Resisting Colonization in the Academy: From Indigenous/ Minoritized Standpoints

Barbara Waterfall & Sarah Maiter
Faculty of Social Work, Wilfrid Laurier University
bwaterfa@wlu.ca   smaiter@wlu.ca

Abstract

This paper takes up discourses pertaining to the agency politics and resistance to colonization within the western Academy. Introducing the notion of a circular methodology as a paradigm for counter hegemonic modes of engagement, the authors begin by referencing their personal locations as a North American Indigenous woman and woman of colour. Challenged to find zones of common experience and resistance, the authors articulate and employ an anti-colonial discursive framework which makes room for collective mobilization. The paper speaks to some problematics connected to the experience of being minoritized within the Academy. Referencing the everyday occurrence of being scripted into colonized roles the authors speak to the specific colonial scripts of "token," "Native informant," and "ghettoized other." Employing discourse pertaining to decolonization the authors then speak to individual and collective strategies for resistance.

Introduction:

We speak to you today as minority, untenured scholars teaching within the context of a Western university institution. Our social locations are important to clarify, particularly at an anti-racist conference as it can enhance the literature in the field by including a view from our own standpoints. We come from diverse positions. One position is that of being Indigenous to this land which is known as "Turtle Island,"[1] while another is a "woman of colour.[2]" We bring our diverse perspectives into this discourse about the positioning of Indigenous/minoritized faculty within the Academy. We share common research interests and experiences such as, anti-colonial, anti-racist, and anti-oppressive theorizing, the inclusion of multiple knowledges within the academy, challenging Eurocentric knowledge production and the work of decolonizing methodologies.

We conceptualize the context of our engaging in this discourse as the creating, or the casting of a circle. We begin this circle by acknowledging the spirits of this land, the Indigenous Peoples of this land and all of our ancestors. We welcome everyone who has come into this space. Within the context of the circle we understand that we are all equal and that there are multiple perspectives and multiple ways of doing things. To guide this discussion we metaphorically conceptualize our employing a "talking stick" as a means of acknowledging our location as speaker and the reader's responsibility to respectfully listen. We contextualize the creation of this space as circle to rupture the binary between Indigenous and racialized positioning within the context of Euro-western hegemony. As Collins (1997: 4) contends, this type of binary "ignores the interconnectedness among knowledges and the accompanying difficulty of remaining oppositional in a context of

---

[1]The term Turtle Island is used by Indigenous Peoples of North America to refer to the continent of North America.

[2]We have chosen a race category here rather than an ethic one as women of colour are racialized in various ways in the Academy and we wish to draw attention to this raciliazation. Razack (1998) further contends that regardless of where you are born women of colour are slotted into the category of immigrant.

multiple knowledges all differentially positioned within hierarchical power relations."

For the purposes of this paper we define Indigenous knowledges and Indigenous perspectives as "a body of knowledge associated with the long-term occupancy of a place" (Dei, Hall & Rosenburg, 2000: 6). Accordingly Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies are deeply rooted in the wisdom of the land and in kin-based systems of respectful coexistence with all of Creation (Cajete, 1999; Castellano, 2000; Holmes, 2000; Wane, 2000). We also acknowledge that minoritized standpoints bring attention to historical and current societal, organizational, and institutional systems of colonization, oppression, and marginalization affecting individuals, families and groups of people. As is indicated, our intent for writing this paper is to center Indigenous and racialized perspectives and to create a context for the inclusion of multiple perspectives within counter hegemonic discourse. We begin this discussion by presenting a discursive framework whereby the sharing of Indigenous, racialized and other minoritized voices can be mutually explored.

Discursive Framework:

In accordance with Dei's (2000a: 23-24) usage of a "discursive" as opposed to a "theoretical" framework we employ anti-colonial thought inclusive of anti-racist and anti-oppressive perspectives. Contemporary thinkers, such as, Bannerji (1995); Dei (2000b) and hooks (1994) utilize the present day usage of anti-colonial thought as counter/oppositional discourse. As a starting point we make use of Dei & Asgharzadeh's (2000) understanding of colonialism as that which is imposing and dominating. We also utilize Waterfall's (2003) definition of an anti-colonial discursive framework as the absence of colonial imposition, as the agency to govern one's own life and the practice of such agency based on Indigenous/localized foundational wisdoms. Dei (2000c) further articulates an anti-colonial gaze as affirming the reality of colonialism in it's ongoing and reformulated forms,

reclaiming Indigenous Peoples own particular localities and histories, and providing space for validating and centering Indigenous knowledges and methodologies. Dei & Asgharzadeh (2000) also conceptualize an anti-colonial framework as acknowledging epistemologies and methodologies of racialized and oppressed people. Integral to an anti-colonial perspective is that of honoring the land in which we live, acknowledging and centering the perspectives of the land's Indigenous Peoples and providing space for the inclusion of other colonized realities.

In our understanding of the colonial problematic we also employ Smith's (1999) assertion that colonialism encompasses Western rules of practice for knowledge production. As such, colonial processes encompass the imposition of Western rule over all aspects of Indigenous, Eastern, and African knowledges, languages, and cultures. Furthermore, as noted by Mohanty (1994: 214) "legal, economic, religious and familial structures are treated as phenomena to be judged by western standards." She further argues that "It is here that ethnocentric universality comes into play." Maiter, Trocme, & Shakir (1999) further assert that such comparison also serves to define the West as developed and progressive.

Semali & Kichenlo (1999: 32) argued that "all Indigenous knowledge is subjugated by Western science and its episteme." Semali & Kinchelo (1999: 25-33) and Smith (1999: 65) have stated, that attempts to "indiginize" academic institutions or disciplines involves major struggles about what counts as legitimate knowledge, as language, as literature and as curriculum. Smith (1999: 42-58) further argues that the rules of practice for Western hegemonic knowledge production stretches beyond the boundaries of Western science to the system we refer to as "the West." We assert that the problematic associated with centering Indigenous knowledges within the Academy can resonate with other racialized and/or differentially positioned knowledges.

Likewise, Indigenous and racialized persons within the Academy can share common

experiences of marginalization and oppression. Razack (2001) states that racialized immigrant subjects are given faculty positions within the western universities on the condition that they adhere to rigidly prescribed "colonial scripts." Referencing Spivak, (1996) Razack further contends that racialized minority women are primarily hired to fit the role of "Native informants"enabling those in power to manage notions of difference. To be placed in this position is not about the exercise of freedom. Rather, as Razack (2001: 55) articulates, racialized faculty are granted this space within the Academy conditional on their not challenging or bringing up contentious issues such as "hegemony, racism, feminism, and social change." She further states that the Native informant role is also a classed and "straight one." That is, "you can't have any working class attributes or be politically and openly 'out' (as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered or two-spirited) since this raises suspicions that you might not play the Native informant role well" (Razack, 2001: 56).

While Razack speaks to the experiences of racialized immigrant subjects within western universities, Indigenous faculty can also be caste into the Native informant role. Similar and related experiences of being ghettoized, or being caste into "token" positions can also be shared by Indigenous and racialized faculty alike. Attempting to create a "common zone of resistance and struggle" Dei & Asgharzadeh (2000: 317) expand the understanding of an anti-colonial gaze as inclusive of examining the interdependent and interrelated sites of oppression such as race, gender, class, sexuality, age, and (dis)ability. In this way an anti-colonial discursive framework becomes pertinent to multiple issues of minoritization and oppression.

Indigenous and Racialized Faculty Within the Academy:

Some Embedded Problematics

In more recent times there is increasing diversity within university communities. The presence of this diversity can be attributed to advocacy work from grass roots and community-based organizing. In response to increased community pressure a Royal Commission on Equality in Employment was carried out with the ensuing Abella Report (1984) designating four groups as equity priorities. These four groups are women, people of colour, Aborginal people and people with disabilities. A formal Federal Bill was passed, (The Employment Equity Act) which mandated these four groups as priorities for equity policy. In turn, many Canadian universities have based their equity policies on this Bill. While fortunate that pressure was now placed on universities to provide room for the inclusion of diverse bodies, sadly, gay, lesbian, bisexual, trans-gendered and two-spirited people have been left out of this politic.

It also needs to be stated that the result of this Bill has not created a mandate for hiring based upon affirmative action. Indeed, there is much debate within academic circles about the feasibility of affirmative action hiring policies. While many minoritized persons view affirmative action as a legitimate approach to equity, there is also dominant discourse, such as, Furedy, Sullivan, Kimura & Seligman (2003) which questions the legitimacy of such appointments arguing that they would contravene the efforts of academic excellence in teaching and scholarship. The reality is that universities are not required by law to target the four designated groups for the purposes of appointments and hiring.

Nevertheless, we are slowly observing an increase in diversity between staff and faculty within university communities. But what does it mean to have diverse bodies in the Academy? Or

more particularly, what are the consequences for minoritized faculty within western academe[3]? Luther, Whitmore & Moreau (2001: 21) reporting on a research study of the experiences of Aboriginal and women of colour in the Academy indicate that Indigenous and racialized faculty do not experience "academic freedom" as is the experience of their western colleagues. Rather, for Indigenous and racialized faculty, their every move is observed, critiqued and managed. Bannerji (1995); Monture-Angus (1995); and St. Lewis (2002) maintain that Indigenous and racialized faculty are positioned as colonized subjects within western academic institutions. Calliste (2000: 146) states that "Aboriginal people and racialized minorities are perceived as 'outsiders within.' " She further argues that minoritized faculty are expected to know and stay within their ascribed "place" and are also expected to accept their subordination.

Razack (2001: 54) notes that the construct of race, (and the construct of Indigeniety from a western perspective can be included) is conceptualized as merely involving "the management of difference." As such, she further argues that race, (and Indigeniety) "can never be a scholarly topic worthy of serious consideration." For those whose research and curricula reflect the study of colonialism, imperialism, globalization, racism and the inclusion of multiple knowledges, their efforts are often devalued, inferiorized and ghettoized. More problematic is that these efforts are also readily appropriated into the dominant Euro-western discourse where they lose their original context and meaning. Smith (1999: 42-58) argues that localized Indigenous knowledges become commodified into Western systems of classification and representation. In this process Indigenous knowledges become classified and represented in fragmented ways and, are retrieved and reformulated in different contexts as discourses. Indigenous and racialized knowledges need to be evaluated on their own terms. They also need to be legitimized in faculty tenure and review

---

[3]While these experiences of minoritized staff are certainly deserving of discussion this paper focuses particularly on the experiences of minoritized faculty in western university institutions.

processes and must be "taught as legitimate forms of inquiry in 'regular' research courses" (Razack & Jeffery, 2002: 266-67). With the increase of diverse bodies within the Academy there remains a general lack of support for the inclusion of subjugated knowledges, paradigms, and methodologies. Furthermore, Semali & Kinchelo (1999) & Dei, Hall & Rosenberg (2000) argue that there is a critical need for Indigenous (and we include all minoritized) modes of knowledge production and dissemination to be evaluated on their our own terms and not by not by Eurocentric standards.

Indigenous scholars and to a certain extent racialized scholars are members of specific localized communities and also faculty members within western university institutions. There are conflicting expectations of these faculty between their own home communities and university requirements. In accordance with localized community protocols these scholars must spend extensive time developing and maintaining trust relationships with the community. As such, they must move in a slow and respectful way. Yet, these scholars also have the pressure of meeting traditional academic requirements of evaluation such as publishing in known refereed journals, and engaging in what is viewed as "legitimate" scholarly activity. Thus, a disjuncture exists between the conflicting expectations between university requirements and that of localized communities. The consequences of course can have very serious ramifications for these scholars. On the one hand they may wish to conduct research and scholarship in ways which support grass-roots community objectives and maintain their relationships within these communities, while at the same time meet traditional academic requirements for tenure and promotion. This may be a "double-bind[4]" situation for these scholars.

We further acknowledge that Indigenous and racialized faculty are disadvantaged from

---

[4]The term double bind was originally coined by Bateson, Jackson, Haley & Weakland (1956) to refer to the internal experience of conflicting external expectations. Mahmoud (1998) following up on this early thinking concretizes some lived experiences of racism as double binds such as a light-skinned African Canadian student experiencing preferential treatment from academic mentors on the basis of his skin colour. At the same time the African students begins to experience his African peers refusing to socialize with him.

conducting research within the "mainstream" community. Given that Canadian society is structured racially, and that Aboriginal Peoples have been marginalized through apartheid as it has been exercised through the Indian Act, (1876) there are very real barriers preventing Indigenous and racialized people from going into mainstream communities to conduct research. The result is that Indigenous and racialized peoples and their knowledges can become ghettoized within the context of the western academic discourse. That is, these knowledges are often viewed as marginal not contributing in the form of bringing new dimensions to the Academy.

Furthermore, minority faculty teaching on topics of oppression can be impacted in various ways. As has been documented by Ng (1995) students often resist the implementation of curricula and pedagogical practices which serve to "teach against the grain." She further explicates that a minoritized teacher within a higher education institution is "continually at risk." She contends that this risk increases if the teacher attempts to instill critical consciousness among the students (Ng, 1995). It is also recognized that not all minoritized students wish to talk about difference. As Razack (2001: 56) contends, minoritized students are also "scripted as Native informants in the classroom." Accordingly, it is understood that many minoritized students resist being caste into the informant role. The risks involved for students sharing subjective knowledges also need to be taken into consideration. Indeed, particularly for students it can be very painful opening oneself up to rejection and not being accepted by ones peers in what is a "white dominated" space. Faculty have the complex task of ensuring that minority students are not cast into the role of the "native informant" in class, while also acknowledging the pain/guilt experienced by white students. Yet they have to be careful not to enable the experience of pain to prevent learning or the raising of critical consciousness.

Ng (1995) and Bernard (2001) acknowledge the power and authority that a teacher may assert

to ensure a measure of safety for minoritized students. However, they, like James (2001) also contend that, racially minoritized faculty experience everyday devaluation of authority and credibility by students for reasons that have been attributed to their race and ethnicity. Luther, Whitmore & Moreau's (2001) research also depicts Aboriginal and racialized faculty as spending substantive time providing support for the Aboriginal and racialized students within their faculties, or departments. Furthermore, white students who also sincerely wish to grapple with issues of power and privilege and to critique whiteness often appeal for the support of minoritized faculty to assist with this endeavor. While many minoritized faculty do not object to being given these supportive roles it becomes problematic when these demands are invisible for the purposes of their performance reviews (Luther, Whitmore & Moreau, 2001).

Razack (2001:53) also notes the embedded problematics associated with Indigenous and racialized faculty being scripted into the "Native informant" position. She reminds us that the term Native informant originates from anthropology, where a Native person has been positioned to merely help the anthropologist navigate his, or her way through these foreign cultures. Many Indigenous and racialized faculty similarly are asked to be cultural interpreters for western research projects concerned with Indigenous and other minoritized peoples. This can be problematic for a number of reasons. In particular, the research is usually carried out using western constructs, values, and methods of research, and as a result, are often not only beneficial to the people being researched, but indeed are judgemental and harmful (Gilchrist, 1997; Van Dijk, 1993; Swift, 1995). Western researches have to "avoid essentialism and its accompanying romanticization .... but they must sidestep the traps that transform their attempts at facilitation into further marginalization" (Semali & Kicheloe 1999: 20). Furthermore, while well-intentioned western scholars often "unwittingly participate in the Western hegemonic process," (Semali & Kicheloe 1999: 20).

Indigenous and racialized faculty who resist being a Native informant for these research projects are placed in a risky situation as they are often deemed to be uncooperative or non collaborative by their western colleagues with varying consequences for this perceived behaviour. However, if Indigenous and racialized faculty agree to the terms of being located as a Native informant they also risk losing credibility within their home communities. Furthermore, the time and effort spent working with western colleagues on western research objectives can take away valuable time from work on collaborative community-based research projects that would be meaningful and beneficial to their own communities

Indigenous and racialized faculty also readily speak of the problematic of being asked to be a Native informant in the form of guest lecturing in their western colleagues classes on topics of race, ethnicity, or cultural issues (Luther, Whitmore & Moreau, 2001). Often these requests are "add-on" attempts of western colleagues to bring inclusive curriculum into the classroom (Semali & Kicheloe, 1999). In such a context, minoritized faculty are given limited time to speak about issues of deep complexity related to their own people. As Luther, Whitmore & Moreau (2001: 18) contend these requests "circumscribes and predefine expertise in a manner that is limiting and often 'ghettoizing.' " When these minoritized faculty come into the classroom it becomes apparent that the students have little background information about the topic to be discussed. Rather than an inclusive curriculum, these efforts are merely tokenistic gestures to deal with diversity in what remains a western hegemonic curriculum. Luther, Whitmore & Moreau (2001: 18) further state that while this "repeated reliance on faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty can ... be interpreted as an acknowledgement of existing gaps in the knowledge base of faculty members" it really means that there is an "excessive dependency on Aboriginal faculty and faculty of colour that consumes their times, talents and energies while their colleagues remain largely unaltered."

Moreover, because of the recent increase in hiring professors from minority backgrounds, many are still untenured. Untenured faculty who do not comply to guest lecturing requests can be viewed as non collegial. In reality thus many Indigenous and racialized faculty do not feel that they have freedom to say no and experience these requests as gestures of silencing. While these requests to guest lecture often can give the message to Indigenous and racialized faculty that they are experts in their field, and thus, they should feel honored to be given this recognition, in reality, there is no formal recognition for this work within the Academy. It also needs to be stated that requests to guest lecture places undue stress on untenured faculty as the experience of speaking in a western colleague's classroom can feel like scrutiny and evaluation by people who will subsequently be making recommendations for tenure and promotion.

Luther, Whitmore & Moreau's (2001) research also speaks to other demands because of expertise and/or location in the embodiment of difference. Some of these other activities are "extra committee work, identification of resource material for faculty and students, research assistant support ... participation in policy development and review within departments and within the broader university, and organization of and/or participation in conferences, workshops, symposia and seminars." All of these added demands in addition with the requirements placed on Indigenous and racialized faculty with respect to their own home communities diverts the focus away from research and publications in scholarly journals that are required for tenure and promotion purposes. For faculty who attempt to stay academically focused allegations can also be made indicating that they are not committed to equity, thereby, undermining a faculty member's freedom on a day to day basis.

Resisting and Decolonizing Colonial Scripts in the Academy:

The discursive framework presented earlier and the following depiction of resistance and decolonization provides possibilities for the presence of authentic and diverse bodies within the Academy who can question and disrupt the status quo. Informed by an anti-colonial discursive framework Indigenous and racialized faculty can enter into western university institutions from the standpoint of agency, empowered by localized knowledges and perspectives, and by the multiple knowledges and perspectives that are employed by other minoritized colleagues. From this standpoint the scripted roles as "Native informant," "token," or "ghettozied other" can be resisted. That is, these scholars can conceptualize themselves as active participants and view their knowledges as "legitimate" within a multi centric context (Dei, 2000c). We argue that it is our sense of "personal agency" and "collective agency" which enables us to act from can act from positions of strength.

Perhaps, Razack's (2001: 57) strategy is a useful one to employ. She suggests that "... we think of our participation in the academy as a political project -- one that demands a variety of strategies." Fanon (1963) asserted that decolonization is always a violent process as it encompasses the work of rupturing the dominant colonial paradigm. We find it necessary to reiterate Ng's (1997) contention that Indigenous and racialized faculty who resist colonial scripts and whose teaching and scholarship goes against the grain are continually at risk. Indeed, the experiences of Indigenous and racialized faculty who take a stand and actively confront the limiting freedom and movement gives rise to the very real struggle of what it means to be Indigenous/minoritized within the academy. Luther, Whitmore & Moreau (2001: 92) speaking to this problematic state that "the academy often interprets or reframes acts of resistance and strength as personal deficits, then extends that assessment to members of the entire group."

We contend, however, that we must view our experiences within a broader context as it

brings forth renewed energy and space to develop collective strategies. Dei (2000b) reminded students in one of his classes that "decolonization is a process, rather than an event, and as such, must be engaged in continuously." Conceptualized as a process, the project of decolonization has natural ebbs and flows in a growing tide of change and transformation. Mohanty (1994) lends further insight into resistance by stating that "resistance lies in self-conscious engagement with dominant, normative discourses and representations and in the active creation of oppositional analytic and cultural spaces." Dei (2000c: 121) speaking to the project of including and validating Indigenous knowledges within the Academy states that this work involves being engaged in a "sustained critique of the dominance of Eurocentricity." We also argue that the inclusion of other subjugated knowledges serves the same function.

Mohanty (cited in hooks, 1994) further advises that resistance must not be random and isolated but rather carried out in a strategic, mobilized way. Thus, she argues that it is important to reach out, and to work in conjuction with other allies and comrades in the struggle against western hegemony. This lends itself to active resistance to our colonial ghettoization within the Academy. So too, teaching and scholarship must expose the continued racialization and colonization by institutions. In so doing, one can resist what Mohanty (1994) describes as a "harmonious, empty pluralism." Integral to research and teaching, thus, is examining power differentials and speaking about its impact on all minoritized subjects. Furthermore, strategically mapping and interrogating our methods of resistance is essential to the success of the decolonizing and resistance project.

Razack (2001: 53) postulates the possibilities for "increasing (our) numbers as our preeminent strategy of resistance." Luther, Whitmore & Moreau (2001: 21) also speak to the importance of developing a critical mass of support within academic institutions. They state "critical mass can encompass both the presence of significant numbers of general supports of equity, (ie.

allies) as well as the presence of significant numbers of members of equity target groups, such as, Aboriginal individuals and people of colour." However, they also argue that the building of a "true critical mass that is inclusive and reflective of the equity target groups" should be one of the primary goals of equity. We contend that we must broaden the equity target groups to be inclusive of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered and two-spirited peoples.

The development of a critical mass of support within departments and within academic institutions will enable the collective resistance and rupturing of prescribed roles. We argue that Department and Promotion Committees, and Deans and Provost must be educated about the unique needs and concerns of minoritized faculty. Furthermore, efforts must be made to assist evaluators of performance to understand how student resistance can manifest itself in the classroom particularly when the curricula and pedagogical practices encompasses teaching against the grain. Acknowledging and legitimizing localized knowledges is another useful strategy. Mohanty (1994) urges that uncovering and reclaiming subjugated knowledge within the context of strategy and practice will help "transform educational institutions radically" (cited in hooks, 1994: 22). Dei (1996: 51) states that meaningful and "authentic" conversations across and between racial groups (and we include in this analysis other minoritized groups) involves acknowledging the "legitimacy of the varied and sometimes oppositional knowledges and shared experiences of people." He further argues that "differential power relations are maintained and reproduced through the systemic silencing of oppositional voices that challenge dominant viewpoints and structures and the status quo." Hence, he concludes that understanding about differences and power must be continually interrogated "within commonly shared and connected spaces."

Developing discursive frameworks which help to understand each other's positioning and reality, and how to work collectively together should also be an important strategy. Fanon reminds

us that we are engaged in a very real struggle. It is thus important to become familiar and comfortable with conflict and contestation. Dei (1996) posits that rather than embracing a notion of conflict as a basic and a natural element of social and structural ordering, the dominant paradigm constructs conflict as problematic and disruptive. Given this reality Luther, Whitmore & Moreau (2001: 92) further state that negative interpretations of minoritized faculty who do resist serves "to justify the academy's limits on the numbers permitted entry in the future." Thus, it is vitally important to produce collective messages that conflict is an inevitable and natural part of any transformative process.

Speaking to this dynamic we are reminded by hooks (1994: 110) to create "a context where we can engage in open critical dialogue with one another ... where we can hear and know one another in the difference and complexities of our experience, is essential." We argue that the active usage of Indigenous/subjugated knowledges and methodologies such as conducting meetings "in circle" can serve as this very needed context. Meetings conducted in circle foster counter hegemonic modes of engagement and help to develop a sense of collective collegiality between minoritized faculty who can be easily pitted against each other. We find value in the usage of a "talking stick" as it centers the perspective of the speaker and reminds others within the circle to attentively and respectfully listen until it is their time to speak. The speaker learns through this process to use this space wisely. The listeners learn to reflect on the words being said having been giving time and space to actively engage with the message of each speaker. As such, if sensitively facilitated, circles can provide space for constructive conflict resolution and the development of collective strategies.

Recognizing the hegemonic hierarchical structure and the competitive nature of the university environment it is also important to find was to actively rupture this dominant paradigm. One way to do this is to support and validate each other's efforts and work. Monture-Angus (2002: 40) states

that, "especially we need to keep praising each other because ... when push comes to shove, the institutions in which we work do not support us in any kind of meaningful way." Indeed, Monture-Angus (2002: 31) when speaking to the lack of support she received during a tenure review process stated "when I consider the experiences of my struggle to secure tenure, the nature of the ommissions is as revealing as an analysis of who did what and when." She further argued that the lack of an academic mentor to explain "university rules, conventions and practices" was "one of the examples of the gaps that I experienced." Luther, Whitmore & Moreau's (2002) also validated the common experience of Aboriginal and racialized faculty lacking an academic mentor to clarify the expectations and requirements for a successful tenure and promotion review process.

We recognize that this discussion about resistance and decolonization has been focusing on the development of long-term strategies of resistance. Dei (2000c: 121) gives insight into short-term measures that can be employed. That is, he advocates for the mobilization of strategies which bring multiple knowledges and multiple perspectives into the classroom, such as, using guest speakers, resource materials, posters, displays, films and "undertaking research trips to Indigenous (or other minoritized) communities." He also speaks of the possibilities for developing advocacy and support networks both within and outside of our academic institutions as an ongoing mobilization strategy. In so doing, we as minoritized faculty can be active agents in process of ongoing change and transformation.

Conclusion:

We have introduced the notion of a circular discourse into this discussion of resisting colonization in the Academy. Razack (1998: 8) reminds us that it is imperative to understand that "encounters between dominant and subordinate groups cannot be 'managed' simply as pedagogical

moments requiring cultural, racial, or gender sensitivity." Rather, as Razack contends, we must understand "how responses to subordinate groups are socially organized to sustain existing power arrangements." Without such an understanding she further argues, "we cannot hope either to communicate across social hierarchies or to work to eliminating them." Acts of mobilization and collectively speaking out about the experiences of Indigenous, racialized and other minoritized faculty within the Academy are very threatening to the hegemonic status quo. As diverse bodies are becoming increasingly visible within western universities, the expression of diverse perspectives, and our critical examination of social relations within the university can be determined by those in positions of power to be counterproductive. Inevitably, the dominant, but yet, unspoken, or unwritten rule within the Academy allows for the presence of diverse bodies, but demands that those bodies assimilate and adhere to the norms and practices of the dominant Euro-western culture thereby maintaining the status quo.

We are not disheartened by this reality. We have presented a discursive framework whereby diverse, minoritized bodies can begin to come together collectively to strategize the possibilities for decolonization. An examination of the situation of Indigenous and racialized faculty in the Academy provides the context that frames the issue. Going beyond the roles of "native informant," or "tokens for employment equity" can result in resisting being ghettoized. We acknowledge that outlining some of the embedded problematics connected to the experience of being positioned as minoritized in the Academy, can arguably continue to place Indigenous and minority scholars in the informant position. However, we contend that when our teaching and scholarship stems from a standpoint of agency our informant role can be a matter of choice to be strategically employed in a politicized way. We also assert that it is our personal location and our experiences which enable us to envision and interrogate the possibilities for collective strategizing, resistance, and mobilization.

We have come to an end to our contribution to this circular discourse. As is customary when this method of circle we now offer the talking stick to you. We respectfully await listening to your contribution to this discourse pertaining to resistance and decolonization within the Academy. In light of the discursive framework we have employed, we have created a space for many voices to be heard. In that spirit we are particularly looking forward to hearing the perspectives of other minoritized bodies who are positioned as faculty within western universities. We contend that only by enabling frank and respectful discussion among all minoritized faculty can we develop effective strategies of decolonization.

References:

Abella, R. 1984. Equality Now: Report of the Special Committee on Visible Minorities in Canadian Society. Ottawa. Queens Printer.

Bannerji, H. 1995. Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism, and Anti-Racism. Toronto: Women's Press.

Bateson, G., Jackson, D.D., Haley, J. & Weakland, J. 1956. *"Toward a theory of schizophrenia,"* Behavioral Science, Vol. 1: 251-264.

Bernard, W. 2001. *"Claiming Voice: An Account of Struggle, Resistance & Hope in the Academy,"* Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy. Rashmi Luther, Elizabeth Whitmore & Bernice Moreau. (Eds.) Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

Cajete, Gregory. 1999. A People's Ecology: Explorations in Sustainable Living. Sante Fe: Clear Light Publishers.

Calliste, Agnes. 2000. *"Anti-Racist Organizing and Resistance in Academe,"* Power, Knowledge and Anti-Racism Education: A Critical Reader. Dei, G. J.S. & Calliste, A. (Eds.) Halifax: Fernwood.

Castellano, Marlene Brant. 2000. *"Updating Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge,"* Indigenous Knowledges in Global Contexts: Multiple Readings of our World. (Eds.) Dei, G.J.S.; Hall, B. L.; Rosenburg, D. G. Toronto: U of T Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1997. *"How Much Difference is Too Much? Black Feminist Thought and the Politics of Postmodern Social Theory,"* Current Perspectives in Social Theory. 17: 3 - 37.

Dei, George J. S., 2000a. *"Towards an Anti-Racist Discursive Framework,"* Power, Knowledge and Anti-Racism Education: A Critical Reader. Dei, G. J.S. & Calliste, A. (Eds.) Halifax: Fernwood.

Dei, George. J. S. 2000b. *"Decolonizing Lecture,"* Indigenous Knowledges and Decolonization: Pedagogical Implications. Unpublished lecture notes. Sociology & Equity Studies Department: OISE/UT.

Dei, George. J. S. 2000c. *"Rethinking the Role of Indigenous Knowledges in the Academy,"* International Journal of Inclusive Education. Vol. 4, No. 2: 111-132.

Dei, George. J. S. 1996. Anti-Racism Education: Theory and Practice. Halifax: Fernwood.

Dei, George J. S. & Asherzadeh, Alimez. 2000. *"The Power of Social Theory: The Anticolonial Discursive Framework,"* Journal of Educational Thought, Vol. 35, No. 3: 297-323.

Dei, George J.S.; Hall, Budd L.; Rosenburg, Dorothy G. 2000. <u>Indigenous Knowledges in Global Contexts: Multiple Readings of our World</u>. Toronto: U of T Press.

Furedy, John; Sullivan, Philip; Kimura, Doreen; & Seligman, Clive. 2003. *"The Moral Bankruptcy of Diversity/Equity Hiring Policies for University Faculty: Empirical, Logical and Ethical Considerations."* Panel Presentation at the Excellence Through Equity: Confronting the Tensions in Universities. March 22, 2003. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Gilchrist, Lori. 1997. *"Aboriginal Communities and Social Sciences Research: Voyeurism in Transition,"* <u>Native Social Work Journal</u>, Vol. 1, No 1: 69-85.

Homes, Leilani. 2000. *"Heart Knowledge, Blood Memory, and the Voice of the Land: Implications of Research among Hawaiian Elders,"* Indigenous Knowledges in Global Contexts: Multiple Readings of our World. (Eds.) Dei, G.J.S.; Hall, B. L.; Rosenburg, D. G. Toronto: U of T Press.

hooks, bell. 1994. <u>Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom</u>. New York: Routledge.

James, C. E. 2001. *"I've Never Had a Black Teaching Before."* In James, C. & Shadd. A. (Eds.) <u>Talking About Identity: Encounters in Race, Ethnicity and Language</u>, Between the Lines: Toronto.

Luther, R., Whitmore, E. & Moreau, B. 2001. <u>Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy</u>. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

Mahmoud, Vanessa M. 1998. *"The Double Binds of Racism."* In Mcgoldrick, Monica. (Ed.) <u>Re-Visioning Family Therapy: Race, Culture and Gender in Clinical Practice</u>. New York: Guilford Press.

Maiter, S., Trocme, N, and Shakir, U. 1999. *"Fabricating tools of resistance."* <u>Proceedings Manual</u>, Qualitative Analysis Conference: The Interdisciplinary Study of Social Process. St Thomas University/University of New Brunswick.

Mohanty, C. T. 1994. *"Under western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourse."* In Patrick Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader. New York: Columbia University Press.

Monture-Angus, Patricia. 2002. *"In the Way of Peace: Confronting 'Whiteness' in the University."* In Luther, R., Whitmore, E. & Moreau, B. (Eds.) <u>Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy</u>. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

Monture-Angus, Patricia. 1995. *"A First Journey in Decolonized Thought: Aboriginal Women and the Application of the Canadian Charter,"* Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks. Halifax: Fernwood.

Ng, Roxana. 1995. *"Teaching Against the Grain,"* Anti-Racism, Feminism & Critical Approaches to Education. (Eds.) Ng, R.; Staton, P.; and Joyce Scane. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

Razack, Narda & Jeffery, Donna. 2002. *"Critical Race Discourse and Tenets for Social Work,"* Canadian Social Work Review, Vol 19, No. 2: 267-271.

Razack, Sherene. 2001. *"Racialized Immigrant Women as Native Informants in the Academy,"* Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy. Rashmi Luther, Elizabeth Whitmore & Bernice Moreau. (Eds.) Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

Razack, Sherene. 1998. Looking White People in the Eye: Gender, Race & Culture in Courtrooms & Classrooms. Toronto: U of T. Press.

Semali, L. M. & Kinchelo, J. L. 1999. *"Introduction: What is Indigenous Knowledge and Why Should We Study It?"* What is Indigenous Knowledge?: Voices from the Academy. New York: Falmer Press.

Swift, K. J. 1995. Manufacturing 'Bad Mothers': A critical perspective on child neglect. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, Linda. 1999. Decolonizing Methodologies: Research & Indigenous Peoples. New York: Zed Books.

Spivak, G. C. 1996. *"Diasporas Old and New: Women in the Transnational World,"* Textual Practice, Vol. 10, No. 2: 245-256.

St. Lewis, Joanne. 2001. *"In the Belly of the Beast,"* Seen But Not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy. Rashmi Luther, Elizabeth Whitmore & Bernice Moreau. (Eds.) Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

van Dijk, T. A. 1993. Elite discourse and racism. Newberry Park: Sage.

Wane, Njoki. 2000. *"Indigenous Knowledge: Lessons from the Elders B A Kenyan Case Study,"* Indigenous Knowledges in Global Contexts: Multiple Readings of our World. (Eds.) Dei, G.J.S.; Hall, B. L.; Rosenburg, D. G. Toronto: U of T Press.

Waterfall, Barbara. 2003. *"Native People and the Social Work Profession: A Critical Analysis of Colonizing Problematics and the Development of Decolonized Thought."* Canadian Social Policy: Issues and Perspectives. (Ed.) Westhues, A. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press.