privilege. Jake never really knows what it's like to be a Na'vi because he always has the option to switch back into human mode. [...] When whites fantasize about becoming other races, it's only fun if they can blithely ignore the fundamental experience of being an oppressed racial group, which is that you are oppressed, and nobody will let you be a leader of anything (p.1).

Although many in mainstream North American society appear to be aware of the colonial narrative of what I name, the *"Dances with Avatars"* script, it is apparent that the power of the colonial white male voice still dominates the contemporary reality of Indigenous peoples.

Another well-known international example of how the conventional colonial way of looking at Indigenous peoples has not changed over the centuries and continues to plague the contemporary world is Australian director, Bruce Beresford's film, *Black Robe* (1991). This film is set in the seventeenth century. The central protagonist, Father Laforgue, a Jesuit missionary from France,

travels cross country by canoe with Algonquin guides through Iroquois territory to reach a Huron village where his church has established a permanent Mission.

Twenty minutes into the award-winning feature film, the white male director's gaze is revealed when the audience observes a Jesuit priest watching an Indian man fornicating with an Indian woman doggy style. The director's perspective of Indigenous sexuality is embedded in his vulgar portrayal of the sex act. The scene is problematic for many reasons; however, it is the nuanced message of the subtext that is the most damning. I interpret the subtext of Beresford's visual representation to say: These Indians are so savage; they fuck their women like dogs. In other words, Indigenous women are no better than dogs (Churchill, 1994, pp. 115-137)!

The film is based on a novel of the same name, written in 1985 by literary award winner, Brian Moore, an Irish nationalist who lived in Canada and the United States. His research is based on the *Jesuit Relations* (1610 – 1791), a compilation of the letters and diaries of the first Jesuit missionaries in Canada. An English version of these documents is housed in Canada's National Archive and available on the World Wide Web where these documents are acknowledged as "an important primary source of information on the history of 17th-century New France."[15] Certainly, it is important to have "primary sources" of historical events; however, there is no qualifying statement that they reflect the racist and ethnocentric views of the seventeenth century. And, because of this, I, along with other Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars (Churchill, 1994; Crosby, 1991; Harding, 2006; Palys, 1996; Roth, 2005;[16] Singer, 2001) argue that Canada continues to perpetuate the "savage" myths of this colonial era through their silence.

These contemporary film examples are based in a long history of the colonial (mis)representation of Indigenous peoples. The visual representation of Indigenous peoples reached the highest forms of exploitation in the late 1800s when the colonial practices of anthropologists used Indigenous people as living, museum artefacts put on display for European audiences. Barb Hager's (Cree-Métis) documentary *From Bella Coola to Berlin* (2005) recounts the experience of

nine people from Bella Coola (Nuxalk) of the Pacific Northwest coast taken to Germany in 1885 to be exhibited. [17] And, Robinson's (1989) chapter, "Captive in an English Circus" recounts the dehumanizing experience of an Okanagan man who was put on display, "They took him everywhere for show. [...] And these people, they pay. Pay money to see that Indian. There is no Indian in Europe at that time. Only him." (Robinson, p. 259).

A less distasteful visual representation of Indigenous peoples is the work of adventurous photographers during the settling of the Wild West who stirred the imaginations of the European settlers by taking pictures of the "Vanishing Indians." This paradigm was established in the social sciences and its colonial approach is commonly referred to as the "salvage paradigm" (Crosby, 1991). The staged photographs of the original peoples of North America by famous American photographer, Edward Curtis, are said to be "one of the most significant and controversial representations of traditional American Indian culture ever produced."[18]

The screen culture in North America developed in the early 1900s and would evolve into the primary source of entertainment where Indigenous peoples were the subjects of many silent films. From 1903 to 1949, two hundred and forty-two silent films were made in the United States alone (Hilger, 1986, pp. 10-50). American filmmakers had a

> generally sympathetic view of the American Indian, especially in the early part of the silent era, which was less than thirty years after the western Indian wars. This sympathy was usually expressed in Indian characters who were noble but wronged or doomed, although the bloodthirsty image became more popular toward the end of the silent era (p. 6).[19]

Indigenous characters were in popular demand in the scripts of this new form of visual representation; however, Indigenous peoples rarely played the caricaturized roles.

When silent films progressed to "talkies" one *real* Indian, Mohawk Jay Silverheels (birth name, Harold J. Smith), got to play Tonto, Hollywood's most famous Indian. [20] He faithfully rode his horse alongside the Lone Ranger,

grunting and ugh-ing in monosyllabic tones at the masked Whiteman's cowboy dialogue. Through popular culture, most children in North America mimicked the Lone Ranger and Tonto. Sadly, even Indigenous children played this *game* and most of them wanted to be the *cowboy* rather than the *Indian*. As Randy Fred (1992): (Nuu-chah-nulth) says, in the foreword of the *Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture:*

> We saw the same movies in that school that white kids did: westerns; and, like them, we cheered on the cowboys or the cavalry. We too played Cowboys and Indians – and we all wanted to be cowboys. I felt like I had a special claim on cowboys, as I was named after Randolph Scott, one of the biggest movie cowboys (Fred cited in Francis, 1992, p. xi).

Although in the twenty first century western *Appaloosa* (2008), directed by actor Ed Harris, political correctness has erased the *dumb Indian.* His sidekick, played by Viggio Mortensen has the same skin color as the cowboy hero and he is scripted to speak in full sentences. The fact remains that the people whose lands are being stolen, are still denigrated and the Indian women are still called 'squaws' while Indian men are represented as renegades with guns![21]

Through these various permutations of the colonial gaze established in the 1700s, 1800s, and early 1900s, the pervasive Eurocentric gaze of the settler cultures were indelibly written into the social, political, economic, and spiritual domains of the contemporary Indigenous peoples' lives. I argue that this consciousness established in the early colonial years still dominates the screen cultures of North America, which is used as a tool to universalize Western history. Like Smith (2002), I argue that it is through the "universalization of knowledge" and the "reaffirm[ing] of the West's view of itself as the centre of legitimate knowledge" (p. 63) which creates what Abadian (2006) calls, *post-traumatic narratives.*

However, Indigenous peoples have not been passive from their side of the colonial fence. As one scholar describes, "[in] an intervention that paralleled the postcolonial move to 'write back' against colonial masters, Indian activists began to 'shoot back,' reversing the colonial gaze by constructing their own visual

media, telling their stories on their own terms"[22] (Prins cited in Wilson & Stewart, 2008, p. 4).

Shooting Back: Taking Control of the Images

In 1975, the Chief of my community, Rosalind Leon (nee Williams) along with like-minded Indians of the Secwepemc (Shuswap) and Syilx (Okanagan) territories, took serious political action. In Chief Leon's words:

> The occupation of regional DIA (Department of Indian Affairs)[23] offices followed a UBCIC (Union of BC Indian Chiefs) conference in Chilliwack where a people driven motion was passed to reject Gov't funding that amounted to crumbs and were meaningless in what was needed to address our needs (education, housing, economics) it was also hoped our actions would open the door to discuss our real issues (the land question). Filming of our traditions and practices were also documented along the way (R. Leon (nee Williams), personal communication, July 6, 2009).

The grassroots Indigenous peoples realized their goal through their civil action and closed the regional office. They assumed the right to communicate directly with the provincial DIA office, without the third party supervision of the Indian Agent. More importantly, the activists filmed their political activities and recorded invaluable stories and as a result, my community has a rich archival resource of oral (hi)stories from our Elders who have since passed.

Also, in the mid 1970s, on the national scene in Canada, the Inuit of the north took a strong political stance on visual representation. They started the 30 year political battle to control the images beamed into their living rooms by the Canadian broadcasters of the southern region (Kunuk & Puhipau, 2005, Roth, 2005). Kunuk (Inuit) explains the incredible foresight of his people to consider preservation of their language, known as Inuktitut.

> We had voted to keep television out of the community in the mid-1970s. We didn't want it because there were no Inuktitut programs. It was all in English. And I guess our elders were afraid of the impact it would have if there were nothing in our language on the TV. So we kept TV out for a number of years (Kunuk and Puhipau, 2005, p. 46).

The organized efforts of the Inuit and the Secwepemc are just two examples of Indigenous people actively empowering themselves in the 1970s; many more examples exist than can be documented in one thesis.

Internationally in Maori land (Aoetearoa), geo-politically known as New Zealand, "the 1970s was the key decade in, which social activist movements and diplomatic pressure groups were formed with a view towards organizing coherent strategies for the representation of the rights of Indigenous peoples" (Murray, 2008, p. 11-12). He explains,

> On a global level, 1975 saw the formation of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP), an organization that sought to define an international sense of the Fourth World that might work effectively as a campaigning bloc on a global stage.[24] Within the United Nations (UN), the declaration of a decade against racism in 1973 was followed by the organisation granting non-governmental organisation (NGO) observer status to a number of North American and international Indigenous collectives (p. 12).

Clearly, in the dynamic period of the 1970s, regional, national and international Indigenous communities were politically organizing to take back control of their own visual narratives.

Two decades later, during the 1990s, Indigenous peoples made what were perceived as great political strides when the United Nations declared the *International Decade of the World's Indigenous People* (1995-2004) and set up a UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.[25] However, because of the "enormous problems that Indigenous peoples continue to face," resolution (59/174) was passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations for a second international decade (2005-2014) of the World's Indigenous peoples to take effect on January 1, 2005.

It is critical to note that Canada was one of four countries that did not support the *Declaration on the Rights for Indigenous Peoples* in September 2007 at the United Nations. Originally, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States voted against the Declaration; however, since that time Australia has reversed its position, New Zealand is rethinking its position and President Barack Obama has met with over four hundred tribal leaders in the US, which implies

there may be a change in their position. If the US and New Zealand do in fact reverse their positions, this will leave Canada as the sole opposition to the Declaration on the Rights for Indigenous Peoples.[26]

Indigenous Media

During the 1990s in Canada, there are three primary examples of the institutional gaze where mainstream media operates as an instrument of power and (mis)represents Indigenous peoples during the the highly publicized land rights disputes: Oka Crisis, Gustafsen Lake Standoff, and Ipperwash.[27,28,29] From my Indigenous perspective, the mainstream media racialized and criminalized First Nations people as terrorists when in fact they were standing up to defend their Aboriginal Rights and Title to the lands they were born to. This thesis will not engage in the "them-us" binary because that binary overlooks what is more important: how Indigenous peoples have innovatively used communication systems and technologies in their land rights disputes.

In 1990, I worked in conjunction with the Mohawk Nation Office as much as possible; however, I took my direction from the two Iroquois negotiators Mike (Brian) Myers (Seneca) and Bob Antone (Oneida) and two of the spiritual people from the Okanagan Nation, Jeannette Armstrong and Marlowe Sam. And, in 1995 I worked in a makeshift office set up by the Shuswap Liaison Committee in a garage, next door to a motel at 100 Mile House, under the direction of Jeannette Armstrong (Okanagan) and Marlowe Sam (Okanagan). My communications activities were very portable and crisis oriented. I improvised and drew on my ingenuity to raise consciousness about the land rights fights. I utilized the tools available to me, which were, my personal cell phone, calling card and fax machines I was able to access.

During the summer of 1990, the Mohawk people of the Iroquois Confederacy and their supporters quickly organized a defensive position when the Canadian government deployed their military units against the people. The communities were adapting to the new technologies; fax machines and cell phones were the main modes of communication for the majority of the people.

The negotiators representing the Iroquois Confederacy who managed the crisis called upon their human resources within the Nation and their allies to counter the media (mis)representations of their land rights conflict. At that time, the Mohawk Nation did not have a structured communications department set up (M. Myers, personal communication, June 29, 2009).

Four years after Oka and one year before Gustafsen Lake and Ipperwash in Canada, the Indigenous peoples in the southern region of the western hemisphere captured the attention of the international media on January 1, 1994 when masked and armed Indigenous men and women assumed control of six towns in the Chiapas region of Mexico. It was no accident "the Zapatistas chose January 1, 1994 – the date the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect" because this international trade agreement directly impacted their agricultural practices. The marketing boards established by NAFTA excluded the grassroots people, which means they would lose a major revenue source. In effect, the Indigenous peoples were responding to a set of compounded injustices over a century of being treated as "second-class citizens" by the state of Mexico, which failed to recognize their land and cultural rights and now threatened their ability to trade effectively with each other (Halkin, 2008, pp. 160-180).

On the surface these modern day Indians wars in the North and in the South appear similar; however, in the four years between the two events, it is important to understand how quickly the information technologies changed and how the Indigenous People in the South implemented them in their defensive strategies. When the autonomous communities of the southern region of Mexico in Chiapas, who became known as the Zapatistas, launched their highly publicized resistance movement, it was evident that the new information technologies, specifically the internet, were a part of their pre-planned communications strategy. They utilized the World Wide Web to their advantage. They set up a media network that defied any notions of *backward and primitive* Indigenous peoples. Their electronic reach bypassed the borders of the nation-

state of Mexico and they gained international support from around the world. The Zapatistas had electronic alliances with many groups in their land and cultural rights fight that included other Indigenous peoples, the anti-globalization movement, the labour unions, and church groups. Founder, former director and now international coordinator of the Chiapas Media Project (CMP)/Promedios[30] explains:

> In addition to guns, the media was always an important part of the Zapatista "arsenal"; in fact, in the days immediately following the uprising, the Zapatistas (via sympathetic supporters) used the Internet to broadcast their cause to the world (Halkin, 2008, p. 161).

The ingenuity and innovativeness of the people of Chiapas gained the attention of many researchers and community-based peoples because of how effectively they used the new information technologies. They exercised creativity by writing some of their press releases in poetic form, which inspired many poets. They exercised sovereignty in controlling how the visual images of their cry for justice were managed and disseminated. They made the technology work for them by using the Internet to their advantage.

As Halkin (2008) explains,

> With appeals via the Internet, they focused international attention on the uprising and, in so doing, used the resulting international pressure to force the Mexican government into negotiations, and a subsequent truce, by January 12, 1994 (p. 161).

The Chiapas Media Project (CMP)/Promedios continue to inspire other Indigenous peoples to this day with their stance on political and visual sovereignty. They still provide equipment, computers and training to marginalized Indigenous communities in Mexico; however, the basic training is now provided by regional Coordinators from the Chiapas region. When required, Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples provide advanced media training in Mexico. "Since 1998, the CMP/Promedios has distributed over 6000 Indigenous produced videos. These videos have been screened at universities, museums, and film and video festivals worldwide."[31] They still have total control of the medium and the message!

I was very fortunate to meet Alex Halkin, the founder of CMP/Promedios at a conference on global Indigenous Media in May 2007. We exchanged stories and laughter long into the night. Since then, Alex invited me to serve on the Advisory Board of the Chiapas Media Project.

In Canada, Harding (2006) explains how the mainstream media continues to systematically reproduce hostile, denigrating images of Indigenous People. In the foreword to his article, "*Historical Representations of Aboriginal People in the Canadian news media*," he states that the discourse

> effectively sanctions racism towards aboriginal people since white Canadians have historically enjoyed, and continue to hold, decisive advantages over aboriginal people in all forms of institutional power. Today, these power relations are strongly supported not only by the mass media, but by other institutions such as education and the criminal justice system, and are reflected in laws and policies (2006, p. 205).

Twenty years after three armed conflicts in Canada, the racist discourse continues to sustain and reinforce official state policy and it appears the general Canadian society still turns a blind eye to the constructed colonial history that still denies the place of the Indigenous peoples on their homelands. The relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada remains unequivocally unequal (Harding, 2006, p. 205). The same unequal power relations exist for the Indigenous peoples in Mexico.

While it is critical to underline the continued use of the mainstream media as instruments of power by the nation-states and corporations over the Indigenous peoples in the global world, it is also essential to point out the length of time Indigenous peoples have resisted by controlling their self-representation. It is imperative to understand why in the international domain, the nation-states of Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States would oppose a Declaration for Indigenous Rights at the United Nations. Thus it is necessary to examine the concept of *Indigeneity* to see what is at stake for Indigenous peoples, the nation-states and the multinational corporations.

Indigeneity and Globalization

Most nation-states and the Indigenous peoples living within their current geo-political borders are embroiled in international and domestic political battles about what actually constitutes "Indigeneity." For Indigenous peoples this means many things but the most critical issue is having to prove their *Indigeneity* or *Indian identity* in the costly law courts of the nation-states where they live to validate their a priori existence on the lands they were born to.

Wilson and Stewart (2008) explain some of the complexities of defining *Indigeneity* and the consequences for Indigenous peoples in presenting their visual narratives in national, global and mainstream media.

> When discussing Indigeneity, we encounter an intersection of many discursive paradigms in academia and also in cultural politics at all levels.we believe that an exploration of the paradigms that have defined the concept of Indigeneity will help frame the larger question of what constitutes "Indigenous media" (p. 6).

To illustrate some of the intersections, Wilson and Stewart (2008) begin by describing the efforts of the dominant film industry to include Indigenous filmmakers at a 2004 Santa Fe conference, called *Hollywood's fast track,* and at a panel at the 2006 Sundance Film Festival, described as "providing a world stage for their compelling and innovative stories" and offering the opportunities to become a part of a "global filmmaking community" (p. 1). They criticize how "all public relations discourse" at these types of events focus on the terms, *global* and *marketplace* to entice individuals and collectives to be participants in the capitalist economic system by implying inclusion. In fact, the values of the profit driven market model of the mainstream film industry are diametrically opposed to the values of some Indigenous peoples who are concerned with maintaining the cultural protocols based in their Indigenous systems of knowledge(s) that regulate how their images are managed. Plus, the mainstream film industry expects Indigenous film/video makers to construct their visual narratives according to Western storytelling styles, which by its very nature negates Indigenous storytelling styles. This issue will be discussed more in-depth in

Chapter 3. In the westernization of Indigenous narratives, they may realize profits in the market driven model; however, the films then compromise the quality of *Indigeneity* that gives them a unique place in the market.

Indigenous peoples are "using new technologies to craft culturally distinct forms of communication and artistic production that speak to local aesthetics and local needs," which is why Wilson and Stewart (2008) are calling for a re-examination to formulate new definitions and assumptions for, and about Indigenous media. Rather than accept the film industry's marketing models Indigenous peoples need to formulate their own models, particularly in this era of globalization (p. 2).

Historically, rapid integration into the global marketplace has political, social and economic ramifications, and scholars, like Wilson and Stewart (2008) provide a framework to understand how Indigenous people have both resisted and negotiated market paradigms through concerted political actions. There are unique economic challenges for Indigenous peoples and their indigeneity. One of those challenges relates directly to their self-representation in what Arjun Appadurai (1990) identifies as the "disjunctures" of "global cultural flows" in the global economy.

As Nakata (2007) explained, the issue of Indigenous knowledge(s) is layered with cultural and complex considerations. Bringing those complexities together with the complicated intersections of the global economy whose markets are profit driven, then "selling the Indigenous through media, tourism, arts, crafts, music and images" becomes a maze of contradictions for Indigenous peoples. Because on the one hand, "Indigenous peoples worldwide feel the need to monitor and protect" their cultures; yet, they also want to be participants in the global economy (Wilson & Stewart, 2008, p. 5).

In Appadurai's (1990) comprehensive article about the global economy, he overlooks the original peoples. He examines the "disjunctures" between "global cultural flows" that affect the interrelatedness of nations and cultures and describes how "cultural transactions between social groups" happened in the past through nation-to-nation relationships involving warfare and religious

conversion that "have generally been restricted by geography and ecology and at other times by active resistance to interactions with the "Other." But Appadurai (1990) says, "[...] today's world involves interactions of a new order and intensity" (p. 1). For Indigenous peoples, the intensity of this new order is paramount because as Wilson and Stewart (2008) explain

> 'Indigenous Industry' is a global phenomenon that is worth billions and billions of dollars annually. In this context, it becomes an imperative to examine fundamental assumptions about what actually constitutes Indigeneity on the international stage, because that's where the major players are [...] conducting their business. (pp. 5-6)

While Appadurai's (1990) model is important in dislodging the existing "center-periphery model" and renaming the "new global cultural economy" as "a disorganized capitalism," it is critical to note the omission of Indigenous peoples in his identifying the "fundamental disjunctures between economy, culture and politics" particularly when he discusses the territories of nation-states (p. 2). I argue that linking the question of Indigenous peoples' territories to the nation-states of a globalized world deserves serious theoretical investigation by scholars of Appadurai's stature.

In a global world order where the notion of "de-territorialisation" is dissolving national borders and where large cosmopolitan centres are quickly becoming the hub of the market driven industrialized world, land-based Indigenous cultures are threatened by "the tension between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization" (Appadurai, 1990, p. 1). And, Appadurai (1990) says deterritorialization is "one of the central forces of the modern world, since it brings labouring populations into the lower class sectors and spaces of relatively wealthy societies" (p. 6). Furthermore, he states this is a

> fertile ground of deterritorialization, in, which money, commodities, and persons are involved in ceaselessly chasing each other around the world, that the mediascapes and ideoscapes of the modern world find their fractured and fragmented counterpart. For the ideas and images produced by mass media often are only partial guides to the goods and experiences that deterritorialized populations transfer to one another (p. 7).

At the same time, he states that "as forces from various metropolises are brought into new societies they tend to become indigenized in one way or other way" and that "the dynamics of such indigenization have just begun to be explored in a sophisticated manner" (p. 1). While, Appadurai (1990) applies the term "indigenize" in his analysis of the global cultural economy, he fails to examine how the term applies specifically to the Indigenous peoples of the nation-states. Instead, he focuses more on the general dynamics of "localizing" or what he refers to as "indigenizing" the forces of globalization and in particular, culture. He says,

> The complexity of the current global economy has to do with certain fundamental disjunctures between economy, culture and politics, which we have barely begun to theorize. I propose that an elementary framework for exploring such disjunctures is to look at the relationship between five dimensions of global cultural flow, which can be termed: (a) ethnoscapes; (b) mediascapes; (c) technoscapes; (d) finanscapes and (e) ideoscapes." (p. 2)

Appadurai says, the "tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guestworkers, and other moving groups" of his conceptual "ethnoscape" are an "essential feature of the world" and "appear to affect the politics of and between nations to a hitherto unprecedented degree (p. 2)." Clearly, Indigenous peoples are not considered a part of the "essential feature of the world" as he omits them in his analysis.

Also, in Appadurai's (1990) discussion of deterritorialization, he says it creates "new markets for film companies, art impresarios and travel agencies who thrive on the need of the deterritorialized population for contact with its homeland" (p. 6). He also clarifies his use of the common suffix "scapes" and explains it is not just one view of any given vision but that they are:

> ..deeply perspectival constructs, inflected very much by the historical, linguistic and political situatedness of different sorts of actors: nation-states, multinationals, diasporic communities, as well as sub-national grouping and movements, (whether religious, political or economic), and even intimate face-to-face groups, such as villages, neighbourhoods and families (p.2).

Conceivably, Indigenous peoples could be included in the "diasporic communities" or the "sub-national groupings and movements." However, it is clear that Appadurai has not considered Indigenous peoples or the concept of *Indigeneity* in his analysis of the "fundamental disjunctures between economy, culture and politics." While Indigenous peoples with the complexities of their diasporic experiences are striving to reclaim the Indigeneity of their cultures, they are like the salmon, swimming upstream against the tsunami of the "global cultural flows" that do not recognize or acknowledge their place on their territories, seeing them only as commodities. Nevertheless, Indigenous peoples are profoundly affected by each of the five dimensions identified when interrelating with some of the actors listed, in particular the nation-states and multi-nationals whose hunger for new territories to industrialize, deny and, thus minimize Indigenous concerns.

The interests of the multinational corporations are in direct opposition to any efforts of Indigenous peoples to exercise political, social, or cultural sovereignty that affirms the concept of *Indigeneity* because any recognition of their a priori place on the lands interferes with the profit margins of the corporations and the nation-states.

As Ted S. Palys (1996) points out, by referencing Boldt (1993),[32] stakeholders have divergent interests. He states the

> 'national interest' – which notwithstanding the government's fiduciary obligations, has always been defined in terms of the interests of the settler populations – has always been pitted against the interests of Aboriginal peoples, with the "national interest" always taking precedence [...] The result is that non-Aboriginal Canada has prospered on the backs of First Nations resources, and at the expense of Aboriginal peoples. (Boldt cited in Palys, 1996, p. 3)

In the mean time, "national interests" take precedence over and are in opposition to Indigenous interests, the primary example being how the nation-states' view of land for expanding development or for the natural resources to be extracted. Power continues to remain in the hands of the hegemonic settler governments as the "economic, cultural and scientific forms of imperialism" of the

48

"nineteenth and twentieth centuries" are reformulated and "geography of Empire redrawn" (Smith, 2002, p. 97). If as Smith (2002) claims, "[the] political divide of North-South becomes a more meaningful way to describe the First, Second, Third and Fourth worlds and territories become markets where interesting little backwaters are untapped potentials" for the global economy (Smith, 2002, pp. 97-98), then how is it possible to define the concept of *Indigeneity* in this environment? That is, "nation –states [are] 'putting up' with the presence of Indigenous peoples, [...] – under the auspices of 'official' diversity policies – by competing for Indigenous land and resources, but also for the international 'brand recognition' afforded by Indigenous cultural property" (Wilson & Stewart, 1990, p. 7). How can Indigenous peoples begin to define their *Indigeneity* in this David and Goliath scenario?

In working with "modern international organizations and international legal experts," the Working Group for Indigenous Peoples at the United Nations, has identified some criteria that are considered "relevant to understanding "Indigenous" [peoples] — "but, which do not and cannot constitute an inclusive or comprehensive definition, though they may provide some general guidelines." They include the following: "which imperialist power assumed control of their territories, the location of the lands and peoples in question, what time period in western history this occurred, the demographics of the Indigenous populations, and the politics and cultures of the Indigenous group affected" (Wilson & Stewart, 2008, p 14).

Another approach to *Indigeneity* is through the lens of the book *Indigenous Diasporas and Dislocations* where Harvey and Thompson (2005) explain in their introduction that their book "connects two concepts that are often used as if they were necessarily antagonistic and antithetical to one another: Indigenous and *Diaspora*." The Jewish experience is understood as the "classic form of diaspora"; however, Harvey and Thompson (2005) clarify their approach as "embrac[ing] refugees and migrant labourers, as well as traders and multiculturalists" (p. 1). Furthermore they state that their approach is

concerned with the diasporas of *Indigenous* peoples, and their concepts of culture and religion. It is not only about diaspora, but also about indigeneity. In fact, by engaging with some of the many and various diasporic experiences, locations, communities and contexts in, which Indigenous peoples (and sometimes root) themselves and in, which 'Indigenous religions' are practised or observed, the book considers what Indigeneity itself means and may have always meant, particularly in the context of dispersal rather than rootedness (p. 2).

Harvey and Thompson (2005) are not only bringing together two seemingly "antithetical" concepts, they are also introducing the complexities of religion in relation to Indigenous populations. However, they do not acknowledge the significant difference between western notions of religion and Indigenous worldviews of spirituality. With this clarification, I agree with Harvey and Thompson that Indigenous spirituality (as opposed to religion) is central to the concept of *Indigeneity* because Indigenous peoples locate themselves on the lands they were born through the Creation Stories that are embedded in their systems of knowledge.

Harvey and Thompson (2005) attempt to illustrate the complex issues surrounding the concept of *Indigeneity* by "[c]onsidering what 'Indigenous' might mean in the context of modernity and its diasporic rearrangement of peoples and places" (p. 2). To describe what Indigenous means in this context they set up one set of concepts that "one might assume [are]… indicative of pre-modern conditions and societies" against another set of concepts that "are often assumed or considered to be emblematic and endemic to modernity and colonialism and their putative successors: post-modernity and post-colonialism" (p. 2). They claim that both sets of concepts apply to *Indigeneity* in the global world. Harvey and Thompson (2005) explain,

> On the contrary, the trauma of dislocation and disenfranchisement requires more rather than less engagement with the realities of diaspora and with discourses of home, home-coming, or 'going home'. Indigeneity could be defined as 'belonging *in* a place', but many Indigenous people demonstrate that a better definition is 'belonging *to* a place', though they may or may not live in it (p. 10).

With Harvey and Thompson's (2005) definition of *Indigeneity* as "belonging to a place or in a place," I argue they are getting at the core of what *Indigeneity* means to Indigenous peoples and that is the intimate relationship with their traditional homelands. Moreover, they explain that there are

> aspects of people's cultures that cannot be performed or experienced anywhere but at a particular spring or mountain or river or tree. Distance from such places, or their destruction, must destroy the practice. Destruction may not, however, result in the *de-storying* of a tradition (p. 10).

This is an important distinction because it raises the question about whether or not an Indigenous person can still relate to the land, even though they are forced by economic necessity to live in urban centres away from their home community. Can Indigenous peoples still practise their spirituality away from culturally specific "springs, mountains, or rivers?" Can they still tell the "story" of the land? Most Indigenous film and video makers live in urban centres, so how does living in a diasporic community affect the Indigeneity of their visual narratives, which I argue is at the core of Indigenous aesthetics (Sweet Wong, 1998)?

Another valuable approach to Indigeneity is the analysis that reveals how the colonial discourse *depends on* keeping the construct of Indigenous peoples as fixed (static) in the "ideological construction of otherness" (Brown & Sant, 1999, p. 5). Refusing this myth of stasis transforms the age-old colonial construct of Indigenous peoples from a frozen under glass "Other" culture to one where Indigenous Nations are setting their own course in international and domestic relations by defining themselves within the social, political and economic relations with the nation states they live within (Maaka & Fleras, 2005). As Brown and Sant (1999) explain, the essays in their volume

> serve to show how colonial discourses and practice betrays a determination to objectify, to confine, to imprison, and to harden the colonial relationship. Indigenous peoples are always "the Other," not one of us but what we require it (them) to be. (p. 6)

To summarize, the three approaches to Indigeneity that are relevant to my study are as follows: 1) Wilson and Stewart's (2008) exploration for political definitions of Indigenous people's as well as examining the economics of Indigenous peoples within the marketplace of the international domain and Appadurai's (1990) omission of Indigenous peoples in the globalization discourse. Both scholars provide a contextual framework for Indigenous peoples to navigate globalization as well as provide a space to discuss the effects of the economics of globalization, 2) Graham's and Thompson's (2005) exploration illustrate how "Indigenous" and "diaspora" are not mutually exclusive, but rather that the experience of displacement and diaspora is extremely relevant to Indigenous people because spiritual practices rely on a strong connection to their ancestral lands, and 3) Brown's and Sant's (1996) critique of how the ideological construct of the colonial discourse continues to perpetuate the "Other-ness" of Indigenous peoples through fixing them as relics from the past.

From these three approaches, it is apparent "all things Indigenous" within their systems of knowledge" (stories, songs, images/designs, land and natural resources, including botanical information) are at risk of becoming commodities because the Western attitude of 'business as usual' will sell their cultures into extinction (Wilson & Stewart, 2008, p. 5). This is the primary reason why Indigenous peoples need to be involved in defining themselves because their interests are consistently superseded by the business interests of the multinationals (Palys, 1996) who rely on the cooperation of the nation-states who regulate Indigenous lands and resources.

Gaps in the Disclourse and Summary of Key Points

The gaps in the discourse are easily identifiable because many disciplines within the academic discourse, including film studies "still leave[s] out Indigenous peoples, our ways of knowing and our current concerns" (Smith, 2002, p. 24). The cultural appropriation of Indigenous knowledge(s) are of primary concern because "globalization of knowledge and Western culture constantly reaffirms the West's view of itself as the centre of legitimate knowledge" (Smith, 2002, p. 64;

Pieterse, 2006, p. 660). Pieterese (2006) agrees with Smith (2002) when he states, "globalization has no memory, therefore has no history and within that perspective, the power relations of slavery, conquest, war, imperialism and colonialism are not addressed" (pp. 664-665). Without the colonial nation-states recognizing their own violent roots, they can only perpetuate the same old colonial relationship with Indigenous peoples that have existed since time of first contact. In the current social, political and economic environment of globalization, it is difficult for Indigenous peoples to protect their cultures and take the time needed to consider how to sensitively incorporate the onslaught of technological change when their systems of knowledge are just beginning to be recognized.

For Indigenous film and video makers the implications of the erasure of Indigenous knowledge systems in academic discourses as well as the erasure of their cultural identities in the political domain are great because the film/video makers continue to work towards gaining recognition for their claim to a representational voice in the film/video and television industry as they strive to preserve and document their cultures for their own purposes. And, Barclay's "Fourth World Cinema" is a significant move towards establishing recognition of the "indigeneity" of the filmmaking process, which is, I argue part of the spiritual essence/aesthetic to, which Barclay (1990, 2003) refers.

Palys (1996) explains that he has

come to see the efforts of "Western Science" to understand Aboriginal peoples as a singly tragic and useful case study of the sociology of science: a clash of epistemologies that has acted to the detriment of Aboriginal peoples, and where science, which vaunts the view that the truth shall set us free, has instead been a part of the oppression (p. 1).

It is crucial to underscore his statements about how the research methodologies, assumptions, definitions, and ensuing conclusions of western epistemologies continue to oppress Indigenous peoples the world over. In this time of globalization Indigenous peoples are challenging the status quo through documenting their own systems of knowledge and by decolonizing the colonial discourse.

In the next chapter, I discuss the term "Fourth World" (Manuel and Posluns, 1974), locate Barclay's (2003) "Fourth World Cinema" and link it to Randolph Lewis's (2006) "Cinema of Sovereignty" and explore his meaning of his term the "sovereign gaze." I conclude with an exploration of Indigenous film aesthetics by drawing on the work of Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars and filmmakers.

Chapter 2:
Fourth World Cinema: The Need for Developing Indigenous Film Aesthetics

Introduction

In Chapter One, I began by recounting a meta-narrative (a hidden story) to show how colonial forces have disrupted the Indigenous way of "seeing," "acting," "doing" and "listening." Then I identified when Indigenous peoples started taking control of their communication systems as part of the self-determining process that includes protecting their lands and resources while reclaiming their Indigenous worldviews. I concluded the chapter by exploring the concept of *Indigeneity* and looking at how this concept is critical not just for understanding how Indigenous people communicate but also how important it is for understanding more broadly the media of Indigenous peoples in an era of globalization. The concept of *Indigeneity* is particularly important for Indigenous film and video makers in creating their film aesthetics, which refuse to be confined to the categories and logic of a market-driven economy and its accompanying ideological state apparatus.

In this chapter, I discuss Manuel (Secwepemc) and Poslun's "Fourth World" (1974) and look in-depth at the notion of a "Fourth World Cinema" as named by Maori filmmaker, Barry Barclay (Barclay, 1990, 2003, 2003a). Then I illustrate how Jane Mills' (2009) call for a new paradigm provides a space for First Nations Cinema/Indigenous Cinema/Fourth World Cinema (Mills, 2009). Within the framework of Manuel, Barclay and Mills, I introduce Lewis's (2006) notion of a "Cinema of Sovereignty" and what he identifies as Alanis Obomsawin's "Sovereign gaze" (Lewis, 2006). Drawing on Barclay, Leuthold (1998) and Todd (2005), I discuss the philosophical elements of Indigenous film

aesthetics. Then, I summarize the key points of the chapter, which allows me to apply these elements to Indigenous films in Chapter 3.

The Fourth World

The 1990s brought a convergence of technologies that created a 500-channel universe for television viewers and opened up opportunities for many stakeholders. With the user-friendliness of the World Wide Web, new media and the affordability of digital cameras, laptops and edit suites, Indigenous peoples gained enormously increased access to the telecommunications industry. There is now a virtual explosion of Indigenous creative expression. In the global shift, "Indigenous peoples appropriated the technologies of the dominant society and transformed them to their own uses in order to meet their own cultural and political needs" (Wilson & Stewart, 2008, p. 3).

As I argued in Chapter One, Indigenous peoples started transforming their relationship to the camera during the 1970s when they filmed their own activities, histories and traditions. It is during this time period that Indigenous peoples made noticeable presence in the international arena, which has directly influenced the work of global Indigenous film and video makers. The concept of the Fourth World emerged in the 1970s to be followed by Fourth Cinema.

Stewart and Wilson (2008) cite Dyck to describe the term Fourth World.

In 1974 George Manuel and Michael Posluns were the first to use the term *Fourth World* in connection with Indigenous activism to indicate this growing international consciousness among people who have special nontechnical, nonmodern exploitative relations to the lands which they still inhabit and who are disenfranchised by the nations within which they live (1985:21) (Dyck cited in Wilson & Stewart, 2008, p. 7).

In his book, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*, Manuel (1974) (Secwepemc) discusses the distinctions between the Third World and the Indigenous world in that the

Aboriginal World has so far lacked the political muscle to emerge; it is without economic power; it rejects Western political techniques; it

is unable to comprehend Western technology unless it can be used to extend and enhance traditional life forms; and it finds its strength above and beyond Western ideas of historical process (p. 6)

Although I agree with Manuel's political assessment of the Fourth World, I disagree with his statement, "The Aboriginal World . . . is unable to comprehend Western technology unless it can be used to extend and enhance traditional life forms" because this wording implies that Indigenous peoples have difficulty understanding technology and it limits the application for technology to only "traditional life forms" (Manuel, 1974, p. 6). In 2010, nearly 40 years after Manuel's statement, the realities of Indigenous people's are that they are very successful with digital technologies. I re-word Manuel and Poslun's (1974) statement to read, 'Indigenous peoples of the Fourth World, including film and video makers have mastered Western technology to extend and enhance traditional life forms while at the same time innovatively indigenizing the technology to adapt to all aspects of their realities of the twenty-first century.'

Another reality Indigenous peoples' face is that, as Smith argues (2002), many academic discourse continue to perpetuate the colonial narrative. This is the case in film studies, as the classic text, *The Cinema Book* (Cook, 1999), illustrates. It categorizes "Fourth World and Indigenous Media" under the subtitle of "At The Edges of Hollywood," which by the very nature of the wording explicitly locates Indigenous peoples at the periphery. To further illustrate how marginalized the category is, Indigenous film is not identified in the table of contents with a referenced page number. This form of erasure is commonplace for Indigenous peoples. The editor applies the term "Fourth World" but fails to discuss where the term comes from or when it first appeared in academic studies. Though she does not acknowledge its historical development, Cook (1999) defines Fourth World peoples by estimating the size and distribution of this population of the world as.

> those peoples variously called 'Indigenous', 'tribal' or 'first nations', the descendants of the original inhabitants of territories subsequently subject to alien conquest or settlement. As many as 3,000 native nations, representing some 250 million people,

according to some estimates, function within the 200 states that assert sovereignty over them (p. 101).

Despite her marginalization of the Fourth World, Cook (1999) does provide a basic outline of some important characteristics of Indigenous film; more importantly, she points to a shift in filmic practices by non-Indigenous peoples making films about Indigenous peoples. She explains,

> Fourth World peoples more usually appear in 'ethnographic films', which of late have attempted to divest themselves of vestigial colonialist attitudes. While in the old ethnographic films, self-confident 'scientific' voice-overs purported to deliver the 'truth' about subject peoples unable to answer back [. . .] the new ethnographic films strive for 'shared film-making', 'participatory film-making', 'dialogical anthropology', 'reflexive distance' and 'interactive film-making' (p. 101).

While Cook (1999) locates Indigenous peoples at the periphery of film studies, the disciplines of anthropology and ethnography have had the privilege of researching and studying Indigenous peoples as a central object since the late 1880s, as discussed in Chapter One. Faye Ginsburg (1994), a visual anthropologist, has written extensively about Indigenous peoples and she points to "new discussions emerging, in and outside academia, concerning the multiple ways that culture is encoded in film, TV and video" (p. 6).

While discussing the issue of coding/encoding and the how the ethnographers have changed their approach when filming Indigenous peoples in her article, "Embedded Aesthetics: Creating a Discursive Space for Indigenous Media," Ginsburg (2003) says,

> Since the late 1970s, Aboriginal Australians (and other Indigenous people) have been engaged in developing new visual media forms by adapting the technologies of video, film, and television to a range of expressive and political purposes. Their efforts to develop new forms of Indigenous media are motivated by a desire to envision and strengthen a "culture future" (Michaels 1987a) for themselves in their own communities and in the dominant society (p. 88).

In this article Ginsburg (2003) discusses a "discursive space" for Indigenous media that I argue is the same "discursive space" that Nakata identifies as the "cultural interface" and that he describes as a "complex space with conflicting discourses" that Indigenous peoples must navigate on a daily basis (Nakata, 2002, 2007, 2007a, 2008). Global Indigenous film and video makers and scholars are negotiating their own representation within the complex cultural interface by navigating pathways to the global screens and into the discourses. Ginsburg (2003) names the Indigenous work as "this new and complex object – Aboriginal media (p. 90)." She states,

> Aboriginal media – is understood by its producers to be operating in multiple domains as an extension of their collective (vs individual) self-production. However, it is important to recognize that Aboriginal producers from various locales and backgrounds – remote, urban, rural – come to their positions through quite different cultural and social processes (pp. 90-91).

Discussions from the period when anthropologists critically questioned their approach to Indigenous peoples "from various locales and backgrounds," led to "the dramatic transformation of dominant narratives" in anthropology. Anthropologist, Bruner states,

> In the 1930s and 1940s the dominant story constructed about Native American culture change saw the present as disorganization, the past as glorious, and the future as assimilation. Now, however, we have a new narrative: the present is viewed as a resistance movement, the past as exploitation, and the future as ethnic resurgence. (Bruner cited in Morris, 1994, p. 36)

Indeed, if anthropologists in 1994 considered the visual narratives about Indigenous peoples to go through the past, present and future stages of "exploitation, resistance and ethnic resurgence," then the "new narratives" of resurgence in 2010 from the Indigenous perspective, I argue are represented by what Barry Barclay (Maori) named "Fourth World Cinema," "a myriad cinema — a cinema of dreams, of daring, of love, of piety, of healing, of forward-vision" (2003, p. 16). The systematic categorizations of these visual narratives are yet to be researched and defined by Indigenous peoples.

Barry Barclay and Fourth World Cinema

In 1987, Barry Barclay (Maori) of Aoetearoa (New Zealand) presented his feature film *Ngati* (1987) to the global screen culture at Cannes, France. He was the first Indigenous person to do so. Barclay was also the first to bring attention to and to publicly declare the existence of Fourth Cinema in 2003. Barclay's filmmaking experience is vast and diversified.[33] In his own words, he says,

> I have made major films in the Pakeha [a Maori Word for 'White People] world as well as the Maori one. I made a sixty-minute film documentary on Indira Gandhi, the prime minister of India, for example. It was in 1975, during the Emergency; when western film crews were not being allowed into India at the time. It was a feature-length documentary on an unlikely but highly political subject: Who owns the seeds of the world? We filmed in eight countries, from Italy to Nicaragua. So over my thirty years in filmmaking, I have had one foot in one world at times, in the other world at times (p. 409).

With the foot he had in the Maori world, Barclay was a significant proponent of Indigenous screen culture and was apparently a force to be reckoned with in both the Pakeha [Maori word for white New Zealanders] and Maori worlds in Aoetearoa (New Zealand). He was a man "who commanded great respect within the Maori world" even though he agitated some of the Maori leadership and apparently he was not afraid to argue for whatever issue he was supporting. And within the dominant society of New Zealand, Murray (2008) states he was perceived to be, "a native radical, a trouble-maker who raised issues" but whose films included a "full sense of New Zealand as a multiple and complex culture" (p. 10). He explains,

> Picking up on the classic division of world cinema into First, Second and Third models, [Barclay] has termed Indigenous Cinema a Fourth Cinema, a practice and expression that works behind the current theorisations of global cinematic practice. In speaking of Fourth Cinema, Barclay outlines an umbrella term that he feels can contain the multiple forms of Indigenous cinema as it operates on an international level, yet one that can still reflect the specifics of individual cultural formations and iterations (p. 2).

At the beginning of one of his lectures, Barclay (2003) says:

> I am going to propose here this afternoon that there is a category, which can legitimately be called "Fourth Cinema," by, which I mean Indigenous Cinema — that's Indigenous with a capital "I." I made up the phrase "Fourth Cinema" for my own satisfaction. I have been using it here and abroad for some years now (p. 1).[34]

In order to link Manuel's (Secwepemc) Fourth World concept to Barclay's (Maori) concept of Fourth Cinema, it is necessary to delve into how Barclay names and locates Indigenous peoples who are the subjects of the films but are also directing and operating the camera and editing the films. Barclay (2003) observes that Indigenous cultures are

> outside the national orthodoxy. They are outside the national outlook. They are outside spiritually, for sure. And almost everywhere on the planet, Indigenous Peoples, some 300 million of them in total, according to the statisticians — are outside materially also. They are outside the national outlook *by definition*, for Indigenous cultures are ancient remnant cultures persisting within the modern nation state (pp. 6-7).

Both Manuel's (Secwepemc) and Barclay's (Maori) definitions of the Indigenous peoples of the Fourth World share a common characteristic in that "they reject Western political techniques" and are "outside of the modern-nation states" within which they live (Barclay, 2003; Manuel, 1974). It is critical to point out that some non-Indigenous scholars such as Appadurai (1990), as discussed in Chapter One, do not include Indigenous concerns in the analysis of nation-states and this results in the exclusion of Indigenous peoples from any meaningful discussions in national and international discourses. However, there are other non-Indigenous scholars such as Ginsburg (1994; 2002; 2003), Leuthold (1998), Lewis (2006), Mills (2009), Roth (2005) and Murray (2008) who recognize the culturally specific experiences of Indigenous peoples.

Furthermore, Barclay (2003) says, "First, Second and Third cinemas are all Cinemas of the Modern Nation State," which from his Maori point-of-view are all "invader Cinemas" (p. 7). It is these "invader Cinemas" that Barclay does not want to react to when he says, "I don't much want to hear about *Sites of*

Resistance anymore. Let's talk about Sites of Exuberance" (p. 1). Clearly, Barclay is moving away from the usual strategy of responding to, reacting to, or confronting the colonial incursions. Barclay's stance positions the discussion outside of the normalized colonizer-colonized dichotomy by not engaging in debates about the semantics of the various aspects of colonialism. I argue that Barclay's positioning is a prime example of what Nakata discusses in the following statement. Nakata (2002) says,

> Indigenous peoples do traverse these intersecting discourses on a daily basis, responding, interacting, taking positions, making decisions and in the process re-making cultures – ways of knowing, being and acting. In Indigenous individuals, communities and the broader collective, differences in responses and in the priority given to different systems of Knowledge and thinking illustrate the dynamism and diversity within the collective (pp. 285-286).

To elaborate further on Nakata's (2002) point of how Indigenous peoples "traverse these intersecting discourses," I point to Barclay's lecture "*Celebrating Fourth Cinema*" (2003) where he tells a story to illustrate the differences between the First World and Fourth World camera. He says, "At every Hawai'i conference I've been to, somebody – a white American male every time – refers to one or other version of *Mutiny on the Bounty* and perhaps screens a scene or two from it" (Barclay, 2003, p. 7). [35] The film he refers to was made in 1935 and is set on the South Pacific Island of Tahiti in the 1700's where the crew rebel against the captain's cruelty and decide to remain with the local Indigenous women they have befriended. The imperialist ship is docked in Tahiti and preparing to deliver local plants from Tahiti to be transplanted in Jamaica (Lloyd, 1935).

Barclay (2003) says, "I want to run for you the scene I saw on my last trip played in front of a largely Indigenous audience, many of them women. If any of the women present here today take offence, I apologize in advance" (p. 7). He sets up the video clip as follows:

> A Scene From The Mutiny On the Bounty: Captain Bligh (Trevor Howard) orders Fletcher Christian (Marlon Brando) to go ashore and have sex with a native woman of rank (p. 8).

He elaborately weaves the details of his story to demonstrate how differently the scene from the film would play out if there was an Indigenous Fourth Cinema camera documenting the same scene. To emphasize his point Barclay (2003) says,

> The First Cinema enterprise is likely to be greatly deflated if there is a camera ashore, a camera outside First Cinema, a camera with a life of its own, watching – if it can be bothered to watch – who comes ashore; a camera, which, when the ship men have gone back to the ship, provides images of the visitors and their doings on a big screen set up high in the Indigenous village. This would be unsettling, I imagine, to white men who came ashore to have sex and depart, noses in the air (p. 8).

He adds, "But I've seen men like that, I have to say, in the red light districts of cities like Bangkok, moving through, going "that one, that one." Would the academic who screened the clip have been prepared to show this same scene in a women's refuge?" (p. 8). Furthermore, he says, "The ship camera will always show the white man coming to find the native princess" (p.8). By clearly illustrating how the events have different meanings depending on who is controlling the camera, hr unmistakably locates Indigenous peoples in the following statement.

> The First Cinema Camera sits firmly on the deck of the ship. It sits there by definition. The Camera Ashore, the Fourth Cinema Camera, is the one held by the people for whom "ashore" is their ancestral home. 'Ashore' for Indigenous people is not usually an island. Not literally. Rather, it is an island within a modern nation state. We need to be crystal clear about this (p. 9).

When Barclay positions one of his Fourth Cinema cameras on the deck, he provides a strong example of how culturally specific Indigenous Cinema differs from mainstream Western dramatic films. And his emphasis on the need to be clear about Indigenous people's location as an "island within a modern nation state" is the perspective represented in the film and video work of many Indigenous peoples that many critics from the First World categorize as activist media.

Ginsburg (2003) discusses this topic in her article, "*Screen Memories and Entangled Technologies: Resignifying Indigenous Lives*" in a section titled, "Cultural Activism and the Activist Imaginary." She says,

> The work they have been producing might be considered cultural activism, a term that underscores the sense of both political agency and cultural intervention that people bring to these efforts, part of a spectrum of practices of self-conscious mediation and mobilization of culture that took particular shape beginning in the late twentieth century. (Ginsburg cited in Shohat and Stam, 2003, p. 78)

In Murray's (2008, p. 4; p. 11-12; p. 42-44) discussions on so-called activist movements, he says: "[...] such activism was to some extent reactive, in that it responded to the fundamentally market-driven migration of Maori to the city" (p. 44). Although both Ginsburg and Murray's observations are valid, there is a much deeper connection for Indigenous peoples.

My point is that, from an Indigenous film/video maker perspective, the choice of how and where to locate the people in the visual narrative genres is much more than social or political activism and are yet to be named by Indigenous peoples.[36] Wilson and Stewart (2008) explain,

> Indigenous media often directly address the politics of identity and representation by engaging and challenging the dominant political forms at both the national and international level. In this landscape, control of media representation and of cultural self-definition asserts and signifies cultural and political sovereignty itself (p. 5).

The notion of defining one's self is at the core of Indigenous sovereignty and is consistently misunderstood by observers and critics. This will be discussed more in-depth in the sections "Cinema of Sovereignty" and the "Sovereign Gaze" (Lewis, 2006). At this point, it is important to understand how the differences in ideologies between Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars can result in non-Indigenous scholars dismissing Indigenous film work as *resistance or activism*. From my Indigenous perspective, the films are part of a *cultural preservation* process, whether Indigenous peoples are simply recording

their specific histories or providing complex examples of cultural innovation. As Barclay points out another "aspect of the Indigenous condition" is the great need for ensuring cultural survival within nation-states that are hostile to Indigenous worldviews, because for Indigenous peoples there is a "palpable awareness of extinction, a cultural collapse, followed by the death of a population" (Barclay 2003, p. 16). But, Barclay (2003) says,

> Just because of the possibility of extinction may be a very real component in the complex make-up of the Indigenous Person, it does not follow automatically that Fourth Cinema will be a bitter cinema, a violent cinema, a cinema of resistance, as the West understands resistance. Fourth Cinema may be a myriad cinema — a cinema of dreams, of daring, of love, of piety, of healing, of forward-vision, of a music other ears might find impossible to catch (p. 16).

I argue that the description that Barclay gives of Fourth World Cinema as a "myriad cinema" does in fact exist in 2010 and that Indigenous peoples have moved beyond the first generation of "survival" and "shooting back" productions and are already "celebrating the cinematic possibilities." In fact I argue that Indigenous peoples have moved away from what I name the "glut of documentaries," which from my perspective was the result of the first generation of Indigenous people's film/video works. Indigenous peoples are creating animation, dramatic shorts, full length features, and a spectrum of new media creative endeavours.

However, because Indigenous peoples are focused on the practical logistics of getting the resources and training for creating and distributing film and video and because Indigenous knowledge is just beginning to be validated, there is very little critical analysis in film discourse from an Indigenous perspective. Therefore many Indigenous film and video makers rely on the critiques of non-Indigenous scholars such as Faye Ginsburg, Randolph Lewis, Steven Leuthold, and Stuart Murray.

In *Images of Dignity: Barry Barclay and Fourth Cinema*, Murray (2008) explains that Barclay "has written about his own work (most noticeably in his 1990 book, *Our Own Image),"* Murray (2008) states that it is Barclays'

visual creativity that offers the best guide to any reading of his films. Their use of narrative, structure and technique, and their representation and performance of culture, constitute the best methodology through, which to approach and understand his politics and activism (p. 2).

Murray (2008) acknowledges the need to recognize a global "Indigeneity" and he captures a sense of the Fourth World perspective as he refers to Linda Tuhiwai-Smith's (Maori) (2002) concepts of world views and value systems and affirms her argument for the validity of Indigenous thought, even as Indigenous cultures are surrounded by a world with diametrically opposed values (pp. 12-13). Murray (2008) postulates that it is these differences that "drove a figure like Barclay in the making of his films" (p. 13). He states,

Central to such concerns is the vexed and contested notion of Fourth World 'difference' and the view that the lived experiences of Indigenous lives encompass social, cultural, and individual acts that differ widely from those of their non-Indigenous counterparts. These differences, the argument runs, are *fundamental* and go beyond the fact that Indigenous peoples have a common history of dispossession in the modern period. Rather they involve ideas of cosmology, land use, social organisation, family and community, and of narrative and language, all of, which often cannot be approximated outside of Indigenous contexts (p. 13).

These fundamental differences that go beyond the common colonial history that Murray refers to, I argue, are illustrated in the Introduction of this thesis through the description of my Indigenous worldview. Although, I am representing a Secwepemc-Syilx worldview, I argue that the basic framework of how I "see," "act," "listen," and what I "do" in the world is the basic holistic view shared by most Indigenous cultures in the world. Therefore when Barclay locates Indigenous peoples outside the national orthodoxy and when he claims a space for a standalone Fourth World Cinema, I argue that he is setting the Indigenous way of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and listening," as the fundamental ideology for the theoretical framework.

In Barclay's (2003) lecture at the *Re-imagining Indigenous Cultures: The Pacific Islands*, a conference in Hawaii, he begins by saying,

Last year, when I gave a talk at Auckland University on the theme of Maori cinema, I called my talk, "*Can there be a Fourth Cinema*?" This year I'm talking of *Celebrating* Fourth Cinema. Celebrating, exploring. We might cheekily call this new outlook, this new spirit, "Dancing with the Other," the Other in this case being non-Indigenous people, people with their own special mystery and allure and customs. I don't much want to hear about *Sites of Resistance* any more. Let's talk about *Sites of Exuberance* (p. 1).

When Barclay encourages a "Dance with the Other" rather than responding to, resisting or confronting the Other, I argue he is moving away from the never ending cycle of counter-productive colonial discourse. Furthermore, Barclay is assuming a decolonized position in what Ginsburg and Nakata name as a "discursive space" (Ginsburg, 2003, Nakata, 2002). Nakata (2002) further argues that the "cultural interface," should not be a place for engaging in the usual "clash of cultures/cultural dissonance" or the standard oppositional binaries such as "them-us." I accept Nakata's call for a cultural interface, which, like Barclay's metaphor of the "Dance with the Other" does not focus on the predictable binaries and oppositions. However, I argue there must be a mutual exchange in the dance and by that I mean both partners must be engaged and active in the process.

Barclay's (1990) book, *Our Own Image* (1990), that Murray (2008) references, is unique because it is written as a conversation from one Indigenous person to a group of other Indigenous peoples. This context changes the assumptions in the conversation. Now the conversation is centred on Indigenous knowledge but from an outsider perspective, it contains what may be called, "assumed knowledge" because an outsider may or may not fully understand the dialogue. In an open letter to his Canadian peers, Barclay (1990) asks,

How do Indigenous peoples use the camera once they come to have some control over it? Perhaps, it is on our own shoulders to rework the well-established rules – adopting here, modifying there – so that the way of creating images slowly becomes a little more comfortable for our cultures. (p. 7)

Furthermore, Barclay (1990) includes the following statement,

Every culture has a right and a responsibility to present its own culture to its own people. That responsibility is so fundamental it cannot be left in the hands of outsiders, nor be usurped by them.

Furthermore, any culture living closely with another ought to have regular opportunities to express itself to that other culture in ways that are true to its own values and needs (p. 7).

Although, Barclay does not articulate or discuss the concept of sovereignty, it is clear in these statements that he is speaking of cultural sovereignty because of how he positions himself politically. I discuss this further in Chapter Three. Also, in his proclaiming that the Fourth World peoples are "outside the national orthodoxy," it is logical that his parameters for Fourth World Cinema would be outside the definitions of the national cinema of the nation-states that various Indigenous peoples live within.

Within this context, I introduce Jane Mills's (2009) call for a new paradigm that changes how Indigenous cinema is named and located. To describe the conditions of production she draws on what Appadurai (1990) calls the "global flows" of "ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, finanscapes and ideoscapes." In the environment of globalization Mills (2009) says that "[the] flows are disjunctive because they start, stop, speed up, slow down, collide, unite or by-pass each other chaotically and often unpredictably" (p. 2).

In the chaotic environment of globalization, Indigenous peoples are consistently defined by outside national and global forces, and the world of cinema has named Indigenous peoples in many different ways. Mills (2009) identifies various labels that she argues "fix First Nations cinema in a one-way relationship to the dominant mainstream cinema" (p. 1). Mills states her preference for the term "First Nation" rather than 'Indigenous' or 'aboriginal' because it acknowledges "the concept of location in referring to peoples who have historically experienced enforced de-territorialisation, and often re-territorialisation, by white settler colonisers." She states,

First Nation films have been given numerous designations, which tend to present a homogenous cinema engaged in political and aesthetic opposition to the mainstream. These labels include Third,

68

Third World, Fourth, postcolonial, subaltern, hungry, imperfect, anti-racist, ethnic, multicultural, hybrid, mestizo, marginal, avante-garde, minority, minor, transnational, intercultural, transcultural and accented (p. 1).

In discussing what she names First Nations Cinema, Mills (2009) highlights some of the groundbreaking films made by Indigenous filmmakers. She says,

Ever since the Oscar-nominated *Ofelas (The Pathfinder,* 1987) by Sami director Nils Gaup, and the Maori films, *Ngati* (Barry Barclay, 1987) and *Mauri* (Merata Mita, 1988) were produced, an increasing number of Indigenous films have enriched the global screenscape. Indigenous cinema has a short history and is relatively so new that it has neither a commonly accepted name nor an established analytical framework in, which to theorise it (p. 1).

Clearly, Mills is considering the factors involved in naming and locating Indigenous Cinema, and in calling for a new paradigm to examine the visual narratives of Indigenous peoples, she provides a new theoretical framework. In her discussion, Mills (2009) criticizes how Indigenous cinema is located in postcolonial studies since the starting point of this field of study is usually settler societies that have developed their own national cinemas. In this model, "First Nations films tend to be subsumed within the larger geopolitical nation-state, even though they may have a closer rapport with the globally dominant cinema than the more proximate national cinema" (2009, p. 2). This perspective supports Barclay's (2003) statement that Indigenous peoples are "[..] outside the national outlook by *definition,* for Indigenous cultures are ancient remnant cultures persisting within the modern nation state" (p. 7).

Moreover, Mills (2009) points to the predominant perception that First Nations cinema has become Hollywood's 'Other', which she suggests sets in place a "persistent and widespread notion of fixed and impermeable national, cultural and cinematic borders" – much like the "fixed" colonial binary that persists in keeping Indigenous peoples as "victims" of the colonizer as discussed in the section on *Indigeneity* discourse (pp. 1-3). To destabilise the inflexibility of these borders, Mills (2009) poses a number of questions:

To investigate the inadequacy of this perception, several questions must first be asked. Is First Nation cinema a single entry straddling local, national and regional borders? Is it a number of individual cinemas within individual national cinemas? Can it even be considered a 'cinema' as such? These questions beg further questions relating to cultural particularity and essence, and to the notion of a cinematic centre and its periphery. In other words, to issues of sameness and difference, of cultural transfer and of the permeability, or otherwise, of cultural, national and cinematic borders (p. 2).

In her argument, she goes on to say, that the "notion of fixity fails to recognize that a range of historical and geographical experiences have impacted upon First Nation peoples in a variety of constantly evolving and mutating ways" (p. 2). Furthermore, the notion of a fixed 'global dominant cinema' presupposes Hollywood at the centre, which places Indigenous cinema at the margins. In this context, Mills (2009) recommends changing the framework to include two separate cinemas, First Nations cinema and globally dominant cinema, which are not equal; yet, they exist on a playing field where, Indigenous cinema is *not* "inevitably or necessarily crushed or contained by an undeniably powerful dominant cinema" (pp. 1-3).

To summarize Mill's (2009) call for a new paradigm that provides a new theoretical framework for First Nations Cinema, she begins by shifting the location between the 'fixed one way' relationships of Indigenous cinema to the assumed centralized global cinema of Hollywood, thereby shifting the power relations. She suggests recognizing the diversity of Indigenous cinemas rather than continuing to assume that there is one *homogenous* Indigenous Cinema that is by its very nature, in "opposition to the mainstream." She destabilizes the assumed borders of the centralized global cinema of Hollywood by situating Indigenous Cinema outside the national cinema of the nation-states and places First Nations Cinema/Indigenous Cinema/Fourth World Cinema on the global landscape. Like Barclay (2003), Mills (2009) proposes a standalone First Nations/Indigenous cinema that has its own unique qualities because Indigenous experience and history is consistently changing.

Along with Nakata's (2002) theory of a cultural interface where there can be a new and different conceptualization of the space between Indigenous and non-Indigenous that addresses Indigenous specificities and diversities and Mills' call for a new paradigm, works well with Barclay's standalone Fourth World Cinema. In the following section, I will explore how Barclay's (2003) Fourth World Cinema works with what Lewis (2006) has named, a "Cinema of Sovereignty" (2006).

Cinema Of Sovereignty and a Sovereign Gaze

Alanis Obomsawin (Abenaki) is often called, "The First Lady of Indigenous Cinema" in Canada (Bear and Jones, 2008) among Indian people and is an inspiration to many aspiring filmmakers. Obomsawin is the only long-term Indigenous staff person at the National Film Board of Canada (NFB). In 1967, she started a full-time position at the NFB following a period of serving as an Indigenous Consultant for the agency. As, Lewis (2006) explains,

> [Alanis Obomsawin] caught the eye of several producers working for the NFB, one of whom was Robert Verrall. "We were about to make a film on a remote Indian reserve and felt clueless about how to proceed," recalls Verrall, a key player in the development of the NFB. Along with another colleague, Joe Koenig, he sensed that Obomsawin was someone who might be able to help (p. 2).

It is Obomsawin's response, "Well, I've seen Film Board films dealing with Aboriginal people, and we never hear the [Native] people speak" that reveals her perspective on how Indigenous people were being represented in Canada. She saw an opportunity to intervene in how Indigenous peoples have been represented in the films of the NFB. Up to this time Obomsawin had a successful career as a performer and model; however, the "young Abenaki singer [had] an evident passion for Native rights" (2006, p. 28). Obomsawin has produced some of the most thought-provoking films about the first peoples in Canada that unsettle dominant colonial narratives simply because she allows Indigenous peoples to speak for themselves.

Some of her early documentaries were: *Christmas at Moose Factory*

(1971), *Mother of Many Children* (1977), and *Amisk* (1977). In the 1980s Obomsawin's feature length documentaries started representing some of the hard issues in Indian country. *Incident at Restigouche* (1984) focused on the fishing rights of the Mikmaq people of the Atlantic provinces; *Richard Cardinal: Cry from a Diary of a Métis Child* (1986), told a heartbreaking story of a Métis child who committed suicide while in the care of social welfare agencies in Alberta; and *No Address* (1988) focused on the homeless Indigenous peoples in Montreal.

However, it was during the 1990s that Obomsawin's films catapulted to the international screen when she made four feature length documentaries about the so-called Oka Crisis of 1990. They are *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance* (1993), an in-depth historical look at the relationship the Mohawks have had with the invaders of their territories and the story behind the lines at the so-called Oka Crisis of 1990; *My Name is Kaehentiiosta* (1995), an up close and personal profile of one of the young mothers who was behind the lines during the crisis; and *Spudwrench – Kahnawake Man* (1997) is another personal profile of a Mohawk steelworker who was behind the lines at Oka and was beaten unmercifully by the Canadian military during the crisis. Her final film about Oka was *Rocks at Whiskey Trench* (2000), a story of some Kahnawake citizens who were under siege in their own community during the crisis. The film documents their decision to flee their own community and how they encountered raw, ugly racism from the French Canadian citizens of Chateauguay (Quebec) who burned effigies at night and threw rocks at them as they convoyed out of Kahnawake. During the armed stand-off of the summer of 1990, Obomsawin refused to be obstructed by the bureaucracy of the NFB. In an August 2002 interview with Lewis she said, "I told the Film Board, I'm changing production and I've got to get there right now."[37] Lewis (2006) explains that by 1990, ten years after Restigouche, and

> with seven films and various awards to her credit, she was someone to be reckoned with at the National Film Board (NFB). When she got what she wanted, she headed out to Oka with a

cameraman and an assistant, doing sound herself until another crew member joined her in the warriors' camp (p. 92).

Obomsawin was the only filmmaker who stayed after the Canadian government ordered all journalists evacuated out of the site of conflict. She refused to leave. "Her willingness to remain inside the barricades to record the unfolding events, not knowing what kind of violence might erupt, represents one of the great acts of courage in the history of documentary filmmaking" (Lewis, 2006, p. 93).

In reviewing Obomsawin's films, Lewis dedicates a chapter to discuss and propose what he calls the "Cinema of Sovereignty" (2006, pp. 156-194). He says,

> I would like to think that Obomsawin embodies alternative media practices that could have a broader significance for sustaining democratic values across cultural boundaries. I have high hopes for what I call a *cinema of sovereignty*, a forum where cross-cultural communication can occur without one of the parties being ignored, silenced, distorted, *Othered.* (Lewis, 2006, p. xxii)

Lewis asks,

> What do I mean by this seductive phrase? Simply put, for people to have the opportunity to tell their own stories, in their own way, to the world. [...] the cinema of sovereignty is about authority, autonomy, and accountability in the representational process. (2006, p. 179-180)

When Lewis speaks of "authority, autonomy and accountability" he refers to the deepest core issue of what a "Cinema of Sovereignty" means to the self representation of Indigenous peoples. The question of visual sovereignty is as complex as the matter of land sovereignty, and I argue that this topic falls in the "discursive space" referred to by Ginsburg and Nakata (2002) and in the complex intersections of paradigms that Stewart and Wilson (2008) identify. In Chapter Six, *Cinema of Sovereignty*, Lewis (2006) includes a subsection "Rethinking Sovereignty" where he discusses some of the historical debates between Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars explaining some of the cultural differences in understanding the term sovereignty. He concedes that

"*sovereignty*" must be understood as a relative term in the realm of cultural production" because of the "hybridized nature of neo-colonial life for most Indigenous peoples in the Americas" (Lewis, 2006, p. 181). To illustrate what he means, Lewis (2006) refers to Obomsawin's cosmopolitan life in the city of Montreal while working for the National Film Board, yet she maintains her Abenaki worldview, thus her "sovereign gaze" when producing work for a "Cinema of Sovereignty" (pp. 177-181).

Michelle Raheja (Seneca) (2007) discusses "Visual sovereignty in Indigenous Films" (pp. 1163-1169), revealing some of the layers of complexities in the dense topic. She says, "Sovereignty in its manifold manifestations is what sets Native American studies apart from other critical race discourses," and "it demonstrates how indigenous peoples are different from immigrant communities in the Americas" (Raheja, 2007, p. 1163). I agree with Raheja that cultural and political sovereignty is what sets Indigenous peoples apart from immigrant communities because Indigenous peoples have a priori relationship with the land whereas immigrant groups do not share that privilege. I argue that this political distinction is why the cultural policies of Canada and the US insist upon continually relegating Indigenous peoples to just another minority or ethnic group (Druick, 2007, pp. 126-139). Raheja (2007) goes on to say,

> Sovereignty is an ontological and philosophical concept with very real practical, political, and cultural ramifications that unites the experiences of Native Americans, but it is a difficult idea to define because it is always in motion and is inherently contradictory (p. 1163).

She acknowledges how the concept of sovereignty affects the unique histories of each Indigenous group in the complex intersections of the political, cultural, spiritual and economic domains with the competing jurisdictions of regional, national, and federal governments when the issue of land ownership arises and it is usually mired in a "legal conundrum" (Raheja, 2007, p. 1163). However, Raheja (2007) says,

> While legal and social sciences have used the term to describe a peculiar, problematic, and particular relationship between the

74

Anglophone colonies/United States/Canada and indigenous Nations of North America, I would like to suggest a discussion of visual sovereignty as a way of reimagining Native-centered articulations of self-representation and autonomy that engage the power ideologies of mass media, but that do not rely solely on the texts and contexts of Western jurisprudence (p. 1163).

Lewis (2006) does discuss some of the "very real practical, political and cultural ramifications" that Raheja refers to, and I argue that his discussion of Obomsawin's films is part of the approach to visual sovereignty that Raheja is suggesting. In Lewis' (2006) "Strategies of Representational Sovereignty" the first attribute, he states that a cinema of sovereignty is such that it "carries with it a complex and contested legal status" (2006, p. 181). Lewis views Obomsawin's work as product of a "sovereign gaze," which is

one that is imbued with the self-respect and unique ambitions of a *self-defined sovereign people*, even if this sovereignty carries with it a complex and contested legal status.

Her cinematic vision reflects an *indigenous sovereign gaze*, a practice of looking that comes out of Native experience and shapes the nature of the film itself.

The gaze is sovereign [...] when it is rooted in the particular ways of knowing and being that inform distinct nationhoods. It is sovereign when cultural insiders are the *controlling intelligence* behind the filmmaking process, no matter how much non-Native might help in various capacities.

And, it is sovereign when it works against what one scholar has dubbed the 'whiting out' of the Indigene – the projection of white concepts and anxieties about the primitive on to the Aboriginal Other – effected by the white camera eye (Lewis, 2006, p. 182).

My interpretation of what Lewis identifies as Obomsawin's sovereign gaze is one which represents her worldview and that of the Indigenous peoples who are the subjects of her documentaries, even though she is working for a national film institution. Thus Obomsawin is an "island" in a nation state who has managed to maintain her sovereign gaze even though she has lived through various traumas associated with her colonial experiences that have interrupted

her indigenous gaze.

Obomsawin's approach embodies the operating principles of her Abenaki worldview which she demonstrates by the respect she extends to her film subjects. In 1988 I served as a consultant to *TV Ontario* where I viewed Obomsawin's earlier films. I have also screened all of her subsequent productions. No matter how intense or how disturbing the visuals may be, she treats all her Indigenous subjects with dignity. Obomsawin honours their humanity no matter what life situation they may be embroiled in as her films *Richard Cardinal: Cry from a Diary of a Métis Child* (1986) and *No Address* (1988) attest. In these films she gives voice to a foster child and the homeless people of Montreal. To refer to Lewis's criteria, Obomsawin is the "controlling intelligence" behind the camera and she is not "whiting out" the Indian people or their story. In fact, she does the exact opposite when she humanizes the Indigenous peoples on the Indigenous Screen Culture of Canada by allowing her film subjects a voice to speak about their true realities without interpreting their experiences.

When Lewis (2006) says "a cinema of sovereignty" must speak in the language of equals, assuming a "nation-to-nation" relationship between historically unequal parties such as between the Mi'kmaq nation and Canada"[38] (p. 182), he is referring specifically to Obomsawin's films; however, I argue this principle can be extended to many Indigenous peoples who are claiming visual sovereignty in global screen culture. I further argue that the criteria that Lewis identifies as the Cinema of Sovereignty is comparable to, if not the same as what Barclay (Maori) names as Fourth World Cinema and logically it follows that the visual narratives created for a standalone Indigenous cinema or a Cinema of Sovereignty would be infused with Indigenous specific aesthetics.

Indigenous Film Aesthetics

For Fourth World Cinema to be discussed in any meaningful way, it is necessary to begin a discussion about some of the complexities and distinct qualities and elements that may be identified as part of Fourth Cinema. Raheja

(2007) (Seneca) explains,

> ...Indigenous cinema has its roots in specific indigenous aesthetics with their attendant focus on a particular geographical space, discrete cultural practices, social activist texts, notions of temporality that do not delink the past from the present or future, and spiritual traditions (p. 1167).

Raheja is pointing to what I identify as *bio-regionally based aesthetics* which are *culturally specific* to the Indigenous group of a particular land base. Because there is such a diversity of global Indigenous cultures, it follows that this would be reflected in the diversity of visual narratives produced for the global Indigenous screen cultures.

In discussing Zacharias Kunuk's film *Atanarjuat* (*The Fast Runner)* (2000), Raheja (2007) examines the nuanced differences between an Inuit approach and a non-Inuit approach to filmmaking.

> Cultural difference, particularly as it relates to a shamanistic plotline, is deployed in *Atanarjuat* to trouble a history of discursive representation of Arctic peoples as simultaneously commensurable and alien and to reinscribe these scenes of cultural difference as regenerative sites of cultural preservation within a community that understands culture as a locus of fluidity, historical change, and adaptation (p. 1167).

The distinctive cultural approach that Raheja (Seneca) identifies is exactly why it is critical to establish the Indigenous-specific Cinema that Barclay (Maori) names. It is necessary to create a theoretical framework that is based on Indigenous systems of knowledge that can critically examine Indigenous film that understands the culturally specific ways of "*seeing*," "*acting*," "*knowing*" and "*listening*." In Chapter Three of this thesis, I will present a framework for an Indigenous pre-production process and Indigenous film aesthetics based in Indigenous systems of knowledge and that have direct implications to the overall production process. However, before that discussion can begin, it is important to examine "Representation of indigenous peoples by indigenous peoples [which] is about countering the dominant society's image of indigenous peoples, their lifestyles and belief systems" (Smith, 2002, p. 151). It is critical to hear what

Indigenous film and video makers are saying about the subject of film aesthetics.

Two veteran Indigenous filmmakers, Barry Barclay (Maori) from Aotearoa (New Zealand) and Loretta Todd (Cree-Métis) from Canada have been at the forefront of challenging the settler societies' narratives by engaging in the discussion of Indigenous film from their respective worldviews. While Maori filmmaker Barclay (2003) does not make specific reference to aesthetics, he does articulate "something else is being asserted which is not easy to access," and he says, "I mean the 'exteriority', the surface features, the rituals, the language, the posturing, the décor, the use of elders, the presence of children, attitudes to land, the rituals of a spirit world" (pp. 1-2). Here he refers to some of the elements of Indigenous aesthetics. In addition, in discussing the six feature films made by Indigenous peoples the world over and the five feature films made in Aoetearoa (New Zealand), Barclay (2003) says:

> So far then, we are looking at a very slim body of work. In fact, we will always be looking at a relatively small body of work. How could such a body of work deserve a special category? If we go by numbers, it can't. But I am interested in philosophical elementals (pp. 2-3).

Cree-Metis filmmaker Loretta Todd (2005) addresses some of the philosophical elements that infuse Indigenous film aesthetics when she cleverly brings "the Myth of the Cave" from the classic text, *Plato's Republic,* together with "The Story of Wesakejak," the mythical Trickster of her Cree culture. Wesakejak can be male or female, and he/she shape shifts throughout the essay and performs various outlandish actions to move Todd's inquiry of whether or not the aesthetics of Indigenous filmmaking exists. She says,

> Thus begins my tale of *Wesakejak goes to Hollywood* ©[39]

> Am I positing television and films and media as soul-killers? Am I trying to be Postmodern – fragmenting form? Am I just an old-fashioned Modernist? Or am I an old-fashioned Indian? And what does this have to do with an Aboriginal way or aesthetic in film or video? And is there even an Aboriginal aesthetic in the film and video Aboriginal people make? Some have answered that last question, saying 'there is no specific Aboriginal aesthetic,' and

others have said, 'yes, there is a way – an Indian way' (pp. 105-106).

Steven Leuthold's (1998) book, *Indigenous Aesthetics: Native Art, Media and Identity*, discusses many aspects of whether or not there is "an Indian way." He says, "By indigenous aesthetics, I am referring to thoughts about aesthetic experience that developed independently of Western tradition [...]" (p. 2). The term 'aesthetics' has its own complex history in the dominant discourse that he reveals in the question: How can Indigenous aesthetics be expressed when the term itself is not clarified within the arts of the larger society? He states,

> The meanings of this term ["aesthetic"] are quite varied and notoriously difficult to pin down within the history of Western thought, where the term originated. What can be the value of applying a debated concept to historically non-Western cultures if its usage is contested in the cultures of origin? (p. 5)

Within the context of the larger discussion of the differences of Indigenous thought and Western thought, Todd (2005) attempts to bring some understanding of Indigenous aesthetics in her essay, "Polemics, Philosophies and a Story – Aboriginal Aesthetics in the Media of This Land." Although she does not explicitly address the differences in classical Greek thought and Indigenous thought, her title implies polarized views. While she ponders the importance of Greek philosophy to Myth of the Cave from Plato's Republic for western film theory, she infuses her parallel Story of Wesakejak with Indigenous philosophy that subtly reveals distinct Indigenous principles which directly affect how she, as an Indigenous filmmaker, engages in her practice. [40] Through the juxtaposition of these two stories she shrewdly raises questions and makes important observations. Todd (2005) states,

> Film analysis almost always brings up Plato's Myth of the Cave as a metaphor or prefiguring of cinema (and more, much more). It is a narrative that helps the West to construct its 'moral codes and identity,' and speak[s] about the desire to gaze and need for dream and meaning[41] (p.113).

With the *Myth of the Cave's* preeminent position in western thought, Todd

(2005) says, even "Film's treatment of light and shadow is also influenced by the myth" (p. 114) thereby affecting any critical analysis of Western film theory. But she takes the inquiry one step further, .."now I want to look at whether the *Myth of the Cave* drives our philosophy, and subsequently our ideas about representation and even our aesthetics" (Todd, 2005, p. 116).

In discussing the assumptions of the Myth of the Cave, Todd (2005) points out how

> the people, are prisoners, shackled and left to rot in the dark. Creepy. They don't know what is real until someone tells them what is real – or at least until someone tells them what is shadow and [what is] illusion (p. 116).

By stating that "the construct of the Cave story feels alien" to her as a Cree/Métis filmmaker, Todd also challenges the universal approach of Joseph Campbell and Carl Jung who profess that all peoples on the globe "share all the same basic myths," which is a part of the humanism discourse thus a part of the westernization of all systems of knowledge that I discuss in another section (2005, p. 116). Again, it is vital to understand that the Indigenous worldview and therefore aesthetics are distinct from the dominant Western culture because as Leuthold (1998) says, "Identities differ, [and] we need analytical frameworks within aesthetic theory that acknowledge culturally based differences" (p. 4).

Barclay (2003) gives examples of "culturally based differences" when discussing the Maori concept, *Te Ao Maori*, which literally means, "in the Maori world"; however, he says, "the phrase evokes a whole cosmology, a world of physical and spiritual things, a world of spirits and gods (p. 12). The cosmological differences between the Western and Indigenous worlds presented by Todd gives Plato's Myth of the Cave a whole different meaning when she asks two critical questions, "Do all people start in the Cave? So where were we in the Cave, philosophically?" She responds,

> I would say we weren't that we were already outside the Cave, in the sunlight. We possess knowledge because we were/are knowledge – we are "made of words." It is not that we must forsake our ignorance to come to knowledge; we imagine ourselves as

knowledge. The key is what we do with knowledge. There was no darkness from which to begin with and no fear, and no light to move into where we will finally be rewarded with knowledge, or truth or both (2005, p. 117).

For many Indigenous cultural philosophies, knowledge is sacred and is directly linked to the sentient and non-sentient beings with whom they coexist; therefore Indigenous peoples have a sacred trust relationship to their homelands distinct to the diverse regions they live on which reflect their specific aesthetics. As Hopi filmmaker, Victor Masayesva, is quoted as saying, "[…] there is such a thing as an Indian aesthetic, and it begins in the sacred" (Masayesva cited in Leuthold, 1998, p. 1). In Masayesva's simple statement, immediately a question is raised about sacred versus secular, which reveals a fundamental difference between Indigenous and Western ways of seeing the world.

For Indigenous film and video makers, the fundamental difference between their Indigenous worldviews and the dominant Western world becomes a space of contradictions as they struggle for acceptance within the mainstream industry. With the pull of pop culture, the allure of the perceived glitz and glamour of the film industry, and the hybridization of globalization, many Indigenous cultural producers are seduced and few consider the issue of culturally specific aesthetics. In the flurry of production activities, fewer still can take the time to understand how the policies and practices of the arts institutions may create a false sense of true self representation. Todd (2005) points out the conundrum faced by the diversity of Indigenous cultural producers who create the film and video work for the media landscape in Canada, stating

> [y]et, it would seem we mimic, or at the very least aspire to be, part of that mass media, to replicate their look and sound, their allure. Is this mimicry our media's attempt to perpetuate 'non-communication' and our own brand of social control? [...] The words of decolonization are sometimes there and the records of injustice are recited and the acts of community are celebrated, but these words and images are full of sameness and little attentiveness. [...] but there are a great many more making work that could be made by any twenty to sixty-year old white guy/girl working with different philosophies (p. 122).

Todd (2005) is speaking of a critical core issue for Indigenous film and video makers in addressing mimicry because in the desire to honour their cultures, individuals may address what they identify as "cultural appropriateness" by using visuals and sounds from Indigenous cultures which are not necessarily from the Indigenous peoples they are representing. I argue that it is in fact, cultural congruency that we as Indigenous film and video makers need to address because how we construct the aesthetics of the visual narrative directly affects the integrity of how we represent an Indigenous culture.

> When I worked for Vision TV and had the privilege of working with so many Indigenous Nations, representing many unique cultures I was compelled to construct culturally congruent visual narratives of that specific people. I purposely used visuals of their homelands with songs and sounds specific to their cultures. If I had knowledge of their Creation Story or of special landmarks, I infused visuals which I knew would only have meaning for them. I recall one incident where one of my colleagues from the Toronto office called and requested my permission to use visuals from a visual essay I had constructed from a Pow Wow in my region. He was aghast when I refused. My fellow producer was doing a story with the Anishnawbe (Ojibway) peoples of northern Ontario whose aesthetics are completely different from the Indigenous cultures represented in my visual essay.

Barclay (2003) speaks to the diversity of approaches of Indigenous film and video makers when he says,

> It seems likely to me that some Indigenous film artists will be interested in shaping films that sit with confidence within the First, Second and Third cinema framework. While not closing the door on that option, others may seek to rework the ancient core values to shape a growing Indigenous cinema outside the national orthodoxy. I hope that, in the not too distant future, some practitioner or academic will be able to stand up in a room like this and begin a talk on Fourth Cinema which begins at this very point, rather than ends on it (p. 11).

I maintain that the diversity of Indigenous representations is part of what Leuthold (1998) addresses as the complexities that some Indigenous film and

video maker's experience. In his complex inquiry, Leuthold "explore[s] the link between aesthetic expression and collective identity [...]"and he claims it is difficult to determine whether or not "Indigenous aesthetics are distinct" (p. 5) . It is difficult because from a Western perspective, the individual is primary while from an Indigenous perspective, the collective is of primary concern. Leuthold (1998) asks,

> Have Indigenous cultural producers been absorbed by the western understanding of art? One way to get at the heart of this problem of the distinctiveness of expressive forms is to look at contemporary media expressions by indigenous peoples, because these are inherently intercultural – influenced by the West – in their technology, form, and often in their intended audience. If distinct indigenous aesthetic expressions can be discovered in indigenous film and video, this would seem to point to the durability and importance of native aesthetic expression in general (p. 4).

He addresses some important aspects of Indigenous aesthetics in his "[...] attempt to develop frameworks for discussing indigenous aesthetics" and he does acknowledges how "our value systems are rooted in our experience of the world" and that "[...] beliefs and values are lived and embedded in social relationships" (p. 4). However, he does not identify how those values affect the codes of conduct within those relationships though he may be alluding to this when he says, "In the context of Indigenous aesthetics, a conceptual explanation of a belief or value system may not be the only source of discovering aesthetic ideas" (1998, p. 6).

While Todd's (2005) quest with the Myth of the Cave and The Story Wesakejak is a "contemporary media expression" which is "inherently intercultural – influenced by the West, I say she is demonstrating "the durability" of Native aesthetic expression through the very tone of her brilliant analysis which is steeped in Indigenous theories of knowledge. Furthermore, she links the "beliefs and values [that] are lived and embedded in social relationships." She says, "The key is what we do with knowledge" (p. 117). By asking some critical questions, Todd challenges other Indigenous cultural producers: "How do we imagine ourselves? From what stories do our aesthetics flow? What stories tell

us of our relationship to the sun? To the dark? To the shadows?" (p. 117)

Todd (2005) defines an Indigenous concept of knowledge by sharing a quote from an Anishnawbe (Ojibway) thinker – as D'arcy Rheault (2005) writes in Anishinaabe Mino-Bimaadiziwin,

> Knowledge is the means to being a good person. [The Anishinaabe] tradition stresses the need to investigate the world, and as such it is taught that philosophical thought has conceptual and logical beauty. This realization unleashes one's imagination and liberates one's thinking. The domain of thought/intuition opens up an infinity of possibilities. Individuals are choice-makers, and they are also thought-makers (p. 118).

As a "choice-maker" and a thought-maker," Todd (2005) puts forward the idea that Indigenous peoples are not, "...finding enlightenment. We are already in a universe that is alive, not made of shadows or illusions" (p. 118). She continues to remind us that "we are about relationships. And light is alive and shadow is not dead" (p. 119). She posits a deeper understanding of Indigenous knowledge by quoting respected Sioux knowledge keeper, theologian and scholar Vine Deloria, Jr., who states that in this world

> power and place are dominant concepts – power being the living energy that inhabits and/or composes the universe, and place being the relationship of things to each other…put into a simple equation: power and place produce personality. This equation simply means that the universe is alive, but it also contains within it the very important suggestions that the universe is personal and, therefore, must be approached in a personal manner... (Delora cited in Todd, 2005, p. 118)

It is clear that Indigenous peoples think of the concepts of "knowledge, power and place" in a very different way than western thinkers since in the Indigenous ideological framework everything is relational. Indigenous peoples have a personal relationship that is reciprocal to everything in the universe including what westerners identify as inanimate.

Blackfeet filmmaker, Darryl Robes Kipp (2001), gives a clear illustration of how Indigenous peoples personalize relationships when he says, "Sit with Blackfeet Indians and within twenty minutes everything you wanted to know

about their family, tribe, or themselves pours out like a truth-serum-induced stream of consciousness. Native people are forever trying to establish some family tribal connection with anyone they meet" (p. 4). Conversely, he says,

> On the other hand, illustrative of the incongruent relationships of non-Native people defining Native people, spend twenty hours with visiting filmmakers and you would be lucky to find out their real names. They have no hometown, home state, home religion, or corny nickname. They are the owner of the camera, mover of the pen, thought thief, and decoder of the story (2001, p. 4).

Clearly, Indigenous peoples are very relational in how they "see," "act," "do" and "listen" in the world, Therefore, with this approach, Todd's (2005) question, "How can I imagine a cinema that draws from our concepts of the universe?" (p. 120) introduces a multitude of possibilities. One such possibility, an exuberant one, is Barclay's (2003) conceptualization of his Maori worldview in the context of a "Fourth World Cinema that is unique to global Indigenous peoples and speaks of something else which is "not easy to access" (p. 2).

From a place of deep respect Todd (2005) explains "not one Indigenous person would claim to have the 'truth' but she humbly offers some 'ideas' about indigenous aesthetics" (p. 120). Leuthold (1998) acknowledges the complexities of cultural differences when he says,

> I feel that "the aesthetic" is an important concept to apply cross-culturally because it refers to real personal and social behaviours that occur in every culture. Not simply a logical construct or link in a philosophical system, the term "aesthetic" refers to real aspects of lived experience that have a social dimension. Linking ethics, religion, or politics and aesthetics reveals how value systems are embedded in our physical and emotional relationships to the world in which we live. Aesthetic experience is bodily, sensory; it is not just abstract and theoretical. Our value systems are rooted in our experience of the world (p. 6).

I argue that what Leuthold identifies here as a "body/energy experience" is the same as what Todd (2005) is speaking of when she identifies attentiveness as a key aesthetic element, "I would say that attentiveness refers to our senses as well as our minds" (p. 120). The decisions that Indigenous filmmakers make in

terms of the aesthetics they choose to film or record and even the stories that are told are governed by accepted social norms of behaviour which are grounded in the philosophies of Indigenous cultures. In Chapter Three, I will include a discussion of how Indigenous knowledge guides the personal and social behaviours that determine codes of conduct in the process of some Indigenous filmmakers which are intrinsic to aesthetic forms.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed when Manuel (Secwepemc) and Posluns (1974) first introduced the concept of the Fourth World, and I link this to Barclay's (2003) Fourth World Cinema. I discussed in-depth Barclay's Fourth World Cinema and some of the parameters that may define what he is naming as a "stand alone cinema." I introduced Jane Mills (2009) call for a new paradigm for "First Nations Cinema." Then I turned to Lewis' (2006) "Cinema of Sovereignty" that I argue is the same as Barclay's Fourth World Cinema while delving into what Lewis (2006) identified as Obomsawin's "sovereign gaze" that embodies qualities of self respect, self determination, that is,

> a practice of looking that comes out of Native experience and shapes the nature of the film itself" and "[...] is rooted in the particular ways of knowing and being that inform distinct nationhoods and [...] when cultural insiders are the controlling intelligence behind the filmmaking process, no matter how much non-Natives might help in various capacities" (p. 182).

I completed this chapter by drawing on various Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars' philosophical discussions about differences in systems of knowledge(s) that directly affect Indigenous film aesthetics.

Chapter 3:
Indigenous Knowledge and its Impact on Scripting, Aesthetics and Culturally Specific Pre-Production

Introduction

Cultural healing is an important part of decolonization and renewal for Indigenous peoples. Drawing on Abadian's (2006) arguments of how Indigenous communities are suffering from "...the effects of long-standing collective trauma" (p. 8), I begin by looking at how reclaiming original ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting," and "listening" determine the quality of the self-representation of the written and visual narratives of the Indigenous writers and filmmakers. I recount a detailed history of how Indigenous writers allied with other writers of colour, to address the institutionalized racism of Canada's mainstream writers. I look closely at how the Indigenous writers have developed a culturally specific literary construct by transposing oral stories into the written form. I adopt the writers' model for a multitude of Indigenous literary forms for my exploration of an Indigenous film model. Like writers, film/video makers are working with Western forms and institutions in a cultural interface, so I turn to Roth's (2005) theoretical model for communications development and explain how it might be synthesized with Indigenous writers' models in order to work for film/video makers in the cultural interface. Then, I turn to Barry Barclay's (1990, 2003) ways of applying Maori operating principles in guiding his filmmaking process. I argue that Barclay's (1990; 2003) operating principles are similar to Jo-ann Archibald's (2008) storywork principles of respect, responsibility, reciprocity and reverence [4R's originally developed by Barnhardt and Kirkness in 1991]. I also look at how Loretta Todd's (2005) philosophical points directly affect the codes of conduct for filmmakers based in her Cree/Métis worldview. I argue that Barclay and Todd's

approaches transforms the "post-traumatic narratives" to "self-referential and self reinforcing" (Abadian, 2006, p. 19) collective narratives for Indigenous peoples. I conclude by summarizing how this thinking can be a model for Indigenous film and video production.

Cultural Decolonization: Cultural Healing

Abadian (2006) examines the "unresolved collective trauma" and its relation to the contemporary poverty of Indigenous peoples in the 21st century. This is important because it links generational impacts of the settler government's genocidal policies and practices on Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island to the stories of the people (p. 8). She calls these stories, "post-traumatic narratives," and she argues that "collective traumas necessitates cultural and spiritual renewal – of institutions, narratives, relationships – as well as individuals, so that, at a minimum trauma is not reproduced into the next generation" (2006, p. 8).

In the context of her paradigm of "reparative or toxic" cultural healing I choose to be a part of a reparative approach to healing relationships; therefore, I adopt her position as she describes that prevention of

> toxic cultural renewal requires paying close attention to the quality and tone of the stories we tell ourselves about who we are in relation to others, why misfortunes have happened to us, and who or what is responsible for our current situation (Abadian, 2006, p. 9).

I am going to utilize what Abadian (2006) identifies as "meta-narratives" in this chapter to bring to light some of "the stories beneath our stories" that manifest "deeply held ideas and beliefs that are the hidden scaffolding for our stories, songs, ceremonies, rituals [...]" (2006, p. 9). She explains that "[t]hese hidden narratives [...] critically determine the quality of the renewal process" such that this "toxic cultural renewal is an outcome of toxic collective narratives" (p. 9). She explains that there are a variety of "post-traumatic narratives," which she says can be "disempowering," "falsely empowering" or "deeply pessimistic" (pp.

15-16). The tone of these toxic narratives tends to be "habitual and automatic" and the "damaging assumptions about the self, others, and the world become the *default setting*" of the stories we tell ourselves and others (p. 18). Abadian (2006) says that these

> unspoken narratives are a form of self-hypnosis that keeps us enslaved to the past and frozen. We respond not to what is happening to us right now, today, but to something that happened in the past. When traumatized peoples are in part frozen in the past and not present to this moment's reality, it gets in the way of solving today's problems (pp. 18-19).

The "power of post-traumatic narratives" is that they become "*self-referential* and *self-reinforcing*" because when we "see the world through these narratives and act as though they were true, we begin to elicit from the world those behaviours that in turn support our narratives" (p. 19).

Trauma is not new to the human condition as the survivors of the Rwandan genocide, the Jewish holocaust, and the Japanese Canadian internment camps have attested. However, what is critical to the survival of these people's cultures is how they choose to move forward. Some Indigenous film and video makers who have clearly made a choice to move away from the *unresolved collective trauma* and the subsequent *post-traumatic narratives* by re-inscribing the stories that Barclay (2003) calls, "a myriad cinema – a cinema of dreams, of daring, of love, of piety, of healing, of forward-vision, of a music other ears might find impossible to catch" (p. 16) to contribute to the overall health of their societies. Of Indigenous societies, Abadian (2006) says:

> Healthy traditional societies were aware of what happens to people when they experience terrible things, and they had well-developed methods of dealing with individual trauma. Some communal mourning rituals and ceremonies like sweat lodge release feelings of sorrow and despair (p. 20).

I agree with her when she says, that whole Indigenous families and communities — and indeed First Nations —have experienced "widespread and prolonged collective trauma" and that Indigenous peoples had "pre-existing

institutional mechanisms to cope with and channel pain, as well as ways to re-establish hope and confidence" (pp. 20-21). However, Abadian's language speaks of these "pre-existing mechanisms" in the past tense. I argue that in the decolonization/cultural healing process Indigenous peoples are currently revitalizing the ceremonies and other healing methods that are based in their systems of knowledge to counter the toxic post-traumatic colonial narratives, which have been suppressed by the colonizing process. It is important to understand that Indigenous knowledge(s) are central to Indigenous specific healing processes. Otherwise, as Abadian (2006) explains,

> If the prevailing mood, perceptions and evolving post-traumatic narratives are not countered effectively, disenchantment develops into more enduring cynicism and paranoia. Boundaries are drawn between "us" and "them" become ever more rigid. Over time, the alienation generates collective narratives of "better than" and "less than" – of racism, sexism chauvinism, ethnocentrism and other "isms." In extreme cases, this can lead to the dehumanization and demonization of "others." This downward spiral can ignite aggression and violence, and eventually can lead to exhaustion and the collapse of the society (p. 22).

It can be argued that the alienation of the racism, sexism, and ethnocentrism of Canada's colonial narratives have drawn the lines between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples since the time of first contact. One example that is not well documented in the written history is when Canada deployed its' military into Iroquoian communities because the traditional Chiefs were refusing to adopt the Canadian Government's *Indian Act* governance system during the 1920s.[42]

The mistrust of settler governments which mobilizes its' military against Indigenous peoples when they stand up for their sovereignty has a long history in the oral stories of Indigenous peoples; however, it is only since the armed conflicts of the 1990s that visual documentation was widely enough distributed to be viewed in mainstream Canada.

Therefore, the counter-narrative of the Indigenous writers and film/video makers is crucial because Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships are at a

critical stage of development in healing their cultural and institutional relationships. In this state of distrust and when the potential for violence erupting at any given land rights dispute exists, it is crucial to understand the role of post-traumatic narratives. Abadian (2006) says, "Depending on the tone and content of our narratives – the way we make meaning – [the narratives] can be more or less toxic, more or less adaptive. By adaptive, I mean generating ways to thrive in new ways and challenging environments" (p. 11).

In the challenging environment of the 1990s Indigenous peoples have engaged in a concerted process of cultural decolonization to heal from "the effects of long-standing collective trauma" (Abadian, 2006, p. 8) caused by the compounded political, social, spiritual and economic actions of the colonial occupiers of their lands, since the time of first contact. At the same time, Indigenous peoples are at various stages of reclaiming and reconstituting their cultural ceremonies and other rituals of healing based in their Indigenous knowledge(s) which means turning to and adapting their original ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening" in representing their own voices in their contemporary narratives. However, I argue that the countering of the *post-traumatic narratives* can only be effective if both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples agree to be functional partners in what Barclay (2003) calls *the Dance with the Other,* what Nakata *(*2002, 2007) calls the *cultural interface,* what Ginsburg (2003) calls the *discursive space* , and what Stewart and Wilson (2008) identify as "an intersection of many discursive paradigms in academia and also in cultural politics at all levels" (p. 6).

I want to now turn to the work of the Indigenous writers because they have led the way in Canada's "challenging environment" by dealing with "cultural politics at all levels." In their movement to renew their cultures, the writers have challenged the classic narrative structure of Western storytelling. Annette Kuhn (2007) describes this narrative form, as one that is "organised around a basic structure of enigma and resolution." Furthermore Kuhn (2007) explains,

> At the beginning of the story, an event may take place that disrupts
> a pre-existing equilibrium in the fictional world. It is then the task of
> the narrative to resolve that disruption and set up a new equilibrium

(see Barthes, 1993). The classic narrative may thus be regarded as a process whereby problems are solved so that order may be restored to the world of the fiction. But the process of the narrative – everything that takes place between the initial disruption and the final resolution – is also subject to a certain ordering. Events in the story are typically organised in a relationship of cause and effect, so that there is a logic whereby each event of the narrative is linked to the next. (Kuhn cited in Cook, 2007, p. 45)

In the cultural decolonization/cultural healing process, Indigenous writers have set the *tone and* determined the *content* of how Indigenous peoples make meaning within their contemporary realities by showing that Western storytelling forms do not serve or offer the counter-narratives they need to develop for constructive cultural healing and successful decolonization of their societies. The following section will explain why it is critical to develop culturally specific storytelling styles in creating the counter-narratives.

Indigenous Writers Model of Literary Constructs

In the early colonial years of Canada, Métis leader, Louis Riel predicted the role of the writers and artists when he said, "My people will sleep for one hundred years, when they awake it will be the artists who give them their spirit back" (July 4, 1885).[43] That spirit was revealed when Lee Maracle (Squamish-Métis) challenged the white feminist community in 1988 at the Third International Feminist Book Fair in Montreal, Quebec Maracle asked Anne Cameron to "move over" and stop appropriating and profiting from telling Indigenous stories (Greenhill & Tye, 1997, p. 68). Then, in 1989 Lenore Keeshig-Tobias (Anishnawbe) challenged the systemic racist policies of the Writers Union of Canada at an annual general meeting when she, "effectively launched the Appropriation of Voice controversy at a Writers' Union AGM in Kitchener, Ontario with her argument that the stories and cultures of the First Nations (and, by extension, other minorities) should not be appropriated by non-native writers"[44] (Tator, 1998).

The established writers, including the feminist community in Canada were forced to deal with the race issue because Indigenous writers would no longer be

silenced and marginalized.[45,46] The initial steps in Canada moving towards becoming functional partners in the "Dance With The Other" (Barclay, 2003) are described by Christine St. Peter when she discusses the controversy in her essay, "Feminist Afterwords: Revisiting Copper Woman" (Greenhill & Tye, 1997, p. 65-72). She concludes,

> The task seems clear for those of us who are professional academics (or artists from the dominant group) and in a position to profit professionally from our study of minority women. To appropriate others' stories in the face of centuries of genocidal treatment is simply unethical (St. Peter cited in Greenhill & Tye, 1997, p. 70).

As Indigenous storytellers/writers established ethical boundaries with the mainstream literary community they turn to a sophisticated code of ethics and cultural protocols within the Indigenous system of knowledge of their cultures. Marjorie Beaucage (Métis) explains in the following statement,

Stories are also gifts. As Maria Campbell (2005), a Métis storyteller from Saskatchewan explains:

> 'No one ever told a story that was not his/her own and if they did, it was only if the story had been given to them or if the story was traded. Even then, the storyteller would begin the story by telling how he/she came by it and the name of the original creator would be given.' Some stories are sacred and can only be told at certain times by the people who have been chosen and trained to carry them for the people. (p. 144).

It is important to be aware of these caveats when the traditional stories of Indigenous peoples are under discussion because most Indigenous peoples place themselves on the lands they are born to with a body of stories that begins with a Creation story that is specific to the biodiversity of the plants, animals, and water systems of their regions. These oral (hi)stories govern the codes of conduct and provides the infrastructures for how specific Indigenous peoples interrelate amongst themselves and with their environments. These oral stories are passed from one oral story teller to another, from one generation to the next (Deloria, 1973, pp. 91-109).

In discussing Indigenous literary constructs with Victoria Freeman, Jeannette Armstrong (Syilx-Okanagan) gives some important insights. She says,

> The thought and philosophical worldview underlying a cultural system which did a number of things that seem to be important in terms of knowledge today – the connectedness to the environment and to the land in a way which preserves and promotes regeneration for the next generation...the cooperative systems that encompass and move always outward to include and align with anything that remains counter-active. That's where the greatest losses occur, in those systems and customs – the stories reflect and embed the philosophical ideals, the underlying infrastructure (Armstrong cited in Freeman, 1992, p.10).

It is these losses that put Indigenous cultures at risk of extinction. Some storytellers have taken extraordinary measures in transposing the oral to the written form to ensure cultural survival in the cultural decolonization/cultural healing process (Anderson, 1997; Freeman, 1992; Young-Ing, 1993, 1994, 1999).[47]

Indigenous writers have been "breaking new ground" and "exploring new literary constructs which push beyond the hard line concepts in Canadian literature" by writing reparative narratives for Indigenous peoples (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, p. 52). Armstrong as the founder of the En'owkin International School of Writing, writer, scholar and activist, states that her motivation is, "want(ing) a place to give Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous perspective the academic respect it deserves" (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, p. 52).

Armstrong (1997) discusses the critical process of transposing the oral to the written forms, within the epistemologies of Indigenous peoples with Kim Anderson (Anishnawbe) (1997). She cites the works of Campbell (Métis), Culleton (Métis), and Maracle (Squamish/Métis) as an illustration of how Indigenous writing moves fluidly between fiction and non-fiction thereby transcending the boundaries of western genres. She explains how the characters and events blur the lines between "fact and fiction' [...] and suddenly you are confronted with the idea that there's more non-fiction here than there is fiction,

and so you need to ask 'What is this?" (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, p. 53). She goes on to say,

> One of the issues [that we address] here is the categorization of fiction, poetry and drama. Those categories very clearly indicate a set of criteria that says, 'this is fiction writing,' or even further than that, 'this is a novel' – you know in terms of what the novel is, and how that becomes the container, and becomes the criteria by which the work is understood, appreciated and experienced. (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, p. 53).

The most complex notion discussed involves how to define Indigenous oratory within the definitions of western literature and its genres. The complexities are revealed when Armstrong asks, "How do you show the reader when a speaker is raising his/her voice? Or when the speaker is emphasizing a point or when there are pauses, how do you translate the rhythm of the oratory" (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, pp. 55-56).

Furthermore, she states that oratory

> extends beyond poetry in its need to interact with, and persuade an audience. It is not simply political rhetoric because of its link to traditional story. It is not drama because, at its roots, it is prayer. It is a distinct combination that defies western genres (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, 55-56).

Also, because a direct translation from oratory to the written form is not possible, she states,

> There are more than structural concerns. The question is how do you tell an Indigenous story from within the Indigenous worldview but in the western literary prose tradition? What is the role of the narrator? How do you write sounds? Indigenous writers have created innovative techniques in their writing to create a reality that is understood from an Indigenous cultural context. They create a series of vignettes, impressions and images that are pulled together in a larger gestalt of movement in the story. (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, p. 55)

To illustrate her point, Armstrong uses Louise Erdich's (1984) story, *Love Medicine*, as an example when she describes how the one female character

commits suicide at the beginning of the novel but the reader never hears from that particular character again. However, all the other characters in the novel are related to her in one way or the other and the layers of social, political, cultural and spiritual activities in the community provide some insights as to why this character would take her own life. Armstrong (1997) describes the story arc as a "gestalt of movement in the story" of a number of characters, which is a notable difference from western literary conventions of character development. The story does not revolve around the life path of one character, one hero (Archibald, 2008; Sweet Wong, 1998; Torres, 1998; Wheeler, 2010).

The innovative approach of the Indigenous writers gives insight into how their storytelling styles do not fit neatly into the Western literary genres. Armstrong (1997) says because there is a diversity of Indigenous cultures with unique traditions and specific epistemologies; then there is "more than one Native literature being created" (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, p. 64). With this basic theoretical understanding of the creative process in Indigenous writing, it is consistent to suggest that more than one visual narrative is being created by the Indigenous film and video makers because they share similar concerns about transposing the oral (his)stories into the visual narratives. For Indigenous peoples the complex intersection of the "diversity of their unique cultures" with the diversity of a multicultural/multiracial dominant society is problematic because so-called multicultural/diversity policies in Canada do not acknowledge the a priori place of Indigenous peoples on the land. This relationship that the original peoples have with the land, gives them a very different political location from the immigrant groups of the so-called visible minorities who are seeking to re-root or re-orient themselves on the land they have chosen as their new home.

I argue that for Indigenous writers and film and video makers, the *reparative* narratives that are necessary for cultural renewal/healing consist in telling stories that are guided by their Indigenous knowledge which holds culturally specific operating principles that govern codes of conduct to ensure the survival of the *collective*, not just the *individual*. In turning to their *pre-existing mechanisms* (Abadian, 2006, pp. 20-21), Indigenous writers and film and video

makers are reclaiming Indigenous ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening." It is critical to work with the policy makers from the dominant society to create a cultural interface where these writers and film and video makers can re-establish hope and confidence by embracing their original systems of knowledge. Though alliance building in the cultural interface is not easy work, it is possible and necessary in this current moment. One non-Indigenous scholar who has worked with Indigenous peoples to understand the complexities of the cultural interface is Lorna Roth (2005).

Lorna Roth's Theoretical Model for a Diversity of Cultures

Lorna Roth (2005) a Communications scholar, has worked with Inuit peoples for 35 years and has witnessed the cultural, policy and media developments in northern Canada that led to the licensing of the first ever Aboriginal People's Television Network (APTN) on February 22, 1999. She documents the "Phases of First Peoples Television History" and the "Aboriginal Broadcasting Funding History" (p. 20, p. 161) and critically analyzes the approach of the policy makers in Canada.

Roth's history with the Inuit of the North started at a critical time when the Inuit "voted to keep television out of the community in the mid-1970s" (Kunuk & Puhipau, 2005, p. 46). Rather than being invaded by this technology and programming from the South, they initially barred television. Clearly, her knowledge reflects her long term relationship with the Inuit of the North and other Indigenous peoples of the South when she says "[m]y research suggests that First Peoples are slowly developing new discourses, practices, and explanatory frameworks to account for the specificities of Fourth World communications development" (Roth, 2005, p. 227). Her analysis clearly shows she is already in the cultural interface when she explains,

> Fourth World development occurs when the formerly colonized transform their consciousness from that of powerless objectified being to subject-agents who can publicly act and speak in the language of their choice on the basis of their own cultural histories, knowledges, and capacities. Media play a critical role in

documenting and publicly asserting their ownership rights to these very things (Roth, 2005, p. 227).

Roth's (2005) statement is important because she acknowledges that Indigenous peoples are in the Fourth World and that they exercise agency within culturally specific ways of operating. Although, Roth does not specifically use the word "agency," I argue that her use of terms like "subject-agents" indicate that she is concerned with agency. For the purposes of this thesis, I will now clarify what I mean by Indigenous agency. I refer to Nakata's (2007) "second useful principle for an Indigenous standpoint theory [that] would recognise Indigenous agency as framed within the limits and possibilities of what I can know from this constituted position" (p. 216). He further explains the limits in the cultural interface for Indigenous agency as consistently being asked to "be continuous with one position [while] at the same time being discontinuous with another" that creates a space of "push-pull" and confusion (Nakata, 2007, p.216).

> When I worked for Vision TV, I faced this push-pull situation. I had some difficult choices to make because I was very involved with the writers in the cultural appropriation issue and was painfully aware of intellectual property rights. However, because Rita Shelton Deverell was training and mentoring me, I had to decide what I would compromise to "get the story out there." I decided to sacrifice the copyright of my productions for the opportunity to be trained in the broadcasting industry; therefore, I had "to be continuous with one position while at the same time being discontinuous with another." I decided it was more important to get as many Indigenous stories out there rather than to stand by my political stance on copyright.

Roth (2005) sheds light on ways to navigate the complexities involved in Nakata's (2007) cultural interface in her critical discussion of development studies. She "emancipat[es] the concept of development from its Eurocentric, neo-colonial legacy in order to re-think power relations" and puts forward the

notion of "co-development" (p. 230). She builds on the work of Keval Kumar (1988-89) who determined that in order to revitalize development in communications, the time had come for the pluralistic society to make room for each "culture and tradition [to] develop(s) its own theory or theories and practices or strategies in terms of its own philosophy, its resources, its history and experience" (Kumar cited in Roth, 2005, p. 229). She adds to Kumar's approach.

> If we, no matter what our cultural origins may be, recognize that there is no fixed or terminating point to development and if we acknowledge that we are living in a complex, multicultural, and multiracial world in which we can no longer depend on the stability we once took for granted, then it is clear we have to rethink the categories of development communications frameworks. (Roth, 2005, p. 229)

I interpret her statement as a call for the privileged of the mainstream broadcasting industry to "move over" as Lee Maracle requested, in 1988, of Anne Cameron in the writers' community. This new thinking that Roth (2005) puts forward recognizes the systems of knowledge of the original peoples' that have distinct ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening" that inform culturally specific production practices.

Barb Cranmer (Kwakwaka'wakw/Namgis) is an excellent example of a film maker who has been attentive to her People's distinct ways and has integrated this into her films.[48] Each one of the films is located on the Pacific Northwest region of British Columbia. Each one reflects visual elements of west coast Indigenous culture, which includes boats, water shots of every conceivable kind, including underwater shots, oars hitting the water, food gathering/eulachon making, seagulls, seals, mountains, carvers making house poles, Eagle down feathers blessing everyone, archival footage of their ancestors, and the ever-present ocean. There is footage inside their Big House including ceremonial mask dancing and drumming where ceremonial button blankets illustrating their Clan symbols are proudly worn. The sounds are the distinctive West Coast

drumming and singing and the natural ambience of a coastal culture, such as the cries of seagulls, the sloshing sounds of water on the sides of the canoes, and the dipping of paddles into the ocean, moving the canoe forward. Yet, at the same time, the films could fall into the genre of "domestic ethnography" that Michael Renov (2004) describes as

> play at the boundaries of inside and outside in a unique way. This work engages in the documentation of family members or, less literally, of people with whom the maker has maintained long-standing everyday relations and has thus achieved a level of casual intimacy. Because the lives of artist and subject are interlaced through communal or blood ties, the documentation of the one tends to implicate the other in complicated ways; indeed, consanguinity and co(i)mplication are domestic ethnography's defining features (p. 218).

However, to do an effective analysis of Cranmer's films in relation to the finer attributes of Renov's theories would require a dedicated chapter. The main point I am making is that all of Cranmer's documentaries are located within her family, her extended family, her Clan and her Nation. All her documentaries tell stories of issues critical to cultural survival (See: Appendix I for list of films). The storylines are: how colonial encroachment has eroded their fishing rights (major food source), how critical canoe journeys are to West Coast cultures, how one family hosts a feast and potlatch to memorialize a father's passing, how the Namgis community rebuilt their Big House when an arsonist burned their central meeting place down, and how a group of coastal weavers reclaimed the Chilkat weaving practise to ensure that it is not lost and only available to be seen in museums.

While Cranmer uses some documentary conventions to meet broadcast standards, I also identified some noticeable Indigenous practices. For instance, she chooses to give the authoritative voice to Elders, Chiefs, Women, Carvers, Fishermen, and even children from her community, rather than the professional or expert that a mainstream audience is conditioned to expect. Cranmer's films provide what Barclay calls, "a tapestry of people" (Barclay, 1990, p.10). Barclay (1990) explains,

100

Let's imagine you are making a film about a pollution problem in a long-settled bay. Your researcher will have boned up on the scientific side and will have a couple of articulate scientists in tow. You say to the researcher and the crew, "We are going to film the kuia (women elders) first and we are going to spend a whole day doing it." The crew is anxious to get on with the "proper" filming, thinking that reminiscences in Maori from an old woman will not find their way into the final edit anyway (p. 10).

The way Cranmer delivers her stories is an important element of the Indigenous storytelling style that characterizes the worldview of Indigenous people. To illustrate my point, I counted the number of characters in each documentary. *Gwishalaayt: The Spirit Wraps Around You* (2001) has the least number of representative voices with *six* characters telling the story. *T'Lina: The Rendering of Wealth* (1999) has *seventeen* representative voices. *L'Tusto: To Rise Again* (2000) has *twenty-three* community voices. *Qatuwas: People Gathering Together* (1997) has over *thirty* community peoples represented.

Although a conventional documentary may have more than one character speaking to the storyline, the general practice is to focus on a single character throughout the film in the development of the overall story arc. Cranmer's documentaries do not do this.

If cultural institutions accepted Roth's (2005) model of co-development, then this could garner more institutional policy support for Indigenous film and video makers like Cranmer and others who are creating works based in their culturally specific filmmaking practices. However, this would require a functional relationship between Indigenous film and video makers and policy makers because Indigenous-specific criteria would have to be co-developed by both parties in the cultural interface. As Roth (2005) explains, "it seems clear that aboriginal program producers, in trying to build bridges of understanding across cultural terrain, are consciously engaged in a social mediation of sorts" (p. 224). Furthermore, she states,

First Peoples at APTN have refashioned the Canadian television landscape by indigenizing it – transforming their parcel of electronic space into a catalyst for (cross) community development and

101

utilizing it to mediate and explore versions of their own historically ruptured pasts and presents (Roth, 2005, p. 224).

Clearly, Indigenous peoples are already in the cultural interface; however, many non-Indigenous policy makers do not appear to be. Roth (2005) acknowledges this when she looks in-depth at the historical development of broadcasting policies in relation to Indigenous peoples. In her Chapter Five, "Policy-ing the North" (pp. 12-171). She revisits the 1970s when Indigenous groups started self-organizing to meet with the federal government's Department of Communications (DOC), the Canadian Radio-Television Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) and the Secretary of State's Native Citizen's Directorate for a policy dialogue. Roth (2005) explains that the

> idea and practice of First Peoples' self-representation in broadcasting promised to weave the notion of diversity into the overall fabric of policy and to pave the way for aboriginal cultural coexistence with the Euro-Canadian broadcasting system in the North. While some federal bureaucrats felt that this was a positive and progressive goal for broadcasting and cultural policies, others considered these objectives to be threatening and continued to resist any changes to the overall system (p. 122).

The promise for policy inclusion came in 1982, when the Applebaum-Hébert *Report on Federal Cultural Policy* stated explicitly that "Indian, Inuit, and Métis peoples had gained a *special place in cultural policy*" [her emphasis] (Applebaum-Hébert cited in Roth, 2005, p. 145). She quotes from the Applebaum- Hébert report to illustrate the thrust of policy.

> We have come to believe, [...] that a special place in cultural policy should be reserved for peoples of Indian and Inuit ancestry. This should be so for several reasons. To begin with, the cultural traditions of the original peoples are uniquely rooted in this country, as compared with those more recently derived from other cultures. In the second place, the federal government has by treaty, law and custom a special responsibility for the well-being of these peoples. Finally, and most important of all, the original cultural traditions have a set of values and aesthetic standards which have not been easily accommodated within the usual structures and practices of federal cultural institutions. (Applebaum-Hebert as cited in Roth, 2005, p. 145)

Almost a decade later, the Indigenous peoples and their non-Indigenous allies achieved a successful outcome with "the enshrinement of aboriginal broadcasting in the Broadcasting Act on June 4, 1991" (Roth, 2005, p. 124). However, I argue that even with these legislated broadcast policies, there continues to be civil servants, politicians and bureaucrats who sit in positions of power and who resent the a priori place of Indigenous peoples in Canada. Therefore, it is difficult for any cultural healing or cultural decolonizing on an institutional level to be effective when there is a lack of cooperation to work collaboratively with Indigenous peoples.

If Roth's (2005) co-development model is to work, then "models of life enhancing cultural and spiritual renewal" (Abadian, 2006, p.9) need to be developed to transform the current reality that exists between Indigenous peoples and the civil servants, politicians and bureaucrats who stonewall the cultural policies. Both sides of the proverbial fence need to "transcend the victim-offender paradigm" that upholds "systems of domination" (the colonial narrative) that render Indigenous peoples powerless, therefore, without agency. This can be accomplished by moving to "systems of mutuality" (Sutherland, 2005, pp. 49-60) that can strategically shift the current policies. New systems and models may shift the policies, but how do individual policy makers change their belief systems and racist behaviours? While individual change will be slow and cannot be forced upon resistant individuals, such behavioural shifts may be more likely to occur in an environment where Indigenous people's stories and perspective regularly circulate.

Theoretically, if Roth's (2005) co-development model is applied with the writer's model of a multitude of literary forms, then finally, what Abadian names the "collective trauma" of Indigenous peoples can be transformed into stories that go beyond the colonial narrative to a collective story of growth, hope and endurance.

Along with the Indigenous writers, the global Indigenous film community has a significant role in re-inscribing contemporary collective narratives. As discussed earlier in the thesis, Barry Barclay has been engaged in the cultural

103

decolonization/cultural healing process by writing and directing films from his Maori way of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening" for many years. He has been in the cultural interface countering the toxic colonial narratives constructed by the generations of "invader cinemas" since the 1970s (Barclay, 2003, p.7).

Fourth World Cinema: In the Cultural Interface

In his 2003 lecture, Barclay presented an overview of feature length films produced in the global Indigenous world, including the films produced in Aoetearoa (New Zealand) for Fourth World Cinema. The global Indigenous films are: *Bedevil[ed]* (1993) by Aborigine filmmaker Tracey Moffit; The *Pathfinder* (1987) by Sami director, *Smoke Signals* (1998) directed by Cheyenne-Arapaho Chris Eyre, *Atanarjuat (The Fast Runner)* by Inuit director Zacharias Kunuk, *Beneath Clouds* (2002) by Aborigine director Ivan Sen, and the *Business of Fancy Dancing* (2002) Spokane-Coeur d'Alene director, Sherman Alexie. Barclay overlooked one feature film, Bearwalker (formerly *Backroads*) (2000) directed by Shirley Cheechoo (Cree) in Canada; thus the total is seven completed features by global Indigenous directors.

Barclay names the Maori films as follows,

> In this country, we have *Mauri,* [1999] written and directed by Merata Mita; *Once Were Warriors [2003],* director Lee Tamahori and released this year, *Te Tangata Whai Rawa O Weneti (the Maori Merchant of Venice) [2002]*, directed by Don Selwyn, and the first of them *Ngati,* written by Tama Poata and directed by myself, released in 1985. *And Te Rua (1992)* which I wrote and directed" (2003, p.2).

Barclay and other Maori filmmakers produced almost fifty percent of the total of twelve Indigenous films worldwide; therefore, they are firmly at the helm as leaders in the movement to re-inscribe *post-traumatic narratives* with a full spectrum of Maori stories.

Barclay's vast experience in the film industry started in the 1960s when "[t]he images [he] took were within the national orthodoxy" (First Cinema). He was working on a film project that was recording the engineering achievements of a river diversion scheme in his home territory (Barclay, 2003, p.1). In the 1970s, the global Indigenous activities would shape his Maori identity and inform his political consciousness as a documentary filmmaker (Murray, 2008, p.16). Murray (2008) describes Barclay's approach as follows,

> What is clear is that his activism is often iconoclastic, and his idea of what constitutes Maori identity is as radical in its conception of the present and the future as it can be traditional in its evocation of the past (p. 16).

Murray (2008) goes on to say, "[t]hey are vital to a consideration of all his work because the combination of national and international perspectives [...] can be seen to be a precursor to the kind of methodology Barclay developed in outlining Fourth Cinema some 30 years later" (p.16). I agree with Murray and I suggest that like the Indigenous writers, Barclay was engaged in his creative process of developing Maori specific film forms in order to translate Indigenous knowledge to transform the established Western film production process. It is in this context that Barclay formulates a new approach to Indigenous filmmaking practices, thus determining the aesthetics of the films.

In order to understand how Barclay constructs his visual narratives so that he may be "true to [the] values and needs of his Maori culture" (Barclay,1990, p.7), it is necessary to introduce some of the Maori concepts that he applies to his production process. I argue that Barclay's Maori concepts guide his filmmaking processes implicitly to present a "self-defined sovereign people" who is the "controlling intelligence" (Lewis, 2006, p.182) with Barclay acting with "authority, autonomy, and accountability" in creating film works. Therefore, Barclay also has the same sovereign Indigenous gaze that Lewis speaks of when discussing Alanis Obomsawin's (Abenaki) film work because while Barclay worked with the New Zealand Film Commission and New Zealand Television, he consciously worked in the cultural interface to present his Indigenous standpoint.

It is from this position that Barclay's Maori films uphold the *visual sovereignty* that Raheja (Seneca) (2007) speaks of within Lewis's (2006) *Cinema of Sovereignty*, which I argue is the same as what Barclay names Fourth World Cinema.

Barclay's Maori Concepts as Operating Principles

The following definitions are some of the Maori concepts discussed in Barclay's lectures and books. [49] These concepts inform and guide the indigenizing of the filmmaking process and govern Indigenous codes of conduct within the Maori culture. I argue that most Indigenous cultures share similar concepts that may be defined slightly differently within their own languages. In introducing himself in a cultural way, Barclay (2003) illustrates the meaning of some of the concepts. He says,

> My whakapapa is by mountain (Taranaki), and by River (Rangitikei) and by tribe (Ngati Apa) and by hapu or extended family, which is most immediately Marumaru: from this, my make-up, my whakapapa, is Maori (p. 2).

In one reference, he calls "whakapapa" the "lineage, genealogy, history on land (1990, p. 52), and then he describes the same word as – interconnectedness of everything in another reference (Barclay, 2003, p. 2). This self-identity contextualized in the Maori concepts of "mana motuhake" that he describes as "Maori control of Maori matters" (Barclay, 1990, p. 31) elucidates his stance of being positioned "outside the national orthodoxy." The concept, "mana" which he says, "has to do with status, authority, standing tall – Mana Maori may mean Maori pride, Maori dignity, and also Maori self responsibility" (Barclay, 2003, p. 18) embodies who he is as a Maori man taking responsibility for his words in the books has written and for the visual constructs of his films.

One concept that would directly affect the constructs and aesthetics of a filmmaker's visual narratives, is what Barclay (2003) explains as "Te Ao Maori," which he says, "translated literally means "in the Maori world," but the phrase evokes a whole cosmology, a world of physical and spiritual things, a world of spirits and gods" (p. 12). An important part of that cosmology is the concept

"kawa is tapu" which he says is "the sacred process of "raising of the dead" [For Maori, 'the dead' refers to The Ancestors] (p. 10). The term *kawa* is most used in association with the processes of encounter rituals of the *marae* (our places and houses of meeting)" (p. 10). Another concept, *tatau tatau* means "all in together," which has a tactic of "immutability and timelessness" [that is equivalent] to saying, "today is tomorrow is the past" (p. 11) is important to writing or constructing visual narrative because of its implications for time and space. I interpret this concept to mean the collapsing of space so everything exists at the same time as opposed to a linear, chronological occurrence of events or existence of things/beings.

The worldview contained within Barclay's concepts reflect what Archibald (2008) and her colleagues put forward as typical of all Indigenous knowledge where a whole person (body, mind, heart, and spirit) as an individual relates to three other levels, (family, community and Nation) with the operating principles of: respect, responsibility, reciprocity, and reverence. This is similar to what Barclay (2003) speaks of when he suggests, "that it could be that some of the fundamental principles by which we construct our moving image sequence may hearken back to age-old processes which we bring into our projects without our hardly being aware of it" (p. 10). He says, "...it might be helpful for us to think of our work as a different sort of marae, explaining that a typical marae has

> three buildings – a meeting house, where important talk is conducted and where people sleep; the dining room, where people cook and eat; and the ablution block. Marae are a combination of town hall, church, restaurant, sleeping quarters and playground. There are many rules of conduct on a marae, and while the rules differ a little from place to place, the broad rules are common to all marae across the country (1990, p.76).

There is one area Barclay (1990) is not willing to *adapt or modify* in the cultural decolonization process when he says, "...the way to keep the spirit of the young communications marae strong is to be absolutely rigid about operating it along marae lines." that is, "[w]hen you enter this space, you hear our people

talking in their own way to their own people" (p. 77). Furthermore, he states that the

> slightest compromise on this principle reduces the set of marae buildings and the land around them to nothing more than a motel-cum-conference centre – and that you can find in any part of the world (1990, p. 76).

Barclay further rationalizes his position when he explains, "The talk out approach has been tried, not only in film-making but in many other areas too – in education, public broadcasting and publishing. By and large, the approach has failed (p. 76)." He also states, I have come to believe we need to be talking to our own people first – to be 'talking in' (1990, p. 76). To clarify what Barclay means by his "talk out" approach, my understanding is that he is referring to what many Indigenous peoples refer to as, "educating the non-Indigenous peoples about their own racism, sexism, and ethnocentrism."[50]

> Barclay (1990) further explains,

> I do not think this is turning inward in an unhealthy way. Rather, I see it as asserting a cultural confidence so that, if we shape things our own way, we shall come to make images that will be attractive to those humans on the planet who wish to enjoy them. I am not talking about minority programmes directed at a minority. I am talking about a minority being confident enough to talk with its own voice about whatever it chooses (p. 78).

I agree with Barclay and I argue that this approach is an absolute necessity for Indigenous peoples to transform the generations of 'toxic collective narratives' of colonial representations because in the cultural healing/cultural decolonization process Indigenous peoples need a common space to self-determine their conceptual and physical pathways towards a healthy society. In this space, Indigenous peoples can meet without having to explain the approach of their philosophies and without having to justify themselves to others who do not share their experiences and/or are implicated in the colonial violence.

> In my years of working for Vision TV, I was consistently puzzled when my Story Editor in Toronto asked me about "assumed knowledge" in

108

my scripts. Years later, in deconstructing and analyzing my own practice, I came to realize that when creating my productions, I unconsciously constructed whatever story I was working on for the people who were the subjects because I felt a strong sense of accountability to them. I was very aware of the responsibility they placed on me in trusting me with their story. My secondary audience was other Indigenous peoples, then the larger community. I realize now this unconscious practice is what Raheja (2007) is referring to in her article when she discusses the hierarchy of audience I emphasize this was an unconscious process and not a purposeful exclusion of 'the Other'.

At first glance, the films I produced could be seen as "talking out" to the larger Canadian audience; however, when examined closely, it is clear that I was "talking in" since my primary concern was for the Indigenous peoples whose story I was telling. As my story editor pointed out, for others without the assumed knowledge of the spiritual and philosophical ways of the people, it would be difficult for them to understand all the dimensions of the film. This makes the film "for an Indigenous audience" rather than for a wider audience who needs to be educated about Indigenous peoples.

In Raheja's (Seneca) (2007) discussion on visual sovereignty, she analyzes the script of *Atanarjuat* (2000) to reveal a hierarchy of audience(s). Of one scene, she says,

> Tuurngarjuaq sings a song in the *qaggiq* [large igloo], which he prefaces by claiming, 'I can only sing this song to someone who understands it. When you sing, you laugh at the same time. It must be because you're winning too! It's fun to sing and play a game at the same time.' The opening subtitled lines of the film are a cue to the non-Inuit spectator (including non-Inuit Native Americans) that the film's narrative and details may remain incommensurable since a non-Inuktitut-speaking person wouldn't understand his song. Tuurngarjuaq's statement makes evident the multiple audiences the film is addressing: Inuit who understand scenes such as the opening one because they are already familiar with the narrative, non-Inuit Native Americans who may read some of the cues from the film and place them in dialogue with their own tribally specific oral narratives and discursive contexts, and non-Inuit who do not understand Inuktitut or the cultural practices represented in the film (p. 1175).

As Barclay (1990) points out, it is important to "talk in" especially now as Indigenous peoples are revitalizing their cultures by re-embracing their systems of knowledge to ensure cultural survival. This is not the time to be translating and explaining this knowledge; however, in choosing to "talk in" to his Maori culture, Barclay clarifies that this does not mean excluding people from other cultures. On this point, he says,

> The whole conduct on a marae is aimed at making people from other areas welcome and comfortable. No matter how steeped in tradition a marae is, and no matter how piously the local people invoke those traditions, if visitors feel they have not been brought in warmly and treated well, then the marae will be considered hollow and will die (p. 78).

Barclay (1990) goes on to say, "....re-orienting communications towards a marae climate has as much to do with tone as direction" (p. 79) and he explains that the conduct on a marae is done in a "special way." Even though "fearfully strong points" may be made and they may be directed at one person, this would be done in such a way as not to humiliate them and to ensure that they are "kept within the fold." To do otherwise, would be "unpardonable" and "the old people would not stand for it" (1990, p. 79). Barclay (1990) explains how the Maori code of conduct translates on his sets and in the field.

> All film-makers have some code about treating people properly, of course, but a Maori film-maker has the marae tradition to draw on, a tradition that makes use of humour and anecdote more freely than other New Zealanders do in situations which are potentially confrontational (p. 79).

I argue that Barclay's embracing of the Maori code of conduct is a major part of creating a *reparative* cultural renewal that honours, respects and upholds the Indigenous ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening." It is critical to understand how the culture determines Indigenous codes of conduct.
 Loretta Todd's Code of Conduct

In consciously exploring how the Indigenous ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening" informs the production process, Loretta Todd (Cree-Métis)

110

(2005) offers valuable knowledge to this discussion. She philosophically explores whether or not Indigenous production has culturally specific aesthetics, by questioning, "How can I imagine a cinema from our concepts of the Universe" (p. 120)? After all, she says, "Filmmaking came almost fully packaged when it arrived in Indian country. Its' units of construction – from shots to scenes to sequences, from mise-en-scene to montage – were neatly tied with a bow" (p. 106). She asks critical questions of Indigenous film and video makers,

> Have we truly decolonized our imaginations when it comes to how we represent ourselves in media – both in the aesthetics and content of our stories? Have we internalized the images made of us, the idea of 'us' by the colonizer – from the camera angles to the editing to the music? Are we their tour guides or even recruiters into their worldview (2005, p. 107)?

In responding to her questions, I suggest that the aesthetics and contents of our stories directly reflect each filmmaker's unique location in their personal decolonization and cultural healing. Some may be constructing *toxic* rather than *reparative* narratives because of their personal experiences, that is, generational effects of residential school, placement in white foster homes, being adopted out to non-Indigenous homes or being dispossessed from the land or people as a result of the policies of the settler governments. Todd (2005) says,

> Yet it would seem we mimic, or at the very least aspire to be part of that mass media, to replicate their look and sound, their allure. Is this mimicry our media's attempt to perpetuate 'non-communication' [...] A small body of work from both Native experimental and mainstream makers, of mostly video and some film, has broken through the wall of non-communication, but there are a great many more making work that could be made by any twenty to sixty-year old white guy/girl working with different philosophies (p. 122).

I argue it is consistent logic that individuals who are recovering from the generational effects of the collective trauma that Abadian (2006) names, will be creating work within Western philosophies thus mimicking Western ways of constructing stories because they have not yet reclaimed their Indigenous ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening." Some may argue that there are

Indigenous filmmakers who choose to work within the Western forms of storytelling thereby creating work for First World cinema. While all filmmakers must be afforded their creative freedom; I speculate this choice would be directly related to economic circumstances.

Further in Todd's exploration she quotes Chris Eyre (Cheyenne-Arapaho), the director of *Smoke Signals* (1998), the first feature film to be directed and written by Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island as saying, "Film is a language that you watch – you expect an establishing shot, and then a medium shot, and close-ups, reverses and inserts. There are conventions, and a true Indian movie wouldn't have the same conventions" (Eyre cited in Todd, 2005, p. 108). A formal analysis comparing western film conventions and Indigenous film practices deserves a dedicated study. However, it is important to note Raheja's (Seneca) (2007) comment in her analysis of Kunuk's 2001 film, *Atanarjuat (The Fast Runner).*

> The filmmakers' refusal to edit the film to a more conventional length and to 'subject' the audiences to seemingly interminable long shots of people walking or running on the snow and ice marks a visually sovereign practice. In a geographical site represented as terra nullius except for a few large mammals, the filmmakers' insistence upon peopling the land and demonstrating the Inuit's dependence on it is a means of asserting political and representational sovereignty (p. 1178).

However, if Indigenous filmmakers are to assert political and representational sovereignty as Raheja suggests the Inuit are, then Indigenous film and video makers must self examine what our film conventions might look like. In that way, Todd (2005) puts the onus back on Indigenous peoples,

> ...because Aboriginal governments have not supported the development of our own media; and because, as media makers, we have not lived up to the responsibilities that extend from generations of storytellers to both create something uniquely our own and insist on the management of our own cultural resources (p. 110).

Todd interrogates her own approach to filmmaking and makes some significant points when she asks,

> Imagine how my philosophy as a Cree and Métis woman filmmaker influences how I make images and meaning. How have Aboriginal filmmakers reflected meaning and their relationship to knowledge and even our state of being in our work? How do we imagine ourselves? (2005, p. 117)

In her exploration about how she brings meaning to her filmmaking and how she conducts herself as an Indigenous filmmaker she delves into her childhood. She says, "When I first started to watch film and television as a child, I was struck by the volume of sound. And the volume has only gotten louder. [...], there is seldom such a wall of constant sound present in daily life as there is when one is watching a film or television" (2005, p. 120). Reflecting further on the wall of constant sound, Todd speaks about how "[a]ll cultures have their methods of teaching their people. She noticed how

> our old people try to get us to be attentive – attentive to one another, to the world around us [...]. Let's say that being attentive is in contrast to a culture of noise. And let's say attentiveness reflects a principle connected to how Aboriginal people come to knowledge. Attentiveness is also directly related to our institutions of governance: oral tradition requires precision of knowledge combined with creative expression. And, I would say that attentiveness refers to our senses as well as our minds (pp. 120-121).

Todd's (2005) concept of 'attentiveness' is drawn directly from her life experience within her Cree-Métis culture that she implies has a different way of listening "to a culture of noise." And, she says that "our attentiveness could play itself out in a number of ways in the production of our media" (p. 121).

> As a filmmaker, I imagine how attentiveness looks and sounds in my work, how it serves in the narrative of the story, how it engages and energizes the story, and how I use it in the process of making the film. Without making a prescription for Aboriginal aesthetic, attentiveness would seem to serve as one link in Aboriginal aesthetic (p. 121).

Similarly, Barclay (Maori) (1990) refers to another way of being when discussing character qualities of a Maori filmmaker. He says,

> To be any sort of Maori, you have to be a listener. You do not interrupt a person who is talking, no matter how humble that person may be – the rules about that are quite firm when formal talk is in progress. But a similar spirit is maintained even at informal occasions, such as a meal among relations, or chatting over a beer at a hotel (p. 14).

He compares this to the approach of the settler peoples when he says,

> The liveliness of Pakeha groups, on the other hand, seems based on thrusting yourself forward, of butting in to keep the conversation sparkling, or going one better. Often enough a speaker will not even get an opportunity to finish a sentence. [...], but it is alien to Maori ways of exchanging thoughts (p. 14).

I argue that Barclay's discussion of *listening* is similar to Todd's concept of *attentiveness* because they are both referring to different aspects of sound. Furthermore, I argue that what Todd (2005) is discussing in the concepts of attentiveness and full mindedness is a part of our culturally specific way of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening." She says, "Attentiveness also plays itself out in an understanding of the audience and even in the filmmaker's awareness of herself." There must be, "'full-mindedness' – the fusion of the 'mind and heart,' intellect and intuition,' and spirit and body'. The attentive filmmaker makes sure that the viewer, the actors, the people in the documentary must be engaged in their full-mindedness (p. 121). It is critical to observe that without the cultural context, the concepts that Todd refers to may be reduced to the simplistic binaries of: noise and silence, activity and stillness or active and passive.

Barclay and Todd's discussion is just the beginning of much needed "talking in" session(s) for Indigenous film and video makers to elaborate on what actually constitutes Indigenous specific filmmaking practices and aesthetics. When Todd says, "[...] we have not lived up to the responsibilities that extend from generations of storytellers [...]" (2005, p. 110), this opens up the whole issue of accountability that some Indigenous film and video makers feel towards

their families, clans, tribes or Nations. The accountability factor causes tensions in the cultural interface for Indigenous film and video makers because when they are receiving funding support from the larger society the funding criteria is only accountable to the needs of the broadcasters and not the Indigenous communities they are filming.

Indigenizing the Pre-Production Process: Funding

Funding for any film project is what determines whether or not it ever reaches the broadcaster for dissemination to television screens or if it is picked up by distributors for theatrical release for audiences. Barclay (1990) discusses some of the tensions he has experienced in the funding arena because of value differences.

> It is as if you have to prove to the majority culture that your project will be genuinely Maori (in the eyes of the majority culture) before you can gain [financial] support to make a Maori film. […] A Maori film might be very violent, or frivolous. Maori films might deal with incest, robbery, or love under the apple tree – who is to say? A Maori film might have nothing whatsoever to do with what both Maori and Pakeha are pleased to think of as 'the Maori style of life' – communal attitudes, a respect for elders, a love of the land (p. 20).

Ideological differences inevitably lead to tensions in the production process because investors ultimately want creative control as one of the conditions of their funding. A successful example in the cultural interface that Barclay (1990) gives is when the Maori negotiated with New Zealand Television (NZTV) for three hours of Maori drama. Phase one was winning the political battle to have the three hours, Phase two was circumventing the conventional practice of the second payment being contingent upon a "satisfactory script and production packages," and "Phase three was concerned with setting up a Maori trust under Maori control" whereas NZTV and the New Zealand Film Commission (NZFC) would have "no right to ask what projects the money was being allocated to" (pp. 63-64). In essence, the Maori protected their right to tell their stories their way.

Another aspect of the pre-production process where Barclay (1990) encountered differences in value systems arose in the actual funding breakdown of a project. This has a direct impact on the shooting schedule. Barclay gives an example of one "50-minute documentary (Te Urewera) [that he directed] for NZTV as part of their series on national parks. Five weeks' of shooting per programme was budgeted for, and two weeks' pre-production was allocated to each program" (1990, p. 10). He goes on to say,

> I asked for six weeks' pre-production for my programme, as I wished our team to spend time with the old people explain the import of the programme and getting their commitment. Having got that commitment, I felt we would then have the whole community behind us and would be able to shoot the programme very efficiently. As a trade off, I guaranteed to shoot the programme in three weeks, rather than five. We actually shot the programme in twelve days (pp. 10-11).

Through the negotiations to invert the budgeting allocations and the pre-production and production scheduling, he demonstrates how important it is to take the time to build a respectful relationship where there is trust with the Indigenous community because in the end, the programme he directed "included material that has almost never been recorded on film among the Tuhoe people before" (p. 11).

Barclay's documentary with the Tuhoe peoples is a good illustration of how his approach in honouring the Indigenous ways of "doing" is critical because some of the *meta-narratives (the hidden stories)* of the collectively traumatized Indigenous peoples get told while reflecting their contemporary realities. He discusses some of the difficulties he negotiated in collecting the "priceless footage" from the Tuhoe peoples who he likens to the bushmen of the Kalahari desert and who historically do not speak to anyone on camera. However, he was allowed to film their traditional rituals, hunting and cooking methods, all while speaking in their dialect because he made agreements with them (1990, pp. 85-91). One of Barclay's agreements was to return copies of what was recorded to the Tuhoe peoples. Of that experience, he says,

Over the next few days we delivered tapes to all the elders who had taken part in the filming. Handing those tapes across one by one to each elder became some of the most special moments I have ever had in film-making. Part of it was knowing I was keeping the trust ("that fella didn't turn out to be a liar after all") and part of it was seeing the pride in those old people's eyes [...], they were holding their own image in their own hands. I told them that only one copy had been made of the material. Nobody – not the marae committee, not the university, not the Queen of England – could get a copy without their permission (1990, p. 93).

Barclay is a strong proponent of Indigenous peoples maintaining their intellectual property rights. In 2005, his book, *Manatuturu: Maori treasures & intellectual property rights* was published*;* however, this very dense and complicated domain requires more than a chapter to address. But, knowing that he wrote the book may give us insight into the strong stance Barclay takes on the guardianship of Maori culture, including the portrayal of Maori in scripts written for the visual narrative. Maori storytelling is one of many Indigenous storytelling styles; however, there are some basic elements that most Indigenous peoples share because of shared operating principles derived from their systems of knowledge.

Indigenizing the Script for Fourth World Cinema

In order to understand the diverse storytelling styles, it is necessary to understand the stories, metaphors, iconography, and sounds of each unique Indigenous culture. Jordon Wheeler (Cree, Ojibwa, Assiniboine, Irish, English, Scottish), who is a television story editor/writer, has written for series television in Canada (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's (CBC's) *North of 60* and renegadepress.com television series).[51] Wheeler explains one of the primary metaphors that shapes Indigenous story form when he says,

We have our own archetypes; for example the western model uses the good and evil metaphor with God and Satan iconography. Indigenous peoples have their trickster figures (Coyote, Raven, Wesakejak which contain both "good and evil" within one being which informs the storytelling. Hence, the "conflict" is within the

117

character, rather than without. (Wheeler cited in Bear and Jones, 2008).

Barclay (1990) agrees with Wheeler in that the western way of imagining characters becomes an obstacle for Indigenous filmmakers to overcome, and he says that the "roots of the foreign script run very deep" (p. 48). And, it is not just character development that is troublesome from an Indigenous perspective because, as Barclay says, "[the first verse in the] book of Genesis gives human beings the right to "have dominion over" everything else on the earth thereby negating the inter-relatedness of all things which is a cornerstone approach of Indigenous philosophy (1990, p. 48). More importantly, Barclay (1990) identifies why this fundamental Christian way of thinking is so offensive to Maori. He says,

> If a script based on that principle were submitted to a Maori panel, it is likely it would be rejected straight off because, from a Maori point of view, the command is fascist; [...] it represents a blank cheque for screwing the earth for human purposes. It may be a good directive for the human race, but where does it leave the forest and the fish? Maori thinking over the centuries has never been that way, is not now and, I hope never will be (p. 49).

Wheeler and Barclay's statements point to a fundamental difference in belief systems that uphold and create culturally specific metaphors and iconography that lead to definitive and nuanced differences in the script. These differences in ideology/worldview begin in the writing phase and have a domino effect because "scripting touches all aspects of production" (Barclay, 1990, p. 62). Writing scripts from an Indigenous perspective is the source of many political battles for Indigenous filmmakers, especially when their stories reveal the results of colonial violence or if they are too financially viable. The film, *Once Were Warriors* (1994) directed by Maori director Lee Tamihori, is one example.[52]

For a period of ten years after "the unprecedented success of *Once Were Warriors (1994)*, the most successful local film at the box office ever" (Barclay, 2003, p. 14), mainstream funders in Aoetearoa (New Zealand) refused to fund the scripts written by Barclay (2003) and his colleagues. He explains,

The first humiliation has been watching the white film establishment make imitative Maori films: two badboy features featuring Maori, *What became of the Broken Hearted? (1999)* And *Crooked Earth (2001)*; and recently, a feel good film featuring Maori, *Whale Rider (2002)*…The second humiliation has been to see Maori, especially younger Maori seduced, frog-marched or tricked into First Cinema (p. 14).

Barclay (2003) gives three examples of *seduction* in the twelve months prior to his 2003 lecture. The first involves a successful Maori playwright who, because she is inexperienced, turns to the Film Commission who directs her to a non-Maori producer rather than making an effort to find a Maori producer (p. 14).

[The non-Maori producer is] a sympathetic enough producer but one with no knowledge of the Maori world and one who, it turns out, is puzzled anyway by her mysterious screenplay. And they find this young Maori woman as well a non-Maori director, another woman, talented, it's said, but a novice. It's not as if they have lined up a top notch non-Maori director. No – a novice. And we have novice talent aplenty in our own ranks. Now the pressure is on to make the film conform to the international norms, to convert the film to First Cinema (p. 15).

The second incident involves a "very promising Maori director who has won awards in short drama, including at Cannes;" however, Barclay (2003) says that the young director

will soon enough be making a First Cinema film with a non-Maori producer and a non-Maori writer – and what else can he do because he can see as well as any of us that the Film Commission does not fund Maori films. This is state money, millions of dollars – it goes only to whites (p. 15).

The third situation involves "two Maori writers who have been sent to a script writing course in Amsterdam, both with scripts they've written themselves, both of which look likely going to non-Maori producers and directors further down the track" (2003, p. 15). He says, "I know one of the scripts well. Its structure is similar to *Ngati* [1985] – communal, no heroes – and it could have gone into production immediately" (2003, p. 15). However, the

scripts are in Amsterdam being 'improved', the Film Commission has funded the two Maori writers to travel over there for six months, and now there is only one way these scripts will go: individual storylines will be strengthened, personal journeys will be enriched and heightened, and wily-nily the scripts will move out of the Indigenous space into First Cinema (2003, p. 15).

The counter strategy of Barclay (2003) and his colleagues was to take control of "the project development phase" by negotiating with the NZFC to set up a "Maori Development Committee within the Film Commission" that they named *Mana Maori Paepae,* where they would determine "what scripts should be selected, how they were to be assessed, how they were to be taken forward, and how, of course, they might be made into first class films and then distributed". They would have "sufficient funds to make one Maori film a year" (p. 18). This body would function within the principles of the marae where the paepae has a distinct function. Barclay (2003) explains,

> The paepae is the meeting place in front of the meeting house. It is the open space where the keepers of the paepae – the home people – welcome strangers with challenge, oratory and song. As I indicated much earlier in this talk, these processes of challenge and welcome are sacred processes involving the 'raising of the dead and even of the gods', where the orator is charged with the task of 'directly communicating with the dead.' The paepae is a place of 'te ao Maoro' par excellence. Suddenly, in the renaming, the development committee is lifted into another world altogether. Here another set of rules apply, or additional rules, or prior rules. They are being applied to the practice of cinema (p. 18).

He further explains that entering the area of the paepae is not to be taken lightly. "You come with all the forces you can muster to your side. You don't come as a loner, an individual, an egotist. Coming with you, seen or unseen, are all those parts of the Maori world you are the visible part of [...]" (p. 18). Once again, the collective values of Indigenous peoples take precedence over the individualistic approach of Western ideology. Barclay (2003) explains the paepae would accept a "first draft feature film screenplay" as a gift, and he elaborates, "the keepers of the paepae are not seeing simply little old insignificant you: they

are seeing all that you bring with you in your person and in your gift" (2003, p. 18). Furthermore, he explains,

> Our intention is that there will be a karakia for each script submitted to the paepae. Karakia means prayer; a process which brings something into tea o Maori. This act of prayer will, we hope, mean that the Maori writer and director who are submitting the work will have satisfaction in seeing their work and what is represented within its pages received with respect and love into the Maori world, the satisfaction of knowing that it will be seen there by other Maori and be acknowledged by them as a treasure in its own right, even if it turns out finally that their script is not one of those chosen to go into production that year (2003, p. 18).

Again, this represents another significant ideological difference in the Indigenous worldview. The Maori approach begins the process with a prayer which I argue is misunderstood by many Western thinkers because they assume prayer has the same meaning and function as a Christian prayer. To qualify this statement, it is incumbent upon me to clarify that there are many Christian denominations and I do not pretend to know how they all pray; however, what I have observed throughout my life, is that prayer appears to be reserved, for one day a week, only on Sunday and directed to an anthropomorphic God.

From an Indigenous perspective, it is understandable that the process in the paepae would begin with a prayer because spirituality is integral to every aspect of life; that is, it is a way of life where there is a mutuality of relationship with both human and non-human beings, rather than a one day a week affair among beings that all look human. As Hopi filmmaker Masayesva asserts, "there is such a thing as an Indian aesthetic, and it begins in the sacred" (Masayesva cited in Leuthold, 1998, p. 1). Syilx-Okanagan writer, Armstrong, shared a similar observation, stating that "It is not drama because, at its roots, it is a prayer" (Armstrong cited in Anderson, 1997, p. 55-56).

Barclay (2003) goes on to explain the fullness of the approach of how the Maori would manage the scripts, when he says,

> Once handed over, it becomes incumbent on the keepers of the paepae to treat all submitted work with respect. Once it has been

welcomed onto the paepae, welcomed into *te ao Maori*, we must all put our arms around that project and do our utmost to find ways to make sure it is achieved to the best of our collective ability. It could be that the director of a project has not had sufficient big crew experience to handle parts of the production confidently; well, why not fund the director to go to New York for three months to work as an observer of a major feature production, if that's what's called for? (pp. 18-19).

Clearly, Barclay and his colleagues have formulated a Maori specific approach to scriptwriting for Fourth World Cinema that would work in theory; however, follow up research is necessary to determine whether or not the *Mana Maori Paepae* meets the needs of the Maori film community. Furthermore, the scope of this thesis only allows for examining Barclay's approach to the pre-production process (funding and scripting) of filmmaking; however, his writings include detailed explanations of his approaches to the "slating techniques," "camera techniques," and "sound techniques," that he has used in his production process when working with Maori peoples. He also applies Maori concepts to the distribution process which is different than the western approach of film distribution (1990, pp. 15-19). Barclay and his colleagues went so far as to begin a discussion of renaming in their language the credits of the film — that is the roles that are taken for granted in filmmaking process. For instance, Barclay (2003) suggests renaming the role of "Director" to that of "Lead Carver," as this description is one which

comes closest to how I feel when directing in the Maori world is that of lead carver. Traditionally, such a specialist was invited into the community by the community. Such a specialist worked on major works – a carved meeting house, let's say – for the community. The stories he would be expected to carve into the carvings would be the stories embedded in the soil of that area itself, in the collective memory of the people of that area. The community would expect the lead carver to direct his team of carvers firmly. To inspire them to do work of excellence and power. To be both traditional and innovative (2003, p. 6).

Barry Barclay has inspired many by upholding the traditions of his Maori culture while being an innovative thinker and filmmaker. It is the responsibility of

each film and video maker to determine how they will incorporate the valuable teachings he has left us with. Clearly, each one of these areas of production deserves a dedicated chapter to explore the complexities of adapting and modifying each part of the filmmaking process in order to provide an in-depth analysis. Barclay's philosophical approach, actions, and operating principles are congruent with what Young-Ing (2005) states:

> Indigenous peoples have adapted into their various unique and distinct contemporary forms by adhering to two important cautionary principles: 1) that incorporating new ways of doing things should be carefully considered in consultation with elders, traditional people, and community; and 2) if it is determined that a new technology or institution goes against fundamental cultural values and/or might lead to negative cultural impact, then it should not be adopted. These principles exist, in one variation or another, in most Indigenous groups dating back to ancient times (pp. 183-184).

As a Secwepemc-Syilx film producer, director and writer, I have had to navigate the cultural interface by finding ways to re-inscribe Indigenous knowledge into my creative process. To end the chapter, I will present an account of my experience with my first independent work, "*a spiritual land claim*" (2006), to illustrate different methods I used to transpose Indigenous knowledge into film production.

Much has been written about how Indigenous people deal with the concepts of space and time; however, very little is written about how we manage or work with sound. When I produced/directed and wrote my independent production, "*a spiritual land claim*," I consciously constructed the piece within my ways of "knowing," "seeing," "acting," "doing" and "hearing/listening". I had artistic freedom and was able to realize my original vision of the piece because I was funded by the Canada Council for the Arts and the BC Arts Council. I was not accountable to a broadcaster's mandate.

I used very little narrative (some poetic prose) because I was playing with how Indigenous peoples treat sound. When Indigenous peoples are together, there are many times when there are 'silences', no one is speaking but everyone is comfortable. The silences that are filled with an elusive something that I have observed make non-Indigenous

peoples uncomfortable. I was exploring the idea of "what's not being said here?" I purposefully chose two songs of the land, the "Lonesome Song" from the Secwepemc (Shuswap) and a "Love Song" from the Syilx (Okanagan). I wanted to convey a yearning feeling for the people and a deep love of the land. I mixed the sounds of piano, cello and violin to get away from the stereotypical Native flute that so many people associate with Indigenous film or video productions because after all, in this contemporary time Indigenous peoples listen to, and create all variations of music.

I experimented with the format by dramatizing two key events in the story. I used different actors to portray the many Indigenous peoples whose story was being told to thwart the notion of one protagonist. I started with classic documentary style by showing archival photos of my ancestors and closed with 'real life documentary' that did not end because the point I was making is that "the spirit of the people lives on".

My production was a conundrum for film festivals. Interestingly, the piece was accepted in a non-Indigenous film festival in Europe (UK) and an Indigenous film festival in Bolivia. And, it was rejected by the major Indigenous Film Festivals in North America, (the American Indian Film Festival in San Francisco, the Native American Film and Video Festival in New York, the ImagineNative Film Festival in Toronto and an Aboriginal Film Festival in Winnipeg. In Edmonton, it won the "Best Experimental" Award at the Dreamspeakers Film Festival in 2007.

Once I processed the initial rejections from the North American Indigenous film festivals, this response raised some questions for me: I wondered are our film festivals so entrenched in western filmmaking conventions and genre designations that they don't recognize an "Indigenous" approach when it is looking them right in the eye? I argue that there are many Indigenous film and video makers, artists, writers and scholars who, like me, are assuming control of their own visual representation by constructing Indigenous specific film elements, thus creating exciting visual narratives in this contemporary time. The critical distinction is that this work is from their "recovered"

124

Indigenous knowledge that informs how they see, act, hear/listen and do. We have gone beyond the "shooting back" phase of the 1970s and are no longer stuck in what I call the "glut of documentaries" of the 1980s and 1990s that we were all compelled to do. We are no longer reacting to, or responding to the pervasive colonial structures. We have moved into a domain of creating visual sovereignty through our culturally specific creative expressions that includes animation, dramatic shorts, science fiction and feature length movies. But I must acknowledge that our reality is that there are still many obstacles to claiming visual sovereignty in the cultural interface.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I looked at the significant roles of Indigenous writers and film and video makers in the cultural decolonization/cultural healing of their societies by applying Abadian's (2006) paradigm of toxic or reparative, post-traumatic narratives. I argued that the writers' model of a multiplicity of Indigenous literary forms, when juxtaposed with Roth's (2005) co-development model for communication, opens up new possibilities in cultural policies. However, while Roth's model recognizes that Indigenous peoples have "...their own cultural histories, knowledges and capacities" (p. 227), it is important for both Indigenous cultural producers and the civil servants and bureaucrats of the federal arts institutions to adapt and modify in the cultural interface for any meaningful change to occur. The reality is that Western systems of knowledge still dominate the arts institutions and the media in Canada. I looked at Barclay's (1990, 1999, 2003, 2003a, 2005) and Todd's (2005) discussion of Indigenous knowledge(s) and how they drew on this knowledge(s) to develop codes of conduct in the contemporary filmmaking process. I specifically examined Barclay's indigenizing of the pre-production process, which is the funding and scripting of films. I concluded with reflections of my own work, relating it to what Indigenous writers and Barclay identify as culturally specific storytelling styles.

Clearly, further research is required to flesh out Barclay's unique Maori approach to all phases of the filmmaking process to determine Indigenous-specific criteria for Indigenous film genres and to elaborate on the elements of

Indigenous aesthetics for the visual narratives in Fourth World Cinema. Every aspect of Indigenous filmmaking needs to be researched and developed. The challenge for Indigenous film and video makers is to gain acceptance and recognition of Indigenous specific ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening" from the funding bodies and the national arts institutions so that they may produce films with cultural integrity.

My argument is that when Indigenous filmmakers are able to truly exercise creative freedom that incorporate their Indigenous norms of social conduct, which govern such qualities as 'attentiveness', 'full mindedness' and being a good listener, as part of what Barclay (1990) says is "the challenge of how to respect the age-old process of discussion and decision-making while using the technology" (p.9) — then we will be able to have a clearer idea of what is entailed in creating Indigenous-specific film conventions and Indigenous specific parameters for the films we create for Fourth World Cinema. Furthermore, I argue that when filmmakers pay heed to these culturally specific codes of conduct and respect the "age-old process of discussion and decision-making," then they are reflected in all aspects of the production process, including the aesthetics of Indigenous people's films. However, there are numerous Western processes and structures for Indigenous peoples to 'adapt and modify' to accommodate their culturally specific ways of "seeing," "doing," "acting" and "listening" before this can be realized.

Barclay (1990) emphasizes the differences in approach to talking and listening by noting how the dominant society film industry does not like "talking heads" while in a "Maori community, at every level, those moments of talk are regarded as the most precious of jewels" (p. 15). I argue the difference in approach to talking and listening goes back to one of the fundamental understandings in Indigenous cultures that the interactions of human to human and humans to non-humans is a sacred process. Although, Barclay does not discuss how this difference is reflected in the overall aesthetic of Indigenous films, I postulate that this fundamental cultural difference is one of the factors that contributes to the difference in rhythms and aesthetics of any Indigenous film.

126

Conclusion

Closing the Meeting

At the beginning of this thesis, I invited readers into an imaginary traditional winter home of my home community Splats'in (Secwepemc) to discuss important issues surrounding Indigenous film production. I explained that the purpose is to explore what is "indigenous" in the multifaceted process of Indigenous film and video making in a complex global world.

At the end of a traditional meeting, the family/person who has called the meeting or her appointed speaker is expected to summarize the salient points of the discussion by restating the original question, reiterating any points brought forward for discussion, and acknowledging any new thinking that arose during the meeting that may influence the issue at hand. Then, any collective decisions that were made and any follow up actions with assigned responsible person(s) are publicly stated.

Most importantly, the host expresses gratitude to all the guests in attendance and the spirits/ancestors who have presided over the meeting. In that way I express my gratitude for the time you have taken to read this thesis, and I look forward to further discussions. At the end of the gathering, the eldest Elder is invited to say a closing prayer while a community or family member goes around the circle with the abalone shell burning medicines. The host feeds all the visitors at a community feast.

However, because this is an imaginary meeting, I have adapted and modified the traditional way of meeting to adhere to academic protocols. This written conclusion will reflect on the implications this research has in the political, cultural, and economic domains for Indigenous peoples, including film and video makers. Also, we will look at how the ideas and *new knowledge* in this thesis may have broader implications in the international and national policy

relationships between Indigenous peoples and the nation-states they live within.

The Contemporary Reality

For Indigenous peoples who live in the imposed borders of what is geo-politically known as Canada, there is an unsettling relationship with this so-called developed nation-state whose head of state makes contradictory and embarrassing statements in the international and national spheres. On the one hand, Prime Minister Stephen Harper claims "We also have no history of colonialism" at an international economic meeting of the G20 (the Group of 20) held in Pittsburgh in September 2009.[53] And, the Conservative Party of Canada, under the leadership of P.M. S. Harper, continually refuses to sign the international *Declaration of Indigenous Rights* at the United Nations Permanent Forum for Indigenous Peoples. Yet, on the other hand, at the national level, Harper made a public apology in June 2008 to Indigenous residential school survivors in Canada, the people who survived the onslaught of the physical, sexual, emotional and spiritual abuse caused by the policies of preceding governments that removed Indigenous children from their families and cultures with the intent of "kill[ing] the Indian in the child."[54] At least two bloggers, Harsha Walia[55] at the *Vancouver Sun*'s Community of Interest website and Derrick O'Keefe[56] at www.rabble.ca have addressed the discrepancies of Harpers' government. Some Indigenous people would say this is a classical example of how the "white man speaks with forked tongue" of the current Canadian Conservative Government led by Stephen Harper as Prime Minister.

Moreover, Canada's contradictory and schizophrenic international diplomacy was also evident at the February 2010, 21st Winter Olympics in Richmond, Whistler and Vancouver, BC where the Vancouver Organizing Committee (VANOC) presented an incredibly beautiful spectacle that included the "very visible" Indigenous Chiefs of the Four Host Nations, at the February 22, 2010 Opening Ceremonies.[57] However, the trade-off is that the international VANOC exploited other Indigenous cultures by appropriating the Inuit Inukshuk design and the West Coast Cowichan sweater designs for the sole profits of the

Olympics. The Inukshuk, an iconic Inuit symbol, was selected to be the logo for the Olympics but it was designed by two non-Inuit graphic artists who no doubt received a substantial fee.[58] The classic Cowichan sweater designs were bastardized by the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) (now an American owned company), and were the official clothing designer for the 2010 Olympics.[59]

Although the issue of cultural appropriation may be unclear to non-Indigenous peoples and there may be misunderstandings as to why the Inuit or the Cowichan peoples (and other Indigenous groups) may be disturbed by the choices made by VANOC, for Indigenous peoples, it is very clear that these political decisions are a continuation of colonial and corporate interests once again superseding Indigenous interests. The Hudson's Bay Company (HBC), the original trading company that exploited many, many Indigenous peoples during first contact is still economically benefiting on the backs of Indigenous peoples. The fact that the HBC is a part of continuing the colonial narrative is not a surprise.

Clearly, the issues raised by the Indigenous writers who decried the cultural appropriation of their Indigenous knowledge(s) (stories, songs, and images) and the call from non-Indigenous scholars for ethical behaviour, have not reached the ethical guidelines of the best business practices of the HBC. Certainly, an Inuit artist and the knitters of the Cowichan sweaters would have appreciated the small income the royalties of their licensed designs would have brought.

Given this current reality of the cultural, political, and economic environments in the globalization process for Indigenous peoples in Canada, it is evident that the colonial narrative still dominates how Indigenous peoples are visually represented. Nakata's (2002, 2007) *cultural interface* and *Indigenous standpoint* theories, as well as many other contemporary developments in Indigenous knowledge, are still not recognized by most scholars in the academy or by many mainstream media outlets. At the same time as my thesis makes this explicit, it is important to recognize that there is a small number of Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars throughout the globe who are clearly in the cultural

interface and giving credence to, as well as making innovations in Indigenous knowledge(s) while they decolonize the discourse. The following sections are reflections on specific areas of discussion in the thesis.

Synthesis of Ideas

The naming and locating of Indigenous peoples is still a critical issue and many do not understand "the diversity within the diversity;" that is, that there are unique Indigenous cultures within the multi-racial/multi-cultural/multi-ethnic settler groups of Canada's political and social landscape. Therefore, there are a number of approaches to social, political, cultural and spiritual issues. This thesis is only one — a Secwepemc-Syilx woman's perspective — of the many approaches to Indigeneity, Indigenous representation and film and video production. My choice to work in an integrated way with my "dream/spirit," "storyteller/body," "scholar/mind" and "heart" voices is my way of expressing my contemporary decolonized, culturally healed perspective. This choice removes the historical silencing and marginalizing that the western academic framework imposes on the holistic Indigenous approach.

I acknowledge that my production experience is limited to television documentaries and experimental film and does not include any experience in feature film production; however, my on-the-ground experience in Indigenous media and overall experience in many areas of production and dissemination still contributes valuable information to the discourse on Indigenous film and video production.

With scholars such as Sousan Abadian (2006), Jo-ann Archibald (2008), Jeannette Armstrong (1997 in Anderson), Barry Barclay (1990, 1999, 2003a, 2003b, 2005), Steven Leuthold (1998), Randolph Lewis (2006), Jane Mills (2009), Stuart Murray (2008), Martin Nakata (1997, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008), Michelle Raheja (2007), Lorna Roth (2005), Michelle Stewart (2008), Loretta Todd (2005), Linda Tuhiwai-Smith (2002), Pamela Wilson (2008) and Greg Young-Ing (1993, 1995, 2005), I conclude that it is possible for Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars to work together or in a parallel process in what

130

Nakata's theorizes from an "Indigenous standpoint" as a "cultural interface". This interface is critical because it makes room for new knowledge to be brought to the discourse without being paralyzed in the usual oppositional binaries that inevitably leads to a counter-productive argument that only re-entrenches the status quo of the colonial relationship. It is apparent that many Indigenous peoples consider themselves outside what Barclay calls "the national orthodoxy" of the nation-states they live within; however, the leadership and some of the bureaucrats and civil servants who sit in positions of power in the settler government, refuse to acknowledge the a priori place of the original peoples. In the face of rigid hierarchies and contemporary forms of colonization, Indigenous peoples need to continue to assert their self-determination and self-identification.

The work of Jo-ann Archibald (2008), Barry Barclay (1990, 1999, 2003a, 2003b, 2005), Martin Nakata (1997 1998, 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008), Linda Tuhiwai-Smith (2002) and the Indigenous writers are essential to this thesis in contextualizing the cultural healing and cultural decolonization for Indigenous peoples. Their challenge to Western systems of knowledge and their call to acknowledge and recognize Indigenous systems of knowledge(s) are unmistakably a foundation for scholars who seek to bring new knowledge from the Indigenous perspective to the cultural interface.

In the extensive introduction of the book, *Global Indigenous Media: cultures, poetics, and politics* (2008), Michelle Stewart and Pamela Wilson discuss the layers of political, social and cultural complexities that Indigenous peoples encounter in their own media representations. They bring Indigenous voices from groups that have not been heard previously. Some of the indigenous peoples they represented in their book live within the national boundaries of the geo-political nation-states of Burma-Thailand, China, Russia, the Scandinavian countries (Sami), Columbia, South America, Latin America, Mexico (Zapatistas), Aoetearoa (New Zealand), and Wales. The stories of each group are unique to their experience; however, they share the common experience of generations of colonial incursions and the associated traumas to individuals, families, communities and Nations.

With Sousan Abadian's (2008) paradigm of toxic or reparative, *post-traumatic narratives*, Indigenous peoples are able to tell some of their meta-narratives, the stories beneath the stories. Many Indigenous narratives are outside the nation-state's representation of who Indigenous peoples are, and how their cultures give meaning to their contemporary lives. Certainly, the challenge for Indigenous peoples in the era of globalization is to become clear on whether or not they want to strive to embrace and embody the values and codes of conduct derived from their Indigenous knowledge(s). For example, how will Indigenous leadership name and locate themselves as they meet the multinationals at the front lines of the cultural interface? Will they develop effective strategies for their impoverished collective communities, yet maintain cultural integrity when dealing with governments and businesses whose primary interest lies in what aspects of the Indigenous cultures they can profit from? What narratives will they create for their communities? As Abadian (2006) states, the stories we tell *about ourselves* and *to ourselves* are a major component of what will transform the devastation of the centuries of colonization, to bring a cultural healing and cultural decolonization (p. 9).

Another important scholar, Arjun Appadurai (1990) offers a framework and in-depth analysis of the global economy that is critical to the contemporary development of global Indigenous media. For the exploration of what *indigeneity* means to the aesthetics of the film and video works of Indigenous peoples, I drew extensively on Arjun Appadurai's presentation on the "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" (1990).

Although this paper is over twenty years old, his analysis is important for a number of reasons as he illustrates the complexities of the many intersections within the globalization process; that is, the economic, the cultural, and the political domains (Appadurai, 1990). His framework to explore how the different aspects of culture, media, technical, finances, and ideas flow between and amongst each domain in a global context is invaluable. One critical point is that his theoretical framework transforms the centre-periphery model and liberates Indigenous peoples from their historical marginalized position. Another important

point, for my thesis is the omission of Indigenous peoples in his analysis, particularly in his discussion regarding territories within nation-states. In his use of the word *indigenous* Appadurai applies the meaning of *localizing* rather than referring to the original peoples within the nation-states of globalization. Because Appadurai is a significant, thoughtful scholar whose work is well respected and applied by many international scholars, it is important to examine how his work ends ups excluding Indigenous peoples so those who use his work in the future can develop and improve upon what he has written.

Faye Ginsburg (1994, 2002, 2003), Lorna Roth (2005) and Stuart Murray (2008) are other non-Indigenous scholars whose works are critical when discussing Indigenous media because they have been engaged in the cultural interface with Indigenous peoples for a significant period of time and have important insights into the historical development of Indigenous media.

For global Indigenous film and video makers, I argue that we have been "bending the technology" (Barclay, 1990) since the 1970s to suit our cultural needs and the digital technology has allowed for greater access, thus the creative explosion in *Indian country*. Furthermore, Indigenous film and video makers have been consciously and unconsciously creating a body of Indigenous film, video and new media works, for Fourth World Cinema. As Barclay points out, this body of work will always be small compared to the work produced for the mainstream's screen cultures. However, I conclude that we have a substantial body of work that can be deconstructed and discussed so that we may begin formulating what the elements, signifiers and genres are for Indigenous film and video work.

Also, for Indigenous cultural producers, we have many challenges in the cultural interface while we are creating our post-traumatic narratives. This research raises more questions than answers. Jo-ann Archibald's (2008) development of Barnhardt and Kirkness' four operating principles — respect, responsibility, reciprocity and reverence — into her story work presents a framework that forces us to ask ourselves: How congruent are we being within our cultural codes of conduct? How do we avoid what Loretta Todd (2005)

identifies as mimicry? When Abadian (2006) says, "cultural renewal can be as dangerous as it can be rehabilitative," it is important to heed that "toxic cultural renewal is an outcome of toxic collective narratives" and there are a number of post-traumatic narratives that can be "disempowering, falsely empowering, or deeply pessimistic" (p. 8, p. 15). Thus, we must urgently ask ourselves whether or not our stories are truly reparative narratives. The issue that Barclay (2003) raises about the seduction of our young, developing film and video makers is a crucial one because if we lose that generation of cultural producers to First Cinema, then what does that mean to Fourth World Cinema?

As we apply some of Barclay's philosophical discussions from his books and lectures, it is important to note that when comparing Maori peoples to the diverse number of Indigenous Nations on Turtle Island, there is a major difference that needs to be acknowledged. My understanding from Barclay's books and lectures is that Maori are a homogenous, Indigenous group, whose fundamental worldview is the same, with their traditions and practices adapted to specific regions and with the same basic language with regionally specific dialects. Compare that to over six hundred so-called Indian Bands who live within the geo-political boundaries of the nation-state of Canada, with fifty different languages within eleven language groupings, and then it is clear how complex research into global Indigenous issues is.[60,61]

Broader Implications: What's Next?

The findings in this research are important because a Indigenous theoretical analysis combined with field production experience is rarely found in academic studies. This work reveals many areas that require further research, some of which are as follows: to define the parameters of Fourth World Cinema, to define Indigenous film genres, to explore the signifiers that encode/decode Indigenous film/video works, to explore the syntax of language in terms of how that affects the rhythms (soundscapes) of Indigenous film/video works.

Two questions arise from this research. First, are the policy makers in the cultural arts institutions prepared to recognize the "diversity within the diversity"

and give credence to the many Indigenous systems of knowledge(s), as demonstrated by Lorna Roth's (2005) theoretical co-development model? Are policy makers prepared to go beyond the oh-so polite Canadian collaborations and the masked racism of diversity policies to become functional dance partners in the cultural interface? Second, there is an important question for the academy: how many non-Indigenous scholars will meet the Indigenous scholars in Nakata's (2002) cultural interface to finally diminish the age-old colonial relationship which continues to perpetuate narratives that victimize Indigenous peoples? While this might seem an odd way to end the thesis, by asking what non-Indigenous scholars will do, it is important for me as an Indigenous scholar to turn the gaze back on where institutional power exists, even as I claim my own voice within that larger conversation.

[September 2009] I dreamt I was riding a horse; we were going through really thick brush. I was on my way to meet someone important. There was an urgency to get to our meeting place. I was riding bareback, totally at one with my horse. I could feel his nervousness, his muscles were taut and he was skittish. We were both sweating as we kept climbing uphill through thick bush. I was ducking and pushing branches aside as we climbed up the mountain side. The horse's nostrils were flaring. He was very nervous. Finally we reach our destination. I jump off the horse and run up to the door of the cabin which was built into the hillside. The horse is still skittish. As I am knocking on the door, I look down and see a beautiful sleek tawny coloured cougar just ambling along on the forest floor. My spirit is relieved and really happy to see her. The horse calms down.

[April 2010] When I had this dream at the beginning of the academic year, I knew I had an uphill climb to finish this thesis but I always knew I would reach the destination. More importantly, I knew my spirit guides were with me, every step of the way!

Appendix A
Synopses of Barb Cranmer's Documentaries

1. *Laxwesa Wa: Strength of the River* (1995) *had eleven characters from the three communities of Namgis, Stolo and Bella Bella. The story focuses on how encroachment has affected their food gathering practices and how it has eroded their fishing rights. A strong point made is how the government regulations have moved them from self determining independent peoples to a welfare dependent community. Running time: 54 minutes 14 seconds.*

2. *Qatuwas: People Gathering Together* (1997) *was a documenting of a historical revival of a major cultural practice of coming together through the coastal waterways of the Pacific Northwest coast by canoe. Twenty one communities from thirty First Nations were invited to participate -- numerous characters, many locations, many people's represented. The people from as far north as Alaska paddled six hundred miles south and communities from the coast of Washington state paddled two hundred miles north to all meet at the community of Bella Bella. There were thirty different voices that I recorded; however, this does not accurately reflect the production because there were other peoples who spoke who did not have a name key. Running time: 58 minutes 26 seconds.*

3. *T'lina: The Rendering of Wealth* (1999) *begins in the Big House with one family doing a memorial for their father who has passed on (the filmmaker's grandfather). His mask is danced in. There is a feast and potlatch go give away eulachon grease, a highly prized commodity in this region. Then the film takes the viewer to their communal 'special' place where they stay for the majority of the summer harvesting the prized eulachon and we see how the grease is made. Throughout the story, we hear seventeen community members speak about what this process means to them and why it is critical to their cultural survival. Running time: 50 minutes 21 seconds.*

4. *L'Tusto: To Rise Again (2000) is a story that begins with the Creation Story of the Namgis peoples which explains the importance of the Big House to this coastal culture. Then we see the iconic structure going up in flames. We learn that someone set the community gathering place on fire and he is sentenced to two years in prison for arson; however, we never learn why he burned the building down. The viewer watches the community rebuilding their Big House and twenty-three people tell the story of how important it is for them to be involved. At the end we see a*

never ending line of people coming to the Grand Opening, along with canoes full of people being welcomed at the shore. Running time: 54 minutes.

5. *Gwishalaayt: The Spirit Wraps Around You* (2001) is a story of one man and five women reclaiming the ancient art of Chilkat weaving. They represent communities of the Pacific Northwest coast in Whitehorse (Yukon), Alaska, Prince Rupert and Namgis (Alert Bay). There are six characters telling the story of Elders passing down the ancient knowledge to the younger generation and one of the women is teaching her daughter. Running time: 47 minutes.

Appendix B
Films Screened

Barclay, B. (Producer/Director/Writer). (1987). *Ngati* [Feature Film]. New
    Zealand.

Bear, J. & Jones, M. (Producers). (2008). *Storytellers in Motion* [Television series
    episode]. Canada. Urban Rez Productions.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. & Jacob, S. (Producers). Cranmer, B.
    (Director/Writer). (2000). *I'Tusto: To Rise Again*. [Documentary].
    Canada. The National Film Board of Canada.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. & Jacob, S. (Producers). Cranmer, B.
    (Director/Writer). (1999). *T'lina: The Rendering of Wealth.*
    [Documentary]. Canada. The National Film Board of Canada.

Cranmer, B. & Brown, F. & Johnson, G. (Producers). Cranmer, B.
    (Director/Writer). (1997). Qatuwas*: People Gathering Together*
    [Documentary]. Canada. The National Film Board of Canada.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. (Producers). Cranmer, B. (Director/Writer). (2001).
    Gwishalaayt: The Spirit Wraps Around You. [Documentary]. Canada.
    Nimpkish Wind Productions.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. (Producers). Cranmer, B. (Director/Writer). (1995).
    Laxwesa Wa: Strength of the River. [Documentary]. Canada. Nimpkish
    Wind Productions and the National Film Board of Canada.

Diamond, N. (Director/Writer). (2009). *Reel Injun.* [Feature Documentary].
    Canada. National Film Board of Canada.

Eberts, J. & Héroux, D. & Moore, B. (Executive Producers). Lantos, R. & Milliken,
    S. & Reichel, S. (Producers). Norlen, E. (Associate Producer). Beresford,
    B. (Director). Moore, B. (Writer). (1991). Black Robe. [Feature Film].
    Australia and Canada.

 Glass, A. (Director). (2004). *In Search of the Hamat'sa: A Tale of
    Headhunting.* [Documentary]. Canada. Program for Culture and Media,
    New York University.

Hager, B. (Producer/Director). (2005). *From Bella Coola to Berlin.* [Feature
    Documentary]. Canada. Aarrow Productions. In Association with
    Aboriginal Peoples Television Network.

Harris, E. (Producer/Director). (2008). Appaloosa. [Feature Film]. USA.

Landau, J. (Producer) & Cameron, J. (Director/Writer). (2009). *Avatar*

[Feature Film]. Canada: Fox Film Distributors.

Mita, M. (Producer/Director/Writer). (1983). *Mauri*. [Feature Film]. New Zealand.

Murray, S. & Procacci, D. & Menzies, B. & deHeer, R. & Ryan, J. (Producers).
    deHeer, R. & Djigirr, P. (Directors). deHeer, R. (Writer) (2006). *Ten
    Canoes* [Feature Film]. Australia.

Olin, C. (Producer/Director). (1983). *Box of Treasures*. [Documentary]. Canada.
    U'Mista Cultural Society.

Wheeler, D. (Director/Writer). (1975). *Potlatch: A Strict Law Bids Us Dance.*
    [Documentary]. Canada. U'Mista Cultural Society.

Bibliography

Aarrow Productions, & Aboriginal People's Television Network (Producers), & Hager, B. (Director). (2006). *From Bella Coola to Berlin.* [Video/DVD]. Canada.

Abadian, S. (2006). Cultural Healing: When Cultural Renewal is Reparative and When it is Toxic. *Healing our Spirits Worldwide Conference,* Edmonton, Alberta. 5-27.

Anderson, K. (1997). Reclaiming Native Space in Literature/Breaking New Ground: An interview with Armstrong, Jeannette. West Coast Line 31.2 (pp. 49-50-65). Canada:

Appadurai, A. (June 1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Theory, Culture and Society, Vol 7* (No. 2 and 3), 295-310. doi:10.1177/026327690007002017

Archibald, J., Pidgeon, M., & Hawkey, C. (2009). *Aboriginal transitions: Undergraduate to Graduate studies. AT: U2G phase 1 final report. Unpublished research report. University of Britsh Columbia. Figure 1 - communication modalities.*

Archibald, J. (2008). *Indigenous Storywork : Educating the Heart, Mind, Body,*
   and Spirit. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Australian Film Commission. (2007). *Dreaming in Motion : Celebrating Australia's*
   Indigenous Filmmakers. Sydney, NSW.: Australian Film Commission.

Barclay, B. (1999). *The Vibrant Shimmer. The Contemporary Pacific 11(2): 390-*
   413. Hawai'i.

Barclay, B. (July 2003). *Celebrating Fourth Cinema.* Illusions Magazine. New
   Zealand. 1-2-11.

Barclay, B. (1990). *Our Own Image.* Auckland, N.Z.: Longman Paul.

Barclay, B. (2005). *Mana tuturu : Maori Treasures and Intellectual Property*
   Rights. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Barry B. (2003). *Exploring Fourth Cinema.* Re-imagining Indigenous Cultures:
   The Pacific Islands for the National Endowment for the Humanities Summer
   Institute. Hawai'i.

Barnhardt, R., & Kirkness, V. (1991). *First Nations and Higher Education: The*
   Four R's – Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity, Responsibility. . Journal of
   American Indian Education, Vol. 30(No. 3), pp.1-15.

Beaucage, M. (2005). Aboriginal Voices: Entitlement Through Storytelling. In
   Hopkins, C. & Townsend, M. (Managing Editors). *Transference, Tradition,*

Technology: Native New Media - Exploring Visual and Digital culture (pp. 138-151). Canada: Walters Phillips Gallery; co-published with Indigenous Media Arts Group and Art Gallery of Hamilton.

Brooten, L. (2008). Media as our Mirror: Indigenous Media of Burma (Myanmar). In Wilson, Pamela and Stewart, Michelle (Ed.), *Global Indigenous Media: cultures, poetics and politics* (pp. 111 - 127). USA: Duke University Press.

Brown, J. N.& Sant, P. M. (Editors). (1999). *Indigeneity: Construction and Re-presentation.* Commack, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Buscombe, E. (2006). *'Injuns!' Native Americans in the movies.* UK: ReaktionBooks Ltd.

Christian, D. (Producer), & Christian, D. (Director). (2006). *"a spiritual land claim".* [Video/DVD] Canada: Moving Images.

Churchill, W. (1994). And They Did it Like Dogs in the Dirt....An American Indian Analysis of Black Robe. *Indians Are Us? Culture and Genocide in Native North America* (pp.115-137). USA: Between The Lines.

Conrich, I. & Murray, S. (2007). In Murray, Stuart and Conrich, Ian (Ed.), *New Zealand Filmmakers* Wayne State University Press.

Cook, P. & Bernink, M. (Editors). (1999). *The Cinema Book, 2nd edition* UK: British Film Institute Publishing.

Cook, P., Editor. (2007). In Cook P. (Ed.), *The Cinema Book (third edition)*. London: British Film Institute.

Cordova, A. & Salazar, J. (2008). Imperfect Media and the Poetics of Indigenous Video in Latin America. In Wilson, Pamela and Stewart, Michelle (Ed.), *Global Indigenous Media: cultures, poetics and politics* (First ed., pp. 39-57). USA: Duke University Press.

Crosby, M. (1991). Construction of the Imaginary Indian. In Stan Douglas (Ed.), (pp. 267-294) Canada. Talon Books.

Deloria, V., Jr. (1973). *God is Red.* New York, USA: Dell Publishing Company, Inc.

Deloria, V., Jr. (1969). *Custer Died For Your Sins : An Indian Manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.

Deloria, V. (1979). *The Metaphysics of Modern Existence* (1st--ed.). USA. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Deverell, R. S. (Producer), & Christian, D. (Director). (1995/96). *Memorial Feast & Giveaway.* [Video/DVD] Toronto, Ontario Canada: Vision TV.

Diatchkova, G. (2008). Indigenous Media as an Important Resource for Russia's Indigenous People's. In Wilson, Pamela and Stewart, Michelle (Ed.), *Global Indigenous Media: cultures, poetics and politics.* (pp. 214-231). USA: Duke University Press.

Doyle, A. (November 12, 2009). *Martin Nakata's Cultural Interface: A Theoretical Location for Indigenous Knowledge Organization.* Unpublished manuscript. Canada. Retrieved November 25, 2009, from http://www.library.ubc.ca/xwi7xwa/IRG091012Nakata.pdf

Druick, Z. (2007). *Projecting Canada: Government Policy and Documentary Film at the National Film Board of Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Dumont, M. (1996). *A Really Good Brown Girl*. London, Ontario: Brick Books.

Francis, D. (1992). *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Vancouver, BC Canada: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Freeman, V. (1992). The Body of our People: An Interview with Jeannette Armstrong. In Paragraph. *Vol. 14* (No. 3), 9-12. Stratford, Ontario.

Ginsburg, F. (2003). Embedded Aesthetics: Creating a Discursive Space for Indigenous Media. In Lewis, Justin and Miller Toby (Ed.), *Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A reader* (pp. 88-99). UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Ginsburg, F. (April 1994). Culture/Media: A (mild) Polemic. *Anthropology Today, Vol. 10*(2), 5-15. USA

Ginsburg, F. D., & Abu-Lughod, L., & Larkin, B. (Editors). (2002). *Media Worlds : Anthropology on New Terrain*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Greenhill, P., & Tye, D. (Editors). (1997). *Undisciplined Women: Tradition and Culture in Canada*. Canada: McGill University Press.

Halkin, A. (2008). Outside the Indigenous Lens: Zapatistas and Autonomous Videomaking. In Wilson, Pamela and Stewart, Michelle (Ed.), *Global indigenous media: cultures, poetics, and politics* (pp. 160-180). USA: Duke University.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 222 -237). London: Lawrence & Wishart: London.

Harding, R. (2006). Historical Representations of Aboriginal People in the Canadian News Media. *Discourse & Society, Vol. 17, No. 2*(No. 2), 205-235. doi:10.1177/0957926506058059

Harry, D. (2001), Bio-piracy and Globalization: Indigenous Peoples Face a New Wave of Colonialism. Splice Magazine. Vol. 7 Issue 2 &3. USA.

Harvey, G. & Thompson, C.D. Jr. (Editors). (2005).*Indigenous Diasporas and Dislocations*. England and USA: Ashgate Publishing Limited and Ashgate Publishing Company.

Hilger, M. (1986). *The American Indian in Film*. Metuchen, N.J. and London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Hornung, R. (1991). *One Nation Under The Gun: Inside The Mohawk Civil War*.

    Canada: Pantheon Books.

International Decade of the World's Indigenous People. (2008). Retrieved

    December 20, 2008.

    http://www.un.org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/rights/Indigenous/mediaadv.html

Kipp, D. R. (2001). Images of Native People as Seen by the Eye of the Blackbird.

    In Ross, L. & Hart, D. (Editors). Wicazo Sa Review*:* A Journal of Native

    American Studies*. Video* America Indigena/*Video Native America. 16.2*, 29-

    34.

Kolig, E. & Muckler, H. (Editors). (2002). *Politics of Indigeneity in the South*

    Pacific. Hamburg, Germany and London, England:

Kunuk, Z.(2005). Dialogue: Puhipau in Conversation With Zacharias Kunuk. In

    Hopkins, C. & Townsend, M. (Managing Editors). , *Transference, Tradition,*

    Technology: Native New Media Exploring Visual and Digital Culture (pp. 42-

    59). Canada: Co-published by the Indigenous Media Arts Group and the Art

    Gallery of Hamilton.

Lantos, R., Milliken,S.,Reichel, S. (Producers), & Beresford, B. (Director). (1991).

    Black Robe. [Motion Australia; USA: Samuel Goldwyn Company. Picture]

Leon (nee Williams), R. (July 6, 2009). Personal communication to D. Christian

    D. *1975 Occupation*. IncrediMail Software.

Leuthold, S. (1998). *Indigenous Aesthetics : Native Art Media and Identity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Lewis, R. (2006). *Alanis Obomsawin : The Vision of a Native Filmmaker*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Lewin, A. (Producer), & Lloyd, F. (Director). (1935). *Mutiny on the bounty.* [Motion Picture] Germany: MGM. Retrieved March 10, 2010 http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0026752/; http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0026752/plotsummary

Maaka, R. & and Fleras, A. (2005). *The Politics of Indigeneity: Challenging the State in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. New Zealand and Canada: University of Otago Press.

Manuel, G., & Posluns, M. (1974). *The Fourth World : An Indian Reality*. Don Mills, Ont.: Collier-Macmillan Canada.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing Qualitative Research, Fourth edition*. California, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Masayesva, V., Jr. (2005). Indigenous Experimentation. In Hopkins, C. &Townsend, M. (Managing Editors). *Transference, Tradition, Technology: Native New Media: Exploring Visual and Digital Culture* (pp. 165-177). Canada: co-published by the Indigenous Media Arts Group and the Art Gallery of Ontario.

McElroy, R. (2008). Indigenous Minority-Language Media: S4C, Cultural Identity and the Welsh-Language Televisual community. In Stewart, M. & d Wilson, P. (Editors.),*Global Indigenous Media: cultures, poetics and politics* (pp. 232 - 249). USA: Duke University Press.

Meadows, M. (1995). Ideas From The Bush: Indigenous Television in Australia and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Communications,*

Mills, J. (March 2009). "First Nation's Cinema: Hollywood's Indigenous 'Other'". Paper presented at the *2008 Film and History Association of Australia and New Zealand Conference: Screening the Past, Issue 24,* University of Otago, New Zealand. Retrieved May 10, 2009 http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/current/current.html; http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/24/first-nation-cinema.html

Molnar, H. & Meadows, M. (2001). *Songlines to Satellites: Indigenous Communications in Australia, the South pacific and Canada*. Australia: Pluto Press.

Moore, B. (1985). *Black Robe*. Canada: McClelland and Stewart.

Morris, R. C. (1994). *New Worlds From Fragments: Film, Ethnography and the Representation of Northwest Coast Cultures*. USA: Westview Press.

Murray, S. (2008). *Images of Dignity: Barry Barclay and Fourth Cinema*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: Huia Publishers.

Myers, M.B. (June 29, 2009). Personal communication to D. Christian. IncredMail.

Nakata, M. (1997). The Cultural Interface: An Exploration of the Intersection of Western Knowledge Systems and Torres Strait Islanders Positions and Experiences (PhD). James Cook University of North Queensland.

Nakata, M. (1998). Anthropological Texts and Indigenous Standpoints. *Australian Aboriginal Studies,* (2), 3-12.

Nakata, M. (2002). Indigenous Knowledge and the Cultural Interface: Underlying Issues at the Intersection of Knowledge and Information Systems. *International Federation of Library Associations Journal,* Vol. 28 (5/6), pp. 281-291.

Nakata, M. (2006). Australian Indigenous Studies: A Question of Discipline. *Australian Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 17 (3)*, pp. 265-275.

Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining The Savages: Savaging the Disciplines* Aboriginal Studies Press.

Nakata, M. (2007a). The Cultural Interface. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, Supplement.* (36). Pp. 7-14.

Nakata, M. (2008). Introduction: Special Supplementary Issue on Indigenous Studies and Indigenous Knowledge. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education,* (Supplement). (37), pp. 1-4.

Nichols, B. (1991). *Representing Reality : Issues and Concepts in Documentary*.

    Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Palys, T. S. (1996). Histories of Convenience: Understanding Twentieth Century

    Aboriginal Film Images in Context. Paper presented at the *Screening*

    Culture: Constructing Image and Identity, York, England. 1-19. Retrieved

    June 6, 2009 from http://www.sfu.ca/~palys/yorkppr.htm

Pidgeon, M. (November 11, 2009). Personal Communication to D. Christian.

    Email sending graphic of figure 1. Canada: Incredimail.

Pieterse, J. N. (2006). Globalization as Hybridization. In Durham, Meenakshi Gigi

    and Kellner, Douglas M. (Ed.), *Media and Cultural Studies: KeyWorks*

    (Revised Edition). Pp. 658-680. USA; UK; Australia: Blackwell Publishing.

Pietikainen, S. (2008). To Breathe Two Airs: Empowering Indigenous Sami

    Media. In Wilson, P. & Stewart, M. (Editors), *Global Indigenous Media:*

    cultures, poetics and politics. Pp. 197-213. USA: Duke University Press.

Raheja, M. H. (2007). Reading Nanook's Smile: Visual Sovereignty, Indigenous

    Revisions of Ethnography, and Atanarjuat (The FastRrunner). *American*

    Quarterly, Vol. 59 (No. 4), Pp. 1159-1185.

Renov, M. (2004). *The Subject of Documentary: The Introduction*. Minneapolis,

    London: University of Minnesota Press.

Robinson, H. (1989). In Wickwire W. (Editor). *Write it on Your Heart*. Canada:

    Talonbooks/Theytus Books.

Ross, L. & Hart, D. (Editors). (2001). Video America Indigena/Video Native

    American. *Wicazo Sa Review: A Journal of Native American Studies, 16.2*,

    5-11.DOI: 10.1353/wic.2001.0032

Roth, L. F. (2005). *Something New in the Air: The Story of First Peoples*

    Television Broadcasting in Canada. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University

    Press.

Shohat, E. &. Stam, R. (2003). *Multiculturalism, Postcoloniality, and*

    Transnational Media. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Shohat, E. & Stam, R. (Editors). (1994). *Unthinking Eurocentrism :*

    Multiculturalism and the Media. London ; New York: Routledge.

Singer, B. (2001). *Wiping The War Paint Off The Lens: Native American Film and*

    Video University of Minnesota Press.

Slowey, G. A. (2005). Globalization and Development in the Fourth World:

    Indigenous Experiences in Canada and New Zealand. *Globalization and*

    Development Stream, 4th International Critical Management Studies

    Conference, University of Cambridge, Cambridge UK.

Smith, L. T. (2002) (Fifth impression). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research*

    and Indigenous Peoples. London.New York: Zed Books.

Sturken, M. & Cartwright, L. (2003). *Practices of Looking: An introduction to Visual Culture*. UK and New York: Oxford University Press.

Sutherland, J. (2005). *Worldview Skills: Transforming Conflict From The Inside Out*. Sooke, B.C. Canada. Worldview Strategies.

Sweet Wong, H. D. (1998). First Person Plural: Subjectivity and Community in Native American Women's Autobiography. In Smith, S. & Watson, J. (Editors). *Women, Autobiography, Theory: A Reader*. PP. 168-178). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Sykes, J. B. (Editor). (1982). In *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (7th Edition). UK, US: Oxford at the Clarendon Press.

Tator, C., Henry, F., & Matthis, W. (1998). *Challenging Racism in the Arts: Case Studies of Controversy and Conflict*. Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Todd, L. (2005). Polemics, Philosophies and a Story: Aboriginal Aesthetics in the Media of This Land. In Hopkins, C. & Townsend, M. (Managing Editors), *Transference, Tradition, Technology: Native New Media Exploring Visual and Digital Culture*. Canada: co-published by the Indigenous Media Arts Group and the Art Gallery of Hamilton. 105-124

Urban Rez Productions (Producer), & Bear, J and Jones, M. (Director). (November 23, 2008). *Storytellers in Motion TV series.* [Video/DVD] National broadcast: Saskatchewan Communications Network (SCN).

UN Resolution 59/174 of United nations - Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples. (n.d.). Retrieved January 16, 2009, from http://www.iwgia.org/sw8961.asp

Unknown. (2010). When Will White People Stop Making Movies Like Avatar. Retrieved January 15, 2010. Message posted to http://io9.com/5422666/when-will-white-people-stop-making-movies-like-avatar

Unknown. (2008). United Nations Media Advisory. Retrieved December 20, 2008 from http://www.un.org/rights/indigenous/mediaadv.html

Valaskakis, G. G. (2000). Blood Borders: Being Indian and Belonging. In S. Hall, P. Gilroy, L. Grossberg & A. McRobbie (Editors.) *Without Guarantees : In Honour of Stuart Hall* (p. 433). London. New York: Verso.

Varga, D. (2006). Atanarujuat: The Fast Runner (2001). Zacharius Kunuk. In White, J. (Editor), *The Cinema of Canada.* Wallflower Press.

Verduyn, C. (2004/2005). Is Canada Postcolonial?: Unsettling Canadian Literature (review). *University of Toronto Quarterly, Vol. 74.1*, 519-521.

Walsh, A. (2006). Re-placing history: Critiquing the Colonial Gaze Through Photographic Works by Jeffrey Thomas and Greg Staats. In A. Kuhn, & K. E. McAllister (Eds.), *Locating Memory: Photographic Acts.* USA: Berghahn Books.

Warrior, R. A. (1995). *Tribal Secrets : Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Williams, R., (May 5, 2009). Personal Communication to D. Christian *Winter homes*. Email Program: IncrediMail.

Wilson, Pamela and Stewart, Michelle (editors). (2008). *Introduction: Indigeneity and Indigenous Media on the Global Stage.* In *Global Indigenous Media: cultures, poetics and politics* Duke University Press.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Wood, H. (2008). *Native Features: Indigenous Films From Around The World*. New York: Continuum.

Woods, L. (2006). Bearwalker (2002) Director, Shirley Cheechoo. In J. White (Editor), *The Cinema of Canada*. Wallflower Press.

Young-Ing, G. (1993 and 1994). The Estrangement and Marginalization of Aboriginal Writers in Canada. *Paragraph, Vo. 15* (No. 3 and No. 4), 23-27.

Young-Ing, G. (2005). The Indigenous Tradition/New Technology Interface. In Hopkins, C. & Townsend, M. (Managing Editors), *Transference, Tradition, Technology: Native New Media Exploring Visual and Digital Culture*. Canada: co-published by the Indigenous Media Arts Group and the Art Gallery of Hamilton. 179-187.

Filmography

Barclay, B. (Producer/Director/Writer). (1987). *Ngati* [Feature Film]. New
    Zealand.

Bear, J. & Jones, M. (Producers). (2008). *Storytellers in Motion* [Television series
    episode]. Canada. Urban Rez Productions.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. & Jacob, S. (Producers). Cranmer, B.
    (Director/Writer). (2000). *I'Tusto: To Rise Again*. [Documentary].
    Canada. The National Film Board of Canada.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. & Jacob, S. (Producers). Cranmer, B.
    (Director/Writer). (1999). *T'lina: The Rendering of Wealth.*
    [Documentary]. Canada. The National Film Board of Canada.

Cranmer, B. & Brown, F. & Johnson, G. (Producers). Cranmer, B.
    (Director/Writer). (1997). Qatuwas*: People Gathering Together*
    [Documentary]. Canada. The National Film Board of Canada.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. (Producers). Cranmer, B. (Director/Writer). (2001).
    Gwishalaayt: The Spirit Wraps Around You. [Documentary]. Canada.
    Nimpkish Wind Productions.

Cranmer, B. & Green, C. (Producers). Cranmer, B. (Director/Writer). (1995).
    Laxwesa Wa: Strength of the River. [Documentary]. Canada. Nimpkish
    Wind Productions and the National Film Board of Canada.

Diamond, N. (Director/Writer). (2009). *Reel Injun.* [Feature Documentary].
    Canada. National Film Board of Canada.

Eberts, J. & Héroux, D. & Moore, B. (Executive Producers). Lantos, R. & Milliken,
    S. & Reichel, S. (Producers). Norlen, E. (Associate Producer). Beresford,
    B. (Director). Moore, B. (Writer). (1991). Black Robe. [Feature Film].
    Australia and Canada.

 Glass, A. (Director). (2004). *In Search of the Hamat'sa: A Tale of
    Headhunting.* [Documentary]. Canada. Program for Culture and Media,
    New York University.

Hager, B. (Producer/Director). (2005). *From Bella Coola to Berlin.* [Feature
    Documentary]. Canada. Aarrow Productions. In Association with
    Aboriginal Peoples Television Network.

Harris, E. (Producer/Director). (2008). Appaloosa. [Feature Film]. USA.

Landau, J. (Producer) & Cameron, J. (Director/Writer). (2009). *Avatar*

[Feature Film]. Canada: Fox Film Distributors.

Mita, M. (Producer/Director/Writer). (1983). *Mauri*. [Feature Film]. New Zealand.

Murray, S. & Procacci, D. & Menzies, B. & deHeer, R. & Ryan, J. (Producers).
deHeer, R. & Djigirr, P. (Directors). deHeer, R. (Writer) (2006). *Ten Canoes* [Feature Film]. Australia.

Olin, C. (Producer/Director). (1983). *Box of Treasures*. [Documentary]. Canada.
U'Mista Cultural Society.

Wheeler, D. (Director/Writer). (1975). *Potlatch: A Strict Law Bids Us Dance.*
[Documentary]. Canada. U'Mista Cultural Society.

Endnotes

[1]   On July 11, 1990, Canada mobilized its military forces to Kahnesatake; a Mohawk community located within the geo-political territory of what is known has Quebec, Canada. There was a seventy-eight day standoff. The national and international media referred to this as the "Oka Crisis."

[2]   The Iroquois Confederacy self identify as Haudenosaunee who originally consisted of a league of five Nations: the Mohawk, the Seneca, the Oneida, the Onondaga, the Cayuga. The Tuscarora peoples joined as the sixth Nation in the 1700s.

[3]   Corporal Lemay of the Sureté de Quebec Police was killed 11 July, 1990. One Mohawk Elder died after the 78 day siege, and some in the community feel that his heart attack was a result of the rock throwing incident that Alanis Obomsawin documents in her film, *Rocks at Whisky Trench* (2000).

[4]:   Writers include: Jeannette Armstrong (Syilx-Okanagan), Maria Campbell (Cree-Métis), Lee Maracle (Squamish-Métis), Simon Ortiz (Acoma Pueblo), Armand Ruffo (Anishnawbe) and Leslie Marmon Silko (Laguna Pueblo).

[5]   The anthropological discourse commonly refers to our winter homes as a "kekuli," which is a term from the Chinook jargon.

[6]   Production details for *Ngati* (1987) available at: http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0093615/ retrieved April 15, 2010. See Appendix II.

[7]   In my culture, fasting is a spiritual ritual where I go "up the mountain" and sit with the natural elements for four days during, which time I go without food and water thus "sacrificing" of myself. During my fast, I prayed to establish a spiritual relationship between Barry Barclay, his work and myself as researcher because he is no longer on this physical plane.

[8] An essential person to the intellectual property rights fight is Dr. Greg Young-Ing (Cree-Chinese), writer, poet and scholar of the University of British Columbia, Okanagan who completed his dissertation *Intellectual Property Rights, Legislated Protection, Sui Generis Models and Ethical Access in the Transformation of Indigenous Traditional Knowledge* on this hot topic in 2006. He brings the ethical and legal issues of intellectual property to the UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous peoples in New York and Geneva, Switzerland. Young-Ing is a major contributor to the Creators Rights Alliance of Canada and is one of the authors of the *Handbook on Creator Rights.* Dr. Young-Ing (1999) has also been instrumental in gaining editorial control of Indigenous stories. He completed a Masters of Publishing at Simon Fraser University, *Understanding peoples on their own terms: a rationale and proposal for an Aboriginal style guide.* Call number: PC y68 u53 1999.

[9]   Another facet of the intellectual property issue was taken up by Dr. Debra Harry (Paiute), scholar and community activist, who stood up to possibly the most heinous appropriation of knowledge when she revealed how the international science community was patenting Indigenous genetic and other biological materials. Harry (2001) called into question the rampant bio-piracy in Indigenous communities through her organization, *Indigenous Peoples Council on Bio-colonialism* and articulates some of those concerns in her article, *Bio-piracy and Globalization: Indigenous Peoples Face a New Wave of Colonialism* – Retrieved January 10, 2009 from, http://www.ipcb.org/publications/other_art/globalization.html. This article was published in Splice Magazine, January-April 2001, Vol. 7, Issues 2 and 3.

[10]   To illustrate the internal tensions I grappled with around a university education -- When I did my undergraduate work at the University of Toronto where my focus was comparing Indigenous thought to western thought, I completed my course work but did not convocate for six years because I was not certain I wanted to admit I had a degree from a western institution. And, when contemplating graduate school, I pondered the question for six years before I submitted an application.

[11]   The quotations marks and lower case application for "*a spiritual land claim*" are how I copyrighted the title of my production. This choice is purposeful because of ongoing disputes surrounding Indigenous territories in British Columbia.

[12]   The literature and films/television I reviewed spans the time period of 1990 to 2009. I choose 1990 because this was the year of Oka, which was a "watershed" year because it was the first time media coverage of a conflict between a nation-state and Indigenous peoples became international. This was also the period when Alanis Obomsawin's films gained national and international recognition. It is important to acknowledge there is a significant amount of film work before 1990.

[13]   *Rez* is a colloquial term used to refer to the reserves of Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island.

[14]   I viewed *Avatar* twice (December 27, 2009 and January 4, 2010 in 3D).

[15]   Retrieved October 6, 2008 from http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jesuit-relations/index-e.html

[16]   Lorna Roth's Endnotes for Chapter 2, #2 states: "Ignoring the advice of native film consultants is not just a thing of the past. A Cree communications colleague of mine was hired to be the cultural consultant for Bruce Beresford's *Black Robe* (1991), which was shot in Quebec. She complained constantly that the director was ignoring the depiction advice that she had been hired to provide and, in the end, begged him not to place her name in the credits – worried that some of film's distortions would reflect back on her and prove embarrassing. Her request was also ignored" (2005, p. 249).

[17]   Production details for Hager's documentary http://www.factsandfiles.com/41.html?&L=1 Retrieved October 15, 2008.

[18]   Website for the work of Edward Curtis, retrieved October 15, 2008 from http://lcweb2.loc.gov/ammem/award98/ienhtml/curthome.html.

[19]   Hilger (1986) qualifies his choice. "The following filmography is representative but not exhaustive. From 1910 to 1913 alone, one hundred or more films about Indians appeared each year, and throughout most of the silent period the American Indian remained a very popular subject. This filmography on the silent film era ends with 1929. The cut-off year is somewhat arbitrary since some films before this date have music, sound effects and some dialogue. A few films after 1929 are still basically silent, but most have music, narration, or dialogue" (1986 p. 9).

[20]   http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0798855/bio Biography of Jay Silverheels at Internet Movie Database. Retrieved April 10, 2010.

[21]   I screened the film, *Appaloosa*, (2008) when it played in Vancouver in October 2008 to scrutinize the script for how Indigenous peoples are portrayed.

[22]   Wilson and Stewart reference Prins, H.E.L. (2004). Visual Anthropology in T. Biolsi, ed., A companion to the anthropology of American Indians. Pp. 506-25. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

[23]   In Canada, this federal agency is designated to uphold the fiduciary responsibility to so-called status Indians (in theory). Each so-called Indian is assigned a number on membership lists that are registered with the Department of Indian Affairs in Ottawa. Each of the six hundred and three Indigenous communities in Canada has registered membership lists housed in Ottawa.

[24]   Murray (2008) references this statement with, "See Allen, *Blood Narrative*, pp. 121-3."

[25]   This is an advisory body to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) at the United Nations. Its' mandate is to discuss Indigenous issues related to economic and social development, culture, the environment, education, health and human rights. The Permanent Forum was established by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) resolution 2000/22 on 28 July 2000.

[26]   George Stroumboulopoulos interview with National Grand Chief Shawn Atleo of the Assembly of First Nations on CBC Program *The Hour* on December 10, 2009.

[27]   On July 11, 1990, the international mainstream media sent startling images of masked, armed Indigenous men all over the world from Kahnesatake, near the township of Oka, Quebec. The Mohawk peoples and their supporters stood up to the land rights in Iroquois territories when the Township of Oka issued a permit to the Club de Golf Oka Inc Course to allow them to expand from a nine to eighteen hole golf course, which would have desecrated the burial grounds of their ancestors. These men and women were criminalized, racialized and represented as terrorists in the national and international media. Mike (Brian) Myers (Seneca) one of the negotiators at the so-called Oka Crisis said: "The people decided that enough was enough. We weren't willing to give one inch more to those occupying our territories; we had lost too much land already." (Myers, Mike (Brian), personal communication, September 15, 2007).

[28]   I discuss the Gustafsen Lake standoff in Chapter 1, Section 1.2 A Meta Narrative: The Hidden Story.

29   Chronological details of the Ipperwash land rights fight is documented at: http://v1.theglobeandmail.com/v5/content/features/ipperwash/ Retrieved December 3, 2009.

30   The Chiapas Media Project (CMP) Promedios is a bi-national NGO, which provides video and computer equipment and training to Indigenous communities in the Mexican states of Chiapas and Guerrero.

31   http://www.chiapasmediaproject.org/cmp/about-englishespa%C3%B1ol retrieved April 10, 2010.

32   Ted S. Palys reference: Boldt, M. (1993). *Surviving as Indians: The challenge of self-government.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

33   For Barry Barclay production credits: http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0054020/ Retrieved July 10, 2009.

34   It is unclear whether or not Barry Barclay was aware that George Manuel (Secwepemc) and Michael Posluns were the first to use the term Fourth World in 1974.

35   *Mutiny On The Bounty (1935)* production details retrieved January 14, 2010 from http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0026752/plotsummary

36   I address this point explicitly in an article called, "*Remapping Activism,*" a published version of a talk I gave in Chinatown on August 28, 2004. The transcript is in, *Active Geographies: Women & Struggles on the Left Coast* (2008), published by West Coast Line 58 Vol. 42, No. 2, Summer 2008.

37   Randolph Lewis (2006) Endnote #11: He states he interviewed *Alanis Obomsawin*, in Montreal, August 2002.

38   It is important to note that Indigenous Nations negotiated Nation- to- Nation treaties that recognize sovereign status with the original settler governments; however, not one treaty has been honoured and it is the succeeding settler governments whose policies and practices have in effect relegated Indigenous peoples to an underclass in their own homelands.

39   The copyright symbol is in the original document.

41Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2002) discusses how Greek philosophy separates man from nature (pp. 47-48). She says, "Classical Greek philosophy is regarded as the point at which ideas about these relationships changed from 'naturalistic' explanations to humanistic explanations. Naturalistic explanations linked nature and life as one and humanistic explanations separate people out from the world around them, and place humanity on a higher plane (than animals and plants) because of such characteristics as language and reason. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are regarded as the founders of this humanistic tradition of knowledge."

41   Todd reference: "From the Herbert Huber website, Arthur C. Clarke "History Lesson": A Modern Allegory of the Cave www.lesekost.de/HHL592.htm

[42]   Director, Sara Rocque's (Métis) documentary, *Six Miles Deep* (2009), produced with the National Film Board of Canada has archival footage of the RCMP in the Six Nations community in 1924, arresting the hereditary Chiefs for not adhering to the Indian Act system of governance. I viewed this film at the 2010 DOXA Film Festival. Some of the history is documented on this government website, Retrieved April 21, 2010.
http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/bp175-e.htm#CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS(txt).

[43]   Louis Riel statement available at: http://www.louisrielinstitute.com/culture/index.php Retrieved on October 11, 2008

[44]   Writers Union of Canada website: http://www.writersunion.ca/au_history.asp Retrieved on February 17, 2010.

[45]   At the 1994 revolutionary "Writing Thru Race conference," the writers allied with other writers of colour from the Japanese-Canadian (Roy Miki), Chinese-Canadian and African-Canadian (Dionne Brand) communities to call for inclusion in the Writers Union of Canada. Roy Miki from the Japanese Canadian community was a major organizer of the collaboration amongst Writers of Color at the Writing Thru Race Conference in 1994. Retrieved February 16, 2010 from: http://www.newstarbooks.com/author.php?author_id=6239.

[46]   During this highly volatile and exciting time, the global Indigenous writers, visual artists and performing artists from Canada, USA, Aoetearoa (New Zealand) and Australia made concerted efforts to build networks to discuss their shared issues at such international gatherings as the 1993 *Beyond Survival: The Waking Dreamer Ends the Silence Conference held at the Museum of Civilization in Ottawa*. I was the initial Fundraiser and Coordinator for this international conference in 1993. When I accepted the position as Chair of the Ontario Film Review Board, I moved to the Steering Committee of the conference and Kateri Akiwenzie-Damm (Anishnawbe) and Alan Deleary (Chippewas of the Thames) were hired to replace me.

[47]   Other examples of Indigenous Writers claiming the right to write and publish their own stories are: Armstrong, J. (1993), *Looking at the Words of our People: First Nations Analysis of Literature*; Armstrong, J. (2000) *Whispering* in the Shadows; Cotelli, L. (Editor) (1990), *American Indian Writers Speak*; Dumont, M. (1996), *A Really Good Brown Girl;* Harjo, J. & Bird, G. (Editors) (1997), *Reinventing the Enemy's Language.* Hulan, R. & Eigenbrod, R. (Editors), (2008) *Aboriginal Oral Traditions: Theory, Practice, Ethics;* Hunter, A. (2002) *Spirit Horses;* Hunter, A. (2008), *The Recklessness of Love;* Ihimaera, W. (1992) *The New Net Goes Fishing;* Lee, S., Maracle, L., Marlatt, D., Warland, B. (Editors), *Telling it: Women and Language Across Cultures;* Lutz, H. (1991) *Contemporary Challenges: Conversations With Canadian Native Authors;* Maracle, L. (1990), *Bobbi Lee: Indian Rebel;* Maracle, L. (2000); Maracle, L. (2002), *Bent Box*; Maracle, L. (2002), *Daughters Are Forever;* Maracle, L. (2002), *Will's Garden;* Marsden, R. (Editor) (2000), *Crisp Blue Edges: Indigenous Creative Non-Fiction;* Moses, D.D. & Goldie, T. (Editors) (1992), *An Anthology of Canadian Native Literature;* Moss, L. (2003), *Is Canada Postcolonial? Unsettling Canadian Literature*; Silko, L.M. (1991), *Almanac of the Dead;* Trudell, J. (2008), *Lines from a Mined Mind;* Van Camp, R. (2007), *Welcome Song for Baby;* White, E, & Archibald, J. (2006), *Legends and Teachings of Xeel's: The Creator.* Lutz, Hartmut. *Contemporary Challenges: Conversations with Canadian Native Authors*. Sakatoon, Saskatchewan: Fifth House Publishers, 1991

48   Barb Cranmer is a highly respected leader in "Indian country" who functions well in the cultural interface. On December 29, 2008, the *Globe and Mail* declared Cranmer as one of the "Top Ten People to Watch" in 2009. However, Cranmer's work is not discussed by scholars. In my research I found references to her as a filmmaker but no one focused specifically on her film work. Thus, writing about her work in my thesis is also a way to pay tribute to her leadership. As a point of clarification, I viewed Cranmer's six documentaries. However, since I screened *My Big Fat Diet* (2008) which she co-produced, during a television broadcast, I did not include this work in my analysis. See Appendix I for detailed synopses of Cranmer's documentaries.

49   It is important as an outsider to Maori culture to qualify that how I use Barclay's concepts in this thesis is through my interpretation from my Secwepemc-Syilx worldview. I also acknowledge the meanings may vary from region to region in Aoetearoa (New Zealand). And, further research is required to examine whether or not each Indigenous group would have similar concepts in their own languages.

50   In my Gemini award winning documentary, *WalkingThe Talk* (2000) about Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships in Canada, one Indigenous activist [Helen Thundercloud] made a statement similar to, "We get tired of educating you settler folks about your own racism."

51   Jordon Wheeler's work has won two Gemini Awards; one in 2007 for Best Writing in a Children's or Youth Program or Series and in 1997 when he was the Executive Story Editor for *The Rez* series. Wheeler also taught the Aboriginal Screenwriters course at the Banff Centre for the Arts.

52   http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0110729/ Production details for *Once Were Warriors* (1994), retrieved April 13, 2010.

53   http://www.g20.org/ home web page of G20 describes their history and economic function, Retrieved April 4, 2010. Pop up notice, "This is the website of the G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors Meeting. The official website of the G20 Seoul Summit will be available in time." Author unknown.

54   http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2008/06/11/pm-statement.html Retrieved April 4, 2010. Title: *Prime Minister Stephen Harper's Statement of Apology,* author unknown.

55   http://communities.canada.com/vancouversun/blogs/communityofinterest/ archive/2009/09/28/really-harper-canada-has-no-history-of-colonialism.aspx Harsha Walia blog, retrieved April 4, 2010.

56   http://www.rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/derrick/2009/09/harper-denial-g20-canada-has-no-history-colonialism Derrick O'Keefe blog, retrieved April 4, 2010.

57   http://www.ctvolympics.ca/opening-ceremony/ Full replay of 2010 Olympic Opening ceremonies was available at this link, at the date of retrieval, April 4, 2010. A dvd commemorating the event is now available at: http://store.ctvolympics.ca/Pages/default.aspx Retrieved, May 1, 2010. Author unknown.

[58]   http://www.cbc.ca/sports/story/2005/04/23/2010_vancouver050423.html Retrieved April 4, 2010. "*Vancouver 2010 logo unveiled*" CBC Sports, Author Unknown, retrieved April 4, 2010.

[59]   http://www.yufreepress.org/?p=325 Jones, Joseph (2010) Article "*HBC Appropriates Cowichan Design for Olympic Sweater*," retrieved April 4, 2010.

[60]   http://www.kstrom.net/isk/maps/canbandsbyprov.html Lists all Indian Bands listed with the Department of Indian Affairs in Canada, retrieved April 8, 2010. Author unknown.

[61]   http://atlas.nrcan.gc.ca/auth/english/maps/peopleandsociety/lang/aboriginallanguages /bycommunity Government website for Aboriginal languages in Canada, retrieved April 8, 2010. Author unknown.