Centering and Transforming Relationships with Indigenous Peoples:

A Framework for Settler Responsibility and Accountability

by

Lilian Kong

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved October 2020 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

K. Tsianina Lomawaima, Chair
Beth Blue Swadener
H. L. T. Quan

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2020

ABSTRACT

What are possibilities for transforming the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers? Research conversations among a set of project partners (Indigenous and settler pairs)—who reside in the Phoenix metro area, Arizona or on O'ahu, Hawai'i—addressed what good relationships look like and how to move the structural relationship towards those characteristics. Participants agreed that developing shared understandings is foundational to transforming the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers; that Indigenous values systems should guide a process of transforming relationships; and that settlers must consider their position in relation to Indigenous peoples because position informs responsibility. The proposed framework for settler responsibility is based on the research design and findings, and addresses structural and individual level transformation. The framework suggests that structural-level settler responsibility entails helping to transform the structural relationship and that the settler role involves a settler transformation process parallel to Indigenous resurgence. On an individual level, personal relationships determine appropriate responsibilities, and the framework includes a suggested process between Indigenous persons and settlers for uncovering what these responsibilities are. The study included a trial of the suggested process, which includes four methods: (1) developing shared understandings of terms/concepts through discussion, (2) gathering stories about who participants are in relationship to each other, (3) examining existing daily practices that gesture to a different structural relationship, and (4) using creative processes to imagine structural relationships in a shared world beyond settler colonialism. These methods explore what possibilities unfold when settlers center their relationship with Indigenous peoples.

i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Responsibility can decenter the one who possesses it—it puts them in relationship to another. Instead of land, dominance, or Indigenous identity, imagine if the settler sought to possess responsibility. How would the current structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers change? This research explores the possibility of transforming the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers. For the study, I gathered a group of Indigenous persons and settlers—who reside in the Phoenix metro area, Arizona or on O'ahu, Hawai'i—to have conversations about what good relationships look like and how to move the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers towards those characteristics. Guiding questions for this research include: (1) what is settler responsibility and what does it entail? and (2) if we imagine a shared world beyond settler colonialism, what might structural relationships between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous people look like? Through these questions, I hope to gather specific ways that settlers may aid in decolonization, and I also aim to address the connection between structural and individual transformation. Based on the research design and the findings, I propose a framework that addresses settler responsibility on a structural and individual level. I suggest that structural-level settler responsibility entails helping to transform the structural relationship and that the settler role involves a settler transformation process parallel to Indigenous resurgence. On an individual level, personal relationships determine appropriate responsibilities, and the framework includes a suggested process between Indigenous persons and settlers for uncovering what these responsibilities are.

Several themes emerged from the study. Participants underscored that having shared understandings, especially of values, is foundational to having shared expectations for relationships because shared expectations for relationships inform roles, responsibilities, and accountability. Therefore, developing shared understandings is foundational to transforming the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers. All Indigenous participants agreed that the idea of Indigenous peoples as "host" and settlers as "guest" is an inappropriate model for a structural relationship because the burden is on the host; the relationship would not be equitable in terms of responsibility. The discussions illustrate that because of specificity and diverse contexts, finding a model for a "good" structural relationship might not even be the right goal or question. Because relationships depend on values and the practice of those values, the transformed structural relationship would depend on which Indigenous people is involved, what their value system is, and what they want and need. Having a one-size-fits-all model to dictate all structural relationships would contradict the specificity of Indigenous value systems. Finally, participants indicated that it is important for settlers to consider position and positionality in relation to Indigenous peoples because position informs responsibility. They describe how settlers should (1) privilege and honor Indigenous peoples' genealogical relationship to land over settler desires and settler relationships to the land, (2) support and adhere to Indigenous structures of relationship and kinship, (3) take a supporting or team member role, and (4) constantly reflect on whether a certain responsibility is appropriate for their position. While these themes are specific to the participants of this study, they begin to point to potential components of a settler transformation praxis.

Organization of Thesis

Following this organizational section, I discuss implications of the study for decolonizing pedagogies and social pedagogy, and at the end of this Introduction chapter I state my positionality. Chapter Two describes the study and begins by reviewing literature from the three areas of scholarship—decolonizing methodologies, critical participatory action research, and Indigenous epistemologies—that inform the methodology for the study and suggested process. Following the methodology is an overview of the study, which includes recruitment methods, participant vignettes, procedures, research design iterations, methods of analysis, and limitations for the study. The rest of the chapter covers the findings.

Based on the research design and findings, I propose a framework for settler responsibility. The framework assumes that awareness and ideological support are prerequisites, not the goal, for settler responsibility. Chapter Three highlights the following prerequisites and reviews the related literature: understanding of the current structural relationship, support of Indigenous sovereignty, and willingness to aid in decolonization. Wilkins and Lomawaima (2001, 5) identify that the current structural relationship "is an ongoing contest over sovereignty." Settler colonialism is the "structure not an event" that imposes this contest over sovereignty, seeking land and requiring the elimination of Indigenous peoples (Wolfe 2006, 402). In this chapter, I suggest that we think of "settler" as a status, or a structural position in relation to Indigenous peoples, rather than an identity. Thinking of "settler" as a status or a structural position instead of an identity may help refocus settler priorities towards accountability.

3

Chapters Four and Five introduce the framework, which addresses settler responsibility on a structural level and at the individual level. In Chapter Four I propose that structural level settler responsibility entails helping to transform the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers. Indigenous resurgence could be considered Indigenous peoples' role in this structural transformation, and I suggest that the settler role involves a settler transformation process parallel to Indigenous resurgence. I use "settler transformation" to refer to the structural transformation of the position of "settler," not individual level transformation. However, "settler transformation praxis" can describe individual level practices and processes aimed at reconceptualizing position in relationship to Indigenous peoples and actualizing structural transformation. The concept of settler transformation praxis extends Anthony-Stevens's (2017, 99) "on-the-ground, everyday praxis of supporting Indigenous projects of [...] sovereignty" and could be considered a parallel to Corntassel et al.'s (2018) "everyday acts of resurgence."

On an individual level, personal and community relationships determine appropriate responsibilities, and Chapter Five lays out a suggested process between Indigenous persons and settlers for uncovering what these responsibilities are. The study included a trial of the process, which includes four methods: (1) developing shared meanings and understandings of terms/concepts through discussion, (2) gathering stories about who we are in relationship to each other, (3) examining existing daily practices in individual relationships that gesture to a different structural relationship, and (4) using creative processes to imagine structural relationships in a shared world beyond settler colonialism. The methods are based on Carter, Recollet, and Robinson's (2017) "project of reworlding"; examples of decolonial, anticapitalist, antiracist, feminist praxis compiled

in Mohanty and Carty's (2018) *Feminist Freedom Warriors*; and Corntassel et al.'s (2018) *Everyday Acts of Resurgence*. All the methods, except for the creative method, were used in the study and I revised all methods, including the creative method, based on participants' contributions. The creative method focuses on a spatial and genealogical Indigenous futurity, rather than a temporal Western futurity, and is grounded in hope. I had planned a creative process as an optional reflection activity after discussions; however, all participants opted out due to the significant amount of time and effort already contributed. Instead of using creative processes as a reflection tool only, I recommend that they are incorporated from the beginning to foster imagination and to help participants think in different ways. I asked my co-facilitator for the group sessions to try the revised creative method with me, and I share the creation as an example.

Implications for Decolonizing Pedagogies and Social Pedagogy

With the high visibility of recent Indigenous "protectivism" movements (Laden 2020), the idea of having a different kind of relationship with Indigenous peoples has begun to percolate in the American public imagination. However, Indigenous activists and scholars have critiqued allyship's and solidarity's inability to dethrone the settler ego (Indigenous Action Media 2014). Current studies by settler scholars on settler solidarity mostly focus on "transforming settler consciousness" to support Indigenous sovereignty (Davis, Hiller, et al. 2017, 400), on what decolonization means for settlers, or on traits of "good" allies.[1] Many of these studies persist in centering settler needs and interests.

---

1. See: Brubacher 2008; Chazan 2019; Davis, Denis, and Sinclair 2017; Laden 2020. I use Davis, Hiller, et al.'s (2017) phrase "transforming settler consciousness"; however, for this study, I define it differently than they do. I use the phrase to mean shifting of perspective or gaining awareness without any substantial action. I share Davis, Hiller, et al.'s definition in Chapter Three and propose that a more appropriate name for their set of definitions is settler transformation praxis.

Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel (2014, 9,10) point out, "Indigenous peoples and issues are de-centred in settler colonial studies […] in these works, the work and resistance of Indigenous peoples is overshadowed." Sepulveda (2018, 55) makes the same critique, adding that "it is rare for works within the field of Settler Colonial Studies to ask the Indigenous peoples how they view and understand non-natives on their lands." A process of transforming the structural relationship, however, requires settlers to center personal relationships to Indigenous persons and communities. This study intentionally centers "Indigenous peoples' own articulations of Indigenous-settler relations" (Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel 2014, 26), by grounding the project's methodology in Indigenous scholarship, by constructing the research design with Indigenous colleagues with whom I have a relationship, and by foregrounding Indigenous perspectives and contributions in the knowledge creation process. This research makes a commitment to processes of decolonization, as the driving force for structural transformation, and the proposed methods in this study may be useful for decolonizing pedagogies. A comparison of Grande's (2004) "Red pedagogy," Goodyear-Ka'ōpua's (2013, 6) "sovereign pedagogies," Deloria Jr.'s and Wildcat's (2001, vii) concept of "indigenization," and a process that Battiste and Henderson (2009) call "Naturalizing Indigenous Knowledge" shows five main characteristics of decolonizing pedagogies: (1) a goal of Indigenous self-determination and sovereignty; (2) building power within Indigenous students and community; (3) critique and transformation of settler colonial structures; (4) narratives of "survivance" (Vizenor 2008, 1); and (5) centering Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies. The proposed methods described in Chapter Five directly address these five components of a decolonizing pedagogy.

While the priority of this research is aiding in decolonization and contributing potential methods for decolonizing pedagogies, the proposed methods in this study are also applicable for social pedagogy because they focus on relationship-based learning. Schugurensky and Silver (2013, 2) describe social pedagogy as "an interdisciplinary academic field of inquiry and a field of practice that is situated in the intersection of three areas of human activity: education, social work and community development." Schugurensky (2014, 369-370) identifies four main themes of social pedagogy, which: (1) is concerned with "providing educational solutions to social problems," (2) entails lifelong learning that is not limited to just schooling, (3) uses a "humanistic and holistic approach that pays attention to the whole person," and (4) is "not a mere set of specific methods and techniques" and has foundational theory and a "normative framework." Stephens (2013, 58) offers a working definition for social pedagogy: "the social scientific study of planned and impromptu socialization via the social learning and the emotional internalization of values and norms." Stephens emphasizes that "planned socialization" must address the following: how to "enable perceived self- and group efficacy," dialogue between the social pedagogue and learners to decide on appropriate actions, and for the social pedagogue to know when "to step back" (58). Stephens's definition raises questions of which values and norms and who gets to decide? Participants' discussion about values addresses these questions. The proposed methods in this research focus heavily on dialogue to determine appropriate actions. Participants' discussions also indicate that settlers should consider when to step back, and these discussions may provide insights for social pedagogues and their position or role. Since all participants in

the study are educators in some form, both within and outside of schooling, their conversations highlight the role of education in social transformation.

In comparing the origins, tensions, and goals of social pedagogy and decolonizing pedagogy, one can find many similarities showing that, as a Western field, social pedagogy can learn a lot from decolonizing pedagogies. Looking at the origins of social pedagogy and decolonizing pedagogy, we find that they are responses to modernization/capitalism and imperialism/colonialism respectively (Jensen 2016; Smith 2012). While a decolonizing pedagogy is a response *in resistance* to colonialism (Grande 2004; Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2013; Deloria Jr. and Wildcat 2001; Battiste and Henderson 2009), currently social pedagogy is viewed as just a response—not inherently in resistance—causing tension within the field about its use for both social control and social transformation (Schugurensky and Silver 2013, 3). Both social pedagogy and American Indian/Native American studies share the struggle of gaining recognition within Western academia as a legitimate discipline when they are fighting against oppressive ideologies that Western academia seeks to uphold (Champagne 2007; Kidwell 2009; Schugurensky and Silver 2013; Weaver 2007). However, instead of framing the struggle around recognition, Smith's (2012) decolonizing methodologies and Mertens's (2007) transformative paradigm help us reframe the struggle to one around power and undermining the institution from within. Social pedagogy and decolonizing pedagogy share a similar goal of moving toward a social reality where "they would no longer be needed" (Schugurensky and Silver 2013, 5). This goal of rendering themselves unnecessary means that a part of their purpose is to resist and help dismantle the structures of modernization, capitalism, and colonialism that make them necessary.

Therefore, I argue that the tension between social control and social transformation is a false one, and that all social pedagogy should be social *justice* pedagogy. While German social pedagogy theorists of the late 19th century may not have realized (and probably would not have acknowledged) that the "Gemeinshaft" or "small community model" (Schugurensky and Silver 2013, 5) they sought already existed in Indigenous communities, social pedagogues of today still have the potential to build solidarity and capacity with Indigenous researchers, scholars, and educators. With connected origins, similar tensions, and aligned goals, social pedagogy and decolonizing pedagogy can learn from each other about methods that work and visions to strive for.

Positionality

I am Han Taiwanese, second generation in diaspora, and therefore a second-generation settler on this land.[2] My mother is Han born in Taiwan and my father is Han born in Indonesia. I recognize that Taiwan itself is a settler state. I currently reside on occupied Akimel O'odham and Xalychidom Piipaash homelands. My co-facilitator for the study and partner Waquin Preston is Diné—he is Tótsohníí (Big Water), born for Naakétł'áhí (Flat Foot People-Pima), his chei is Tł 'ízí lání (Many Goats), his nali is Tódich'ii'nii (Bitter Water).

This project grows out of my goal to answer the following question: How can I be a better ally/accomplice to Indigenous peoples fighting for their self-determination and

---

2. I refer to the land recognized by settlers as North America as "this land" or "the Land". Although "Turtle Island" is commonly used, it is rooted in Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe ontologies, and my responsibilities and relationships are to Diné, O'odham, Piipaash, Ndee, and other Indigenous peoples in what is recognized by settlers as the Southwest.

sovereignty?[3] Through the process of doing this project, I continued growing my relationships with Indigenous friends and colleagues, and also strategically positioned their experience and knowledge as expert. I also co-created knowledge with non-Indigenous friends and colleagues, who are also committed to supporting Indigenous struggles for self-determination and sovereignty, about how we can become better allies/accomplices. This project is my attempt at "doing the work" of learning how to be a better ally/accomplice, instead of expecting "hand-holding" and the work to be done for me (Indigenous Action Media 2014).

3. I thank Dontá McGilvery for introducing me to the concept of "accomplice."

CHAPTER 2

THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to explore what possibilities unfold when settler center their relationships with Indigenous peoples. In this chapter, I describe the areas of scholarship that inform the methodology of the study, give an overview of the study, and describe the findings. The study's methodology centers Indigenous peoples while also recognizing the historical and ongoing use of research as a tool of colonialism. Drawing on Indigenous epistemologies, which focus on relationship-based knowledge creation, I recruited participants through relationship-based, purposive sampling methods. I recruited people with whom I already have a relationship with, and they nominated their project partner. Participants were recruited in pairs with one Indigenous person and one settler person in each pair, and the study privileges the knowledges and perspectives of two Diné (Navajo) participants and two Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) participants. The "Project Partner Vignettes" describe each pair's relationship and background. Participants were involved in four discussions, which included the following topics: what good relationships look like, how to grow and maintain those relationships, personal stories about identity and relationship to project partner, responsibilities/roles, and transforming the structural relationship. In the "Research Design Iterations" section I describe my process of navigating accountability as a settler engaged in research. In the "Limitations" section, I describe the constraints of the project that limited the possibilities that could emerge; however, participants' insightful and meaningful contributions gesture to the potential of the methods. In the "Findings" section, I describe major themes that emerged from the conversations. Participants identified that developing shared

11

understandings is foundational to transforming the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers; that Indigenous values systems should guide a process of transforming relationships; and that settlers must consider their position in relation to Indigenous peoples because position informs responsibility.

Methodology

Three areas of scholarship inform the methodology for the study: (1) decolonizing methodologies, (2) critical participatory action research, and (3) Indigenous epistemologies. These three areas of scholarship uncover specific ways to center Indigenous peoples within a research context, as well as markers for a research design that centers settler interests.

Decolonizing Methodologies

In *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Smith (2012) accounts the historical and ongoing use of research as a tool of colonialism against Indigenous peoples. They also lay the groundwork for ways Indigenous researchers and communities can restructure research to actually benefit Indigenous peoples. Smith identified components of Western research including (1) gaze, or "research through imperial eyes," which objectifies Indigenous peoples, erasing and reconstructing their identities through a Western lens; and (2) Western epistemology which discounts non-Western epistemologies and "assumes that Western ideas about the most fundamental things are the only ideas possible to hold […] which can make sense of the world, of reality, of social life and of human beings" (58). They detail how the West ignores Indigenous knowledge contributions, deems Indigenous knowledge invalid, or commodifies Indigenous knowledge in order to appropriate and consume it (63). Both Western, imperial gaze and Western epistemology

are used to justify the colonization of Indigenous peoples and "ensure that Western interests remain dominant" (49). Smith reveals that these components (and potentially *all* aspects) of the West and modernity are inherently hegemonic, racist (47), and "constantly reaffirms the West's view of itself as the centre of legitimate knowledge, the arbiter of what counts as knowledge and the source of 'civilized knowledge'" (58).

In identifying Western gaze and epistemology as components of a colonizing methodology, Smith reveals potential components of a decolonizing methodology, which has a "goal of self determination of indigenous [sic] peoples" (120). Indigenous scholars have done research that "reverses the gaze", in which they gaze upon settlers and/or employ "ethnographic refusal," refusing to write about certain things in order to protect Indigenous communities (Simpson 2007) or refusal to do research on Indigenous communities at all (TallBear 2013). Some studies by settler researchers also seek to "reverse the gaze," turning it away from Indigenous peoples and back towards fellow settlers.[4] However, both Indigenous and other settler scholars have problematized such research for a couple reasons. First, current studies by settler scholars on settler solidarity mostly focus on transforming settler consciousness to support Indigenous sovereignty, on what decolonization means for settlers, or on traits of "good" allies. Many of these studies still center settler needs and interests, and decenter Indigenous peoples (Sepulveda 2018, 55; Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel 2014; 9-10). Tuck and Yang (2012, 35) assert:

> questions of what will decolonization look like? [...] What will be the
> consequences of decolonization for the settler? [...] need not, and perhaps
> cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework.

---

4. See: Ch. 1, n. 1, page 5.

> [...] decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions -
> decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity.
> Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity.

While decolonization is "not accountable to settlers," settlers are still accountable to Indigenous peoples and decolonization. Instead of asking what decolonization means for ourselves, settler scholarship around decolonization may be more useful if it asks: what do settlers need to do to help decolonization? and also, "when to 'step up' or 'step aside'" (Anthony-Stevens 2017, 95).

A second problem with settler scholarship that "reverses the gaze" is that the direction of the gaze does not account for the fact that settlers still interpret through a settler lens. Whatever the reason for excluding Indigenous individuals as participants— i.e. not wanting to make Indigenous people research subjects or not wanting to burden Indigenous people—doing so still has the effect of excluding Indigenous voices and perspectives, especially when they are not consulted for the research design. Since this study is focused on transforming relationships, Indigenous people's participation is necessary, and as much as possible, the processes were co-constructed with Indigenous colleagues. Stirling's (2015) "Decolonize This" is an example of settler research on decolonization where the research design includes both Indigenous and settler participants and foregrounds the Indigenous participants' perspectives. Stirling interviews participants in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the U.S., and Canada about their perspectives on decolonization, including "the role of nonindigenous people in decolonization" (17). While Stirling's research "is underpinned by decolonizing and Indigenous methodologies" (138), the research design does not address the researcher's gaze and structural power, as both a settler and a member of a Western academic institution.

Measures taken to address gaze and power for this research are described in the "Critical Participatory Action Research" section below.

Critical Participatory Action Research

Michelle Fine (2018), who was influenced by Smith's (2012) *Decolonizing Methodologies*, illustrates how critical participatory action research is a way for the academic—considered the expert, elite in Western societies—to redirect power to marginalized communities. Together, the community with the academic can challenge hegemony by (1) reversing the gaze or "line of vision" as Fine calls it, (2) engaging in critical co-creation of knowledge, and (3) deciding how to use that knowledge and with whom to share it (80). Romero's (1994) "The Keres Study" and Romero-Little, Sims, and Romero's (2013) "Revisiting the Keres Study" are examples of Indigenous-centered, critical participatory research projects that have been impactful, decolonizing tools for building agency within Keresan Pueblo communities.

Drawing on critical participatory action research, this project positions participants as co-researchers. This project also positions Indigenous participants as experts and consultants in five ways: (1) Indigenous colleagues assessed the project proposal's validity; (2) Indigenous colleagues co-created the research design; (3) Indigenous colleagues nominated settler participants; (4) the purpose and topic of the group discussions positioned Indigenous participants as the experts/knowledge holders, and (5) I shared and asked for feedback on my analysis of the process, since I am interpreting through a settler lens.

Indigenous Epistemologies

Indigenous scholars have shown that a decolonizing methodology centers Indigenous epistemologies, including what counts as knowledge and methods of sharing knowledge (Battiste and Henderson 2009; Deloria Jr. and Wildcat 2001; Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2013; Grande 2004). Indigenous scholars have also articulated that relationships are the focus of Indigenous epistemologies (Barnhardt and Kawagley 2005; Battiste and Henderson 2009; Cajete 1994; Cajete 2015; Castagno and Brayboy 2008; Deloria Jr. and Wildcat 2001) and how Indigenous curricula are based on communal, story-centered pedagogy (Basso 1996; Brayboy 2005; Barnhardt and Kawagley 2005; Battiste and Henderson 2009; Cajete 1994; Cajete 2015; Deloria Jr. and Wildcat 2001). This project attempts to center Indigenous epistemologies by using oral storytelling as the main form of knowledge construction and sharing. Acknowledging the importance of relationship in Indigenous epistemologies, I recruited participants through relationship-based, purposive sampling, similar to Stirling's (2015, 153) recruitment "through personal contacts and social networks." I also foreground relationship-based knowledge creation in order to take up "unresolved tensions" within Stirling's research:

> Decolonization is achieved by changing relationships between settlers and Indigenous People, and by changing the ideologies that have allowed for the abuse of power and exploitation of Indigenous resources. However, there remain unresolved tensions in this dissertation as no matter how much individuals seek to decolonize themselves, settler-colonial societies remain solidly based in colonialism and colonial systems of exploitation. (373)

This research takes up the "unresolved tensions" of individual versus structural transformation and Indigenous-settler relations. Stirling's interview questions focus on participants' perspective on decolonization, but do not explicitly address structural

16

transformation (405-407). In this study, discussion prompts ask participants directly about transforming structural relationships. To address Indigenous-settler relations and to focus on relationship-based knowledge creation, the study procedures are designed around project partner pairs—one Indigenous person and one settler person in each pair—who know each other prior to the study.

<div align="center">Study Overview</div>

Recruitment Methods

I recruited seven participants using the following criteria:

- The participant is someone I know personally, or is nominated by someone I know.

- The participant is an adult, age 18 or older.

- The participant lives in either Arizona or Hawai'i, off of federally recognized Tribal Lands.[5]

- For non-Indigenous participants: The participant has expressed a commitment to supporting Indigenous self-determination and sovereignty in the work that they do.

- For Indigenous participants: The participant's work is related to Indigenous self-determination/sovereignty, decolonization, and/or Indigenous resurgence.

Participants were recruited in pairs with one Indigenous participant and one settler participant in each pair. I recruited Indigenous and settler individuals whom I know and asked them to nominate the person they would like to work with in this project. For the project, I acted as both a facilitator and a participant. Three of the recruited participants reside in Phoenix metro area, Arizona and four of the participants reside on O'ahu,

---

5. All lands of Arizona, Hawai'i, and the broader U.S. are Indigenous or Tribal lands, but I made this distinction to accommodate IRB rules.

Hawai'i. Due to the geographic spread of participants and the constraints imposed by COVID-19, all communication and meetings took place through digital means.

Project Partner Vignettes

Recognizing the importance of story in Indigenous epistemologies, I present vignettes of each project partner pair. Western qualitative research would call this "narrative inquiry" or "narrative description," which "documents the research experience as story, in its traditional literary sense" (Saldaña 2001, 127).[6]

Daniel R. J. Kapalikūokalani Maile and Chai Blair-Stahn

They both pause and Kapalikū lets out a laughing breath, "It's been 10 years." Joy floats off of their words as they reminisce about Friday 'awa sessions and 'ukulele jams, sharing food and stories, dances. Kapalikū and Chai were in the same cohort at the Center for Pacific Island Studies at University of Hawai'i, and were pulled together through mutual interests and the community-building and relationship-building emphasis of the program. As they have developed into their roles in the community, they have maintained a strong friendship. Kapalikū has been an educator at the Bishop Museum in Kalihi, Hawai'i for the past five years, where he reconnects people of all ages to Hawaiian history and culture. As a craftsperson, Kapalikū strengthens his connection to his Kanaka 'Ōiwi (Native Hawaiian) identity by "look[ing] at the physical history of my ancestors [...] then try to come to terms with that, by making those things, not always copying those things but trying to understand the shape, the form, the smell, the feel of wood or bone or stone" (session 2). Chai is a lecturer in Pacific Islands Studies at Leeward Community

---

6. In the following sections, pronouns used were specified by the participants.

College in Pearl City, Hawai'i as well as an environmental educator at the Hawai'i Nature Center in Makiki, Hawai'i. As a practitioner of hula, Chai expresses a deep commitment to the practice and to the revitalization of the Native Hawaiian people and culture. Kapalikū describes how Chai "is able to eloquently and graciously help people to understand" issues that are important in Hawai'i.

Summer Maunakea and TY (pseudonym)

"I don't even remember," both say in unison. Summer and TY piece together the circumstances that they met, and are able to pin down that they were connected through food and 'āina [land] education work. They have known each other for five or six years, but it's the kind of friendship where it feels like they've known each other forever. Summer is an Assistant Professor of Native Hawaiian and Indigenous Education and Leadership at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, and also works for the Kōkua Hawai'i Foundation, which supports environmental education in the schools and communities of Hawai'i. TY coordinates a university's student garden, which is a part of a program focused on community food systems, and leads a wide range of community learning experiences from growing and making food to making plant medicines. Their relationship is an epitome of reciprocity; TY describes how "Summer's taught me a lot about when we do hands-on, experiential learning are working with people to strengthen all of our connections with each other and with 'āina, [...] bringing more Hawaiian values into that perspective." Summer reflects, "I feel like TY, she gives so much, and she works the 'āina, and she teaches. And she's done exactly what this 'Ōlelo No'eau ["He malihini no ka lā ho'okahi"] has said to do, without even being told, this is how you live. It's within her."

Mandy Singer (pseudonym) and Alyssa Smith (pseudonym)

"When I first met Alyssa three years ago, I didn't know if I told you this Alyssa, but I thought she was Native because she had so much knowledge about Indigenous plants and Indigenous foods." Alyssa gives a surprised laugh, "I hope I don't come across that I'm-" "No, it's just that you have so much knowledge." Mandy and Alyssa are coworkers at a Native-led organization in the Phoenix metro area. The program, which both are a part of and which Mandy coordinates, focuses on community education to promote wellness among the urban American Indian community. Mandy grew up in the southern region of Navajo Nation, and her identity as a Navajo woman is the foundation for her approach to bettering her community and her work in food sovereignty. Alyssa has lived in Arizona for the past twenty years, and sees her role as uplifting Indigenous communities and helping to build connections. Mandy describes their relationship as a "good working relationship and a good friendship," and appreciates Alyssa's commitment and humbleness in learning. Alyssa appreciates Mandy's ability to cultivate open communication as a manager and also her willingness to listen.

Rena Tsosie (pseudonym) and Lilian Kong

Rena and Lilian were coworkers for a school district in Phoenix, Arizona, where Rena is the coordinator of the district's Native American Program. At the time Lilian was leading garden education for one of the elementary schools in the district and connected with Rena to discuss food- and garden-based learning experiences tailored for Indigenous students. They soon began to collaborate and coordinated culture-based events for Native students and their families, including family cooking nights focused on traditional foods, Indigenous dance workshops, a regalia fashion show, and more. Rena was motivated to

become an educator to help prevent Indigenous students from being trapped into the school-to-prison pipeline. Lilian's motivation is to prevent BIPOC and LGBTQ children from feeling Othered and for them to be proud and grounded in who they are.

Procedures

The project took place from June to August 2020, and each participant was involved in four discussions. I follow Stirling's (2015) use of both interviews and focus groups, but procedures are designed around project partner pairs, focusing on relationship-based knowledge creation and learning. Three of the sessions, up to 1.5 hours long each, took place via the video conference platform Zoom. There was also an "on your own session" between project partners, who decided on format and length of the conversation. General content and format of each session are as follows:

- 1st session – Group discussion
    - o I shared the research design with participants and gathered input about the process.
    - o Icebreaker activity based on Jack Gray's "Movement for Joy" Workshops.
    - o Discussion on what good relationships look like, how to grow and maintain those relationships.
- 2nd session – Project partner stories
    - o I interviewed project partners as a duo about their personal stories (self-identification, family background/cultural heritage, and relationship to project partner, etc.).
- 3rd session – Project partner "on you own" reflection

- o Project partners had their own conversation without me present. I

    provided a list of optional guiding questions about responsibilities, roles,

    and transforming the structural relationship.

  - o Length of time and format of the conversation were up to the participants.

  - o Project partners decided on how to report back about their conversation

    (i.e. sharing a recording, taking notes, verbal report back to group).

- • 4th session – Group discussion

  - o Each project partner pair shared back to the whole group about their

    conversations.

  - o Introduced optional creative process prompt – project partners can make a

    collaborative creation that is an expression of the conversations and their

    process of thinking through these ideas and intentions. However, all

    participants opted out.

I do not describe the methods in this section because they were heavily revised based on

participants' contributions and because they are a part of the framework for settler

responsibility. Instead, I present the methods in Chapter Five where I review the literature

that informs the methods and describe each method in detail.

Research Design Iterations

The research design went through four significant shifts. For the initial research

design, I intended to gather stories from community-identified (not self-identified) allies

or accomplices of Indigenous communities, with the hope that these stories could then

serve as models for other settlers. Because I ultimately wanted to address structural

transformation, not just individual transformation, I shifted the research design. In the

next iteration, I planned on extending Sepulveda's (2018) theory of *Kuuyam*, or guest, and seeing what can emerge when settlers enact a position of guest.[7] Through the study I hoped to contribute to the theory, which Sepulveda mentions is "in its early stages of theorization" (55). Because of Smith's (2012) account of how research has been used to exploit Indigenous peoples, I did not want to position Indigenous persons as research subjects. While I planned on consulting Indigenous colleagues and mentors for input throughout the research process, the first two research design iterations did not include Indigenous persons as study participants. Instead, the research design sought to "reverse the gaze" back on to fellow settlers. My committee chair and mentor, Professor Lomawaima, suggested that since the research addresses relationships between Indigenous peoples and settlers, a more just and appropriate research design would include Indigenous participants. Professor Lomawaima pointed out that not wanting to position Indigenous persons as research subjects can cross the fine line into excluding Indigenous voices and decentering Indigenous peoples. The second major shift in the research design was to include both Indigenous and settler participants.

The third shift came after initial IRB approval. As I was recruiting, I shared the project proposals with potential participants and Chai Blair-Stahn suggested that the research design was too structured. I shifted the research design to be more open-ended, allowing for more possibilities, rather than enacting a pre-determined model. At this point, my goal was still to find a model for a transformed structural relationship that we can work toward. After Indigenous participants unanimously responded that host/guest is an inappropriate model, I shifted the goal of the study. The fourth major shift was to

---

7. I italicize *Kuuyam*, as Sepulveda does.

focus on processes for transformation during analysis, instead of finding a specific model or an end goal.

Analysis

For the study, I focused on thematic analysis with some attention to interactional analysis, using transcripts of the recorded Zoom sessions and notes. For thematic analysis, I used Constant Comparison Analysis (Onwuegbuzie et al. 2009, 5), where I developed data-driven codes (DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall, and McCulloch 2011); conducted first cycle, or open coding (Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña 2014, 71; Onwuegbuzie et al. 2009, 5); and followed up with second cycle or axial coding (Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña 2014, 86; Onwuegbuzie et al. 2009, 5). For the coding, I primarily used descriptive coding, in which a noun is used to summarize the topic, and values coding which "identifies the values, attitudes, and beliefs of a participant" (Saldaña 2001, 104, 105). For interactional analysis, I considered the amount of a participant's speaking time compared to other participants, level of consensus on certain topics, and non-verbal communication, paying attention to dissenting voices, silences, or discomfort. For both thematic and interactional analysis, I considered participants' reactions, comments, and feedback on the project process itself.

Limitations

While this study focuses on possibilities that can unfold when settlers center their relationships with Indigenous peoples, the institutional constraints of research for a master's thesis limited the possibilities that could emerge. This research consulted Indigenous mentors from the beginning; however, more just research would be co-

constructed, serving the goal of a specific Indigenous person or community. A short and

rigid timeline forced participants into a highly structured and fast-paced process, which

left out room for daydreaming, deep reflection, and relationship-building. Due to the

geographic spread of participants and constraints imposed by COVID-19, the study was

conducted entirely through video-conferencing, limiting non-verbal communication.

Analysis was conducted through Western academic methods of making meaning. While

analyses were shared with participants and Indigenous mentors and colleagues, the

findings are still presented through a settler lens. The presented themes emerge from a

very specific group of adults in their late twenties to early forties, highly educated within

Western institutions, with access to internet, who are educators themselves in some form,

the majority focused on Indigenous food sovereignty and land-centered pedagogy.

Specificity is important, as participants identified, but broader diversity of voices may

open even more possibilities. Despite the limitations, participants' amazing contributions

gesture to the potential of these methods.

<div align="center">Findings</div>

In this section, I will highlight emerging themes from the discussions that took

place for the study.[8] These themes are meanings that arose for this set of seven people.

Given the small sample size, these findings should not be considered representative of

any larger group of people or context. Rena gives a reminder, "just know that I don't

speak for all Diné people, or all Navajo people, because we're all different. This day in

age we're all different, every relationship this day in age looks totally different than it did

---

8. The amount I quote people is not necessarily a reflection of my preference to an individual's ideas, but may be proportional to how much they spoke in the discussions.

before" (session 3). Kapalikū notes, "I'll say O'ahu because I grew up on O'ahu. I don't want to speak for the other islands cause they do things differently" (session 2). While these themes are specific to the participants of this study, they begin to point to potential components of a settler transformation praxis.

Types of Relationships and Qualities of Good Relationships

In response to the question "How would you describe good relationships?" the group thought it important to first identify the types of relationships we are accountable to, before describing qualities of good relationships (session 1). Participants repeatedly stressed the importance of non-human relations, including place/land/natural world and ancestors, future generations, and spiritual relationships. Rena said, "Diné people believe our first relationship is with our Mother Earth" (session 1). In describing the Diné principle hózhó, Mandy added, "And it's not just between people, it's between animals, non-humans, my culture, my spiritual beliefs, it really encompasses it all" (session 2). Kapalikū further stresses that non-human relations are not static, passive objects, but active participants in a relationship:

> you have pilina to certain places, [...] Summer was mentioning Waipahu [...] So she's living in Waipahu, but she's also of Waipahu, from Waipahu, Waipahu can claim a relationship to her. And there are different ways to understand that from a language perspective in Hawaiian (session 1).

The group also identified relationships based on level of closeness (from close to stranger) and scale (individual, community, structural), and identified actions, values, and role/position as things that influence relationships. For this group, good relationships are: (1) two-way, with all parties reciprocating, putting energy in, and collaborating; (2) living, active, fluid, dynamic, and (3) continuing, indicating long-term commitment.

Participants repeatedly referenced giving and receiving as actions that grow and maintain relationships. Giving care, energy, or support was mentioned the most, and participants also mentioned the giving of knowledge, time, material things, food, gifts, handmade objects, etc. The group mentioned other actions for growing and maintaining relationships including communication, reflection, managing responsibilities, celebrations/socializing, and acknowledgement.

Importance of Defining Terms - Example: "Settler"

A topic that resurfaced throughout the discussions was use of the term "settler." Though I define "settler" for the context of this study in Chapter Three, I did not set a definition for the group beforehand, not wanting to impose meanings. Five out of the seven participants questioned, at one point or another, the use of the term "settler" for the project, and for two of those participants, their stance on use of the term shifted over the course of the discussions. At the end of the first group discussion, Summer shares:

> I have a thought on the overall concept of Indigenous and settler relationships. I am ok with that construct if it's in its abstract, but [...] I don't view TY- we have a family relationship, we're sisters. I'm there for her, she's there for me. And I could never look her in the eye and say, "I consider you a settler." That's just not within me because she's family. But I can look back in history and say, the people that came over and are still perpetuating injustice, yeah I'll call you a settler, I'll call you a settler colonialist, and I'm happy to do that. And so it's just like a- I wouldn't say a critique, but when you look at it, if you're truly living from value systems of 'ohana and aloha, then I'm almost uncomfortable with that term being associated with my dear sister and tita, TY.

Kapalikū agreed with this idea in the first session, but during his and Chai's second session, he clarified that it is important to differentiate the structural relationship from individual relationships:

maybe it was designed specifically this way, but we weren't looking at them time with the large group at definition for "what is a settler." Like how do we actually define "settler"? Do you consider your partner a settler? And I think if that was by design, I think it brought up the emotive factor first, which is like, "Oh well I'm not using all those potential negative connotations to think about my partner, my friends, my 'ohana." [...] But if we talk about it in the broadest of terms, without talking about the personal connections that we have to each other, a settler is, and again this is coming from the discussion that I had with [my life partner], a settler is somebody who is not Indigenous to a place that has settled in that place [...] It doesn't change the way that I feel about Chai, because he is my brother, [...] But yeah going back to the idea of a settler, having that shared definition [...] I think if we are using those terms, we should employ them in the ways that make the most productive sense.

As Kapalikū pointed out, the research design did not include an opportunity to create shared definitions, and these conversations informed the revision of the methods. These conversations about the term "settler" show that we should be wary of conflating individual and structural relationships. Qualities of an individual relationship may not reflect the structural relationship and structural analyses may not appropriately describe every individual relationship. For the discussion method, I suggest including a discussion topic of individual versus structural relationships, and how to bridge them conceptually and also in social transformation.

Though initial disagreement with use of "settler" may have come from ambiguity about structural versus individual relationships, over the course of the discussions, Summer and Mandy remained strongly against identifying their project partners as "settler," because the term connotes antagonism or "us vs them," which they felt was inappropriate for describing their specific relationships. To be clear, it is not that they are unaware that the structural relationship that settler colonialism imposes is antagonistic as Fanon and Wolfe suggest; they are very aware, as Summer's comment indicates. The

refusal to call their project partner a "settler" could be a rejection of and resistance to the unjust structural relationship, not a refusal of recognizing what the current structural relationship is.[9] The conversations made me consider whether *I* may have fallen into the trap that Gordon (2004) mentions about believing in the structures that we are critiquing—maybe in trying to articulate and defend the Indigenous/settler binary as a useful framework to analyze the existing structural relationship, I had begun to believe in it. The group's conversation about "settler" is a good reminder that outside of academic contexts, certain terms can take on different connotations and meanings, and shared definitions or meanings developed within a group do not necessarily have to be the same as definitions recognized in academia.

Importance of Specificity and Context

Summer, Kapalikū, and Chai highlighted the significance of context and specificity in the words that we use, as we talk about relationships, responsibilities, and values. Meanings or definitions can change depending on personal or cultural context— including the language in which we are communicating. As Kapalikū mentioned, "there is a big difference that I've seen in my life in the way that respect is used in one cultural context versus another" (Kapalikū, session 1). For specificity, it may be helpful to frame discussion prompts using terms in the Indigenous language or terms that participants have used. For example, for project partners in Hawai'i, I replaced "responsibility" with

---

9. While Summer and Mandy, as Indigenous persons, refuse the term, it is important that settlers are careful about refusing the term. Contemporary public rhetoric about unity and division is often a tactic for individuals who benefit from structures of oppression to evade critique and responsibility. On the other hand, settlers should also be aware "that statements of 'I am settler' can become performative" (Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel 2014, 15). Although these two warnings seem contradictory, they actually point to the same thing—that the most important issue is not the categorization of non-Indigenous peoples, but relationships to Indigenous peoples and, as later themes will show, our actions.

"kuleana and kūlana", which Kapalikū had brought up in the first session.[10] For the

question on kinship systems, I posed the following question, quoting a phrase that had

been used in a previous session: Do you think the concept of bringing people into an

"extended ʻohana" could work on a structural level, beyond just individuals?[11]

However, Summer cautions about meanings that may not be fully captured in the

translations, especially when translating from an Indigenous language:

> Just know that sometimes translations are hard because they don't have an
> English equivalent. It's more of a feeling, so translating can put an English
> word, but it's not a direct translation of it. It's maybe the closest thing to
> that feeling or that thing. (session 1)

For example, Summer and Kapalikū spoke about the Ōlelo Hawai'i (Hawaiian language)

word kuleana, which is often used for "responsibility." They described how kuleana

encompasses more than just responsibility, and may also indicate privilege, role, and

obligation among other meanings, including personal meanings. Summer highlighted the

importance the personal meanings one may develop: "when I was younger and growing

up, [...] I always saw kuleana on the board 'responsibility and privilege' but as you get

older and you start to feel what the word actually means and you feel what your kuleana

is" (session 1). She also indicated that these meanings change because kuleana changes as

you grow and/or as your position within your family or community changes. In the way

Summer and Kapalikū spoke about kuleana, there is overlap between responsibility and

role, and they indicated that kuleana is defined by relationships. Kapalikū expands on

how position and positionality inform responsibility:

---

10. kuleana - responsibility, right, privilege; kulana - position, positionality.

11. ʻohana - family, kin group

30

kūlana is important because kūlana is where you stand, or actually from a Pacific perspective, where you sit in your community. [...] Your placement in that circle reflects your responsibility to that community or some of the larger roles that you play. [...] kūlana is important because kūlana also helps to define kuleana [...] yeah there are responsibilities that we have, but not every kuleana is everybody's responsibility. [...] it helps you to manage the kuleana that you choose to take on, and the kuleana that are yours. (session 1)

The idea of responsibility as heavily dependent on community relationships, differs from dominant U.S. understandings where responsibility may have taken on a capitalist framing of job, occupation, and production. Indigenous conceptions of position and positionality compared to Western conceptions of hierarchy may also produce differences in the understanding of responsibility. In thinking about difference in language and meanings, Kapalikū also warns about Indigenous words that become misapplied or appropriated:

"Aloha Spirit" [big sigh] When I hear that now it just disgusts because there are assumptions made about, oh you know, [affected tone] "you give and give and give, and you give because that's aloha." No that is not aloha. No that is totally not aloha! Aloha is a part of a larger system of relationships that are dictated in specific cultural and social ways that allow for the sharing of food, the sharing of space, the sharing of life. But those things have relationships and responsibilities built into them. So outside of that structure, you pull out the idea of aloha, yeah it's going to seem like you're giving and giving and giving, but it's also because if you do not make a commitment to be part of that system then yeah you're just gonna take take take take take. (session 2)

Kapalikū's critique about the misappropriation of aloha brings up important ideas to consider about values and value systems.

Values

For the three of the four Indigenous participants (one was absent during this conversation) values are foundational to relationships and relationship-building because

they inform how we act and interact. In speaking about respect, Rena reflects, "I think respect means we give gratitude and thanks, but we also show respect by doing things for others" (session 1). Summer mentions, "In all of the good relationships that I keep, those [respect, consideration, and appreciation] are just values that are really foundational. It's the foundation of how we interact with one another (session 1). Conversely, as Kapalikū points out, "being able to practice values is what makes them real," (session 1); "values are actions" (session 1), they are not just abstract concepts. Rena comments, "It's [respect is] more than something that we say, it's more of an action that we actually do." (session 1)

As we see from the above quotes, respect was the value that this group referenced the most, although the group also mentioned reciprocity, caring for elders, gratitude, commitment, generosity, and balance among other values. For this group, respect emerges from valuing the other party, and is expressed as consideration, appreciation, gratitude, acknowledgement, and care. Indigenous participants also mentioned that a part of respect is accountability to the other party. Mandy notes that a part of respect is self-education about the other person's context (session 3); Rena gives an example showing that upholding the other party's self-determination is a part of respect (session 3); and Kapalikū describes how a part of respect is upholding obligation (session 3). All these notions of respect differ from other interpretations of respect such as obedience to authority (whether familial or state), tolerance of others, treating others with civility or propriety, or holding in high regard. The discussions in this study seem to indicate that since current structural relationships are based on Western value systems and ontologies, in order to transform the structural relationship, there needs to be a shift towards

32

Indigenous value systems. Chai describes one potential way of shifting and learning

values:

> Everybody loves a good story and we all have our personal stories. Stories
> captivate us and we like hearing stories. Being told at a campfire or
> grandparents telling stories. But that's also how so many cultural values
> are carried [...] I think it's interesting to look at those stories from different
> cultures and the values that they put forth. (session 2)

Chai's reminder that stories are the carriers of cultural values aligns with Indigenous

epistemologies and pedagogies. Mandy illustrates how values are also culturally specific

and hold different meanings depending on the context and exist within a larger value

system of a culture, as Kapalikū indicated with aloha. When asked what the term

"respect" meant to her, Mandy immediately referenced a Navajo principle:

> [Speaking of respect from] an Indigenous perspective, we have this word
> in Navajo, it's called hózhó and includes these principles of your mind,
> your thoughts, your actions. It's a complex philosophy [...] And so for me,
> being respectful is living in hózhó or having hózhó. That's what guides me
> is that principle or that thought and for me that's what narrows down
> respect. If I'm being respectful, I'm following that principle. (session 2)

As Mandy indicates, the Navajo principle of hózhó does not translate into "respect," but

instead is a principle that guides respectful actions. Lee (2014, 3) describes how guiding

principles such as hózhó exist within "distinct Diné matrix [...] A matrix forms a

foundation, becomes a world picture for the *individual and for the community*, and is

culture specified" (emphasis added). Both Lee and the participants of this study show

how value systems and guiding principles reach across individual, community, and

structural relationships. Because of this flexibility participants believed that values, rather

than a static model, should guide a process of transforming relationships.

Host/Guest as an Inappropriate Model

Before implementing the study, my goal had been to find a specific model for a transformed structural relationship that we could work towards. I had posed the question, "Is the idea of Indigenous peoples as hosts and non-Indigenous people as guests helpful?" to the group. The question was based on Sepulveda's (2018) theory of guest. However, given the framing of conversations around responsibility rather than sovereignty and the inclusion of "host" as a complementary role to "guest," all Indigenous participants thought a host/guest model was inappropriate.

Sepulveda (2018) offers a theory of guest as a model for a "decolonial possibility." The theory of guest addresses critiques that theories of settler colonialism do not allow for a decolonized world and that sovereignty, with its Western conception origins, is an inappropriate goal for Indigenous peoples. Sepulveda (2018, 40) helps to "envision a decolonized future in which we [Indigenous peoples] are no longer the dispossessed" by offering *Kuuyam*, the Tongva word for guests, as "a theorization of critically reformed relations between settlers and Indigenous space – as a step toward an abolition of settler colonialism." While I argue that the process is one of transformation, rather than reformation, Sepulveda's theory of *Kuuyam* is a potential model for such transformation. As Sepulveda describes, "Settlers in California, and elsewhere, can be guests on the lands they live on. *Kuuyam* to the local Indigenous peoples, but more importantly, to the land itself which contains spirit and is willing to provide." (54) Sepulveda affirms the sovereignty of the land, showing that a goal of transforming the structural relationship is not a rejection of efforts focused on Indigenous sovereignty, but

34

strengthens Indigenous people's ability to exercise their sovereignty while

simultaneously providing a way to move beyond the sovereignty framework.

While the theory of guest is useful when addressing sovereignty and when helping

settlers rethink claims to Land, all Indigenous participants in this study pointed out that

from a perspective of responsibility, the theory of guest may not be as useful. This could

be because sovereignty emerges from a *rights*-based framework, with less focus on

responsibility. The participant's disagreement may also have been more a reaction to the

idea of host, which was not a part of Sepulveda's theory of guest. In response to the

question "Is the idea of Indigenous peoples as hosts and non-Indigenous people as guests

helpful?" participants unanimously responded that it was not. The question was included

in the optional prompts for the "on your own" session and the group also shared their

thoughts on this question in the last group session. Mandy responded:

> It wasn't helpful just because as an Indigenous person and how I was
> raised was when we have guests, we do everything for them, we make
> sure they're comfortable, they've eaten, they have a place to stay. So just
> to take all that responsibility for a non-Indigenous person, it just felt like it
> would be so much work that I would have to put in—so much work just to
> make sure they feel comfortable. (session 4)

> I feel like if this were the model, I would be bending over backwards to
> make non-Indigenous people feel comfortable (session 3)

Rena adds:

> I had talked about this as well, that host and guest was not helpful at all,
> and I was telling Lilian that maybe a brother-brother relationship,
> something equal, would work out better.

While Summer was unable to attend the last session, TY was able to report back on their

"on your own" conversation:

> We talked about that too [...] that the description of host/guest is not super
> helpful. And Summer was mentioning that host sounds like the role is to

35

serve the guest, whereas she was saying that as an Indigenous person she doesn't feel like the host, but she feels like an extension of the place or the ʻāina [land] that she's from and that she sees her role more so to model and perpetuate ancestral ways and keep that connection going. (session 4)

Kapalikū adds:

Host and guest maybe is not the best productive paradigm to frame the relationship [...] a relationship with equity in it has to be established [...] and for lack of a better framing, there are a lot of guests that were never invited, so they actually were not given that responsibility or right of access and just showed up. (session 4)

Each indicates that a model of host/guest is not equitable in terms of responsibility because the burden is on the host. Summer also mentions "that we have certain ʻŌlelo Noʻeau, or wise sayings, which are really ways to live your life" (session 1). She shared one in particular that shows a Hawaiian understanding of "guest": "He malihini no ka lā hoʻokahi. It was explained to me that you're malihini, like a visitor, for one day only, and then you're responsible to take up the work, and share in this work that we're doing." The group shows the multiplicity of meanings and expectations that host and guest have for different cultural contexts. Because of specificity and diverse contexts, finding a model for a "good" structural relationship might not even be the right goal or question. Because relationships depend on values and the practice of those values, the transformed structural relationship would depend on which Indigenous people is involved, what their value system is, and what they want/need. Having a one-size-fits-all model to dictate all structural relationships would contradict the specificity of Indigenous value systems.

Indigenous Peoples' Role

The responses about host/guest touch on the topic of Indigenous peoples' role in transforming the structural relationship. Indigenous participants repeatedly referenced the

responsibility to reconnect with ancestral knowledges and educate next generations,

reaffirming Indigenous resurgence as Indigenous peoples' role and also reiterating the

connectedness between Indigenous history and futurity. Summer reflects:

> I try to live out some Hawaiian values that are really important to me:
> aloha, trying to do what's pono as best as I can, always living in a way that
> honors my ohana and kupuna, and also living ways that I'm setting up my
> mo'opuna, my grandchildren. And not only my own immediate 'ohana,
> but the Hawaiian Nation, that I'm doing Hawaiian things that will maybe
> help the later generations connect back to our ancestral source. (session 2)

Mandy describes her motivation in giving her future children the best opportunity to learn

their Native language because she did not have the opportunity:

> I already told him [Mandy's husband], "They're going to learn Navajo."
> [...] I want them to learn Navajo. I think it's important. And I feel bad that
> I wasn't able to learn, but I understand where my mom was coming from,
> especially as I got older and I realized what that experience [of boarding
> school] was like. [...] And so for me, teaching my little ones Navajo would
> kind of stop that intergenerational trauma. (session 2)

Rena describes how she is remembering, reconnecting, and passing on her grandmother's

teachings:

> A lot of her teachings are coming back into me. [...] she was just telling us
> about that whole era and what had happened and you should always be
> aware and this is how you should raise your kids. So it has kind of
> reconnected for me during this pandemic of reflections and going deeper
> and realizing that our ancestors did teach us everything. I know mine did. I
> can't say for everybody, but I know my grandma really taught all of us
> how to live, how to be. [...] I mean she even has stories that go back
> further into the 1800s, where they were like being chased by the U.S.
> Cavalry and things like that. So telling my kids all of those stories [...] It's
> especially important now, and it's always going to be important, but right
> now is the time I have to teach them more. Now I'm teaching them a lot
> more about our culture and how we need to keep it and observe it. (session
> 2)

In the "on your own" conversations, differences across people's thoughts show, again,

that roles and responsibilities on an individual level are heavily dependent on context and

specific relationships. One example is the idea of calling out and holding settlers

accountable versus the idea educating settlers can become a burden. Another example is

that both Native Hawaiian participants suggested that one role of Indigenous persons is to

model or teach settlers; however, both Diné participants brought up that because of

historical, intergenerational, and/or personal trauma, some Indigenous persons might not

know how to model good relationships. Rena illustrates how boarding school era has

affected Diné family and social relationships:

> In boarding school we lost all of our important teachings from our parents,
> grandparents—those key people who taught us how to parent, who taught
> us how to develop relationships, who taught us all these key things that we
> need to function. [...] So it's really difficult because I don't think
> Indigenous people have the best relationship either. Does that make sense?
> Because some of us know what that is and some of us don't. It's like a
> mist [...] a lot of Native parents don't even know how to be parents
> because *their* parents [who had been in boarding school] never were
> taught how to be, how to act, or how to make decisions. How to have a
> relationship, how to have responsibilities. So it's this whole broken cycle
> that we have to rebuild. (session 3)

Mandy speaks about her experience as a program coordinator for an organization that

serves the urban Native community in Phoenix metro area:

> I think here at [the organization], working with different people across
> many different [Native] Nations, a lot of them don't know the connection
> between historical trauma, food insecurity, and what food sovereignty
> really means, and so really it's just educating everyone. Indigenous people
> have knowledge but they're not making those connections. And so just
> educating them about the past and history and also how to do a good
> relationship, because unfortunately I think that's not something that a lot
> of Indigenous people see growing up. [...] so really re-teaching them what
> a good relationship looks like I think is important and that goes by
> modeling it. So modeling it within our program, within our community,
> with other peers. (session 3)

Rena and Mandy also remind us that settlers should not essentialize or romanticize

Indigenous peoples by assuming every Indigenous person automatically knows what

good relationships are or that every person has access to the same knowledge. Kapalikū's

following comment shows that settlers also should be careful about expecting Indigenous

peoples to perform or "access" Indigeneity:

> I think for those of us who come from Indigenous backgrounds, some of
> us carry all of that around trying to figure out what to do with it. What part
> am I accessing today? Am I accessing any of it? Is somebody going to ask
> me to access it for them? (session 2)

Mandy's and Rena's comments also show us that transforming the structural relationship

is a matter of healing. Both Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous people need to learn

or relearn what good relationships are—settlers need to unlearn oppression and

Indigenous peoples are still healing from historical and intergenerational trauma. In the

last session, Kapalikū also brings up trauma: "There is still a lot of hurt, there is still a lot

of anger and frustration. [...] how do we lead those discussions, when we're still dealing

with trauma? [...] that's another thing too if we're gonna think about relationships right?"

(session 4).

Settler Position/Responsibility in Individual Relationships

The group was more explicit about settler positions, responsibilities, and helpful

mindsets in their particular relationships. Helpful mindsets that the group identified

include humility, willingness to learn, openness to self-improvement and change, and

accountability. Kapalikū also identified that because settler privilege is having the

"freedom to live somewhere without having to commit or invest" in that place—ex. "If

[name of presidential candidate] gets elected, I'm moving to Canada"—an important way

to confront settler privilege is to have deep commitment to place and to the Indigenous

39

community of that place (session 3). The responsibility that both Indigenous and settler

participants spoke about the most was self-education. Alyssa reflects:

> As a non-Indigenous person, part of my role too is to realize that history
> and accept it and know that it's part of my role to elevate people who have
> been disadvantaged in the past and we're not on equal footing from the get
> go. So my role as a privileged white person [...] is to elevate people and
> really promote their contributions and help them succeed too. (session 2)

TY describes how "you can't start an equitable relationship," if you do not understand

historical context:

> The first step or responsibility for a non-Indigenous person is to educate
> ourselves about the true history of what happened here. I know for me, I
> didn't learn it in school at all. It wasn't until I was in my mid-20s that I
> actually learned that we're living under illegal occupation here. (session 4)

> This is important because if you don't understand historical context and
> how intergenerational/historical trauma affects kānaka today, you may not
> understand how your presence/actions/words are interpreted by kānaka
> (even if how you're interpreted is not how you intended). It is our
> responsibility as non-Indigenous people to learn this history and reflect on
> how we may be perpetuating oppression/racism/etc. (session 3)

Both Alyssa and TY indicate that awareness is not enough and must be followed with

application of the knowledge. Similarly, Kapalikū and Chai note, "awareness of

situations is not the same as action directed towards the situations" (session 3).

Participant's comments mirror Rodríguez's (2014, 49) warning that "recognition must

function as more than simply a self-referential move that seeks to appease guilt or

assuage criticism; it must work in the service of transforming the conditions that

perpetuate material and psychic harm." Mandy presents an example of how she thinks

about applying awareness, "as I'm learning about other people's cultures, how can I take

that and apply it to the program?" (session 3). The program that Mandy directs focuses on

"transforming conditions" for the urban Native community, and the awareness that

Mandy gains about experiences outside of her own does "work in service of" that transformation. Participants also mentioned educating other settlers as one potential action among many others. Chai shares one story of an opportunity to educate, in this case to stop appropriation and exploitation:

> Being from the continent, and studying hula, it's been an opportunity to educate people who would never normally have a way to have deeper insight. So as an example, the other week a friend of mine, a really old friend, we've known each other since high school. [...] she wanted to talk to me about some other performer friends of hers who in their performances were doing these kind of like "luau shows" and "Hawaiian shows" and so it was an opportunity for me to really educate her. She was like, I know this is wrong, but I need some help, how do I talk to these people or how do I address this and I just broke it down for her [...] So for me knowing people on the continent who then feel like they can reach out to me is sort of like my way of giving back as well because I can help educate and use all the knowledge that I have learned and gained. (session 2)

Rena identifies that an important beginning step to address historical trauma is for settlers to own individual and collective mistakes and not do it again:

> We need to go back and start at the beginning [...] acknowledging that the United States has done wrong, just acknowledging that and owning it, and that way we can move on, to build these healthy relationships [...] And I know as a Diné person, that was really something that was focused on when I was raised a lot by my grandmother, owning your own actions. [...Being able to say] It was me, I did that, and I own it. I own it and it won't happen again. (session 3)

Rena indicates that owing mistakes, taking responsibility for harmful actions, and discontinuing those actions are required before the structural relationship can be transformed. Apologizing for acts of settler colonialism makes no sense if settlers continue to perpetuate those structures.

Settler participants also indicated that constant reflection is also required, including reflection on position/role, motivation, and assumptions. Alyssa shares a story

41

about her reflection on her position as a non-Indigenous person who holds a significant

amount of knowledge on growing Indigenous foods of the Southwest region:

> I'm not Indigenous and I'm on the [program name] team. So I always
> reflect on my own role within that along the way, and it is kind of an odd
> place sometimes for me. One of our gardeners was doing these Indigenous
> food competitions that were happening and asking me all these questions
> about what counts as Indigenous food and traditional food and would this
> recipe work and all this stuff. And it's like, "Well...you're the one who's
> Navajo..what works for you?" So I'm always kind of in a weird place, but
> it [growing Indigenous foods] is something I've known about and study
> [...] and I've learned from a lot of people of the years and I try to bring
> that experience [...] But it's made me think like, that is the role I'm serving
> now and I could just help bridge some of these knowledge gaps or divide
> and fill in the role, but my ultimate goal is to empower everyone I work
> with to know more and be excited and learn more and more about growing
> food and traditional foods and facilitate everyone learning from each
> other. [...] I can contribute where I do know things and get everyone
> excited and facilitate it. (session 2)

Alyssa's story, as well as other settler participants' stories raise the question: do settlers

have a role in perpetuating Indigenous culture? This is an extremely touchy issue given

how Indigenous cultures and knowledges have been Othered, banned, made illegal,

erased, exploited, extracted, consumed, and appropriated *by settlers*. Interestingly, this

group seems to indicate that, yes, for them, settlers can have a role in perpetuating

Indigenous culture. With the support of their Indigenous project partners and other

Indigenous community members, Alyssa, TY, and Chai all hold and practice certain

aspects of Indigenous culture—from growing traditional foods and preparing plant

medicines to practicing hula and speaking the Indigenous language. In addition to

holding and practicing knowledge, Alyssa, TY, and Chai also have a role of sharing

knowledge back with the community. Summer and TY stress, however, that the goal is

not perpetuating culture itself, but perpetuating it within the Indigenous people:

42

> If you've been given these things (Hawaiian knowledge/language/etc) or if they were revealed to you in a certain way, the first people that you'd want to feed it back to is Hawaiians because it's theirs. (session 3)

They also emphasize that settlers:

> Must reflect on how to do this in a pono way and acknowledge what our roles are in this perpetuation. One way is to trace genealogy of the knowledge you're sharing so that people know that you're sharing knowledge that was gifted and that you're not claiming it as yours. (session 3)

Settlers must keep in mind that, Indigenous resurgence is Indigenous peoples' role, and settler responsibility is centering and transforming relationships with Indigenous *peoples* not cultures. Settlers' responsibility is not seeking out Indigenous cultural practices and knowledge, and a discussion about perpetuating culture is only a conversation to be had if knowledge has been given. And even then, what settlers do with given knowledge should be determined by what the Indigenous people wants and needs.

The group also expressed that settlers can support a transformation of the structural relationship by (1) privileging and honoring Indigenous peoples' genealogical relationship to land over settler desires and settler relationships to the land, and (2) supporting and adhering to Indigenous structures of relationship and kinship. Indigenous scholars have explained that Indigenous peoples are genealogically tied to the Land, or from another perspective, Indigenous peoples *are* the Land and the Land is who they are (Smith 2012; Trask 2000; Cajete 2015). Settlers are "foreign" to the Land because they do not have a genealogical tie nor is their existence bound with the Land—they "cannot insert themselves into a genealogy of the land […] no matter how long they have lived on it or how much their ancestors have suffered on it […] settlers have their own long and rich genealogical ties elsewhere" (Fujikane 2008, 21). Participants illustrated that it is

43

important for settlers to be *explicit* about their own genealogies and especially their position as non-Native. For example, while Mandy had assumed Alyssa was Native because of the knowledge that she held, Mandy describes how Alyssa communicated early on that she is not Native (session 2). Given historical and present-day settler claims to Indigenous identity, ambiguity about position—letting others assume one is Native—is dishonesty that can breach trust and hurt relationships regardless of how much one has done for the community.[12] Instead, being explicit about one's settler position in relation to Indigenous peoples fosters openness and accountability, which participants identified are necessary for "good" relationships.

In response to Alfred's (2005) critique of sovereignty, Goodyear-Ka'ōpua (2014, 7) theorizes ea as a Kanaka Maoli political philosophy that "surpass[es] state-based forms of sovereignty." From an understanding of ea, the Land is sovereign and Indigenous sovereignty emanates from relationship to Land. If the emplacement of settlers and claim to Land are directly connected to a contest over sovereignty, then settlers can renounce this contest by privileging and honoring Indigenous peoples' genealogical relationship to land over their own desires and relationships to the land. As Alfred (2009, 19) specifies, settler support of Indigenous sovereignty involves settlers "acknowledg[ing] our existence [as sovereigns] and *the integrity of our connection to the land*" (emphasis added). Vaughn (2019, 230) provides "a model for those who are diasporic to engage in a recognition of 'āina and its genealogical caretakers as embodied sovereigns" using the example of the "relationship between Ka Lāhui Hawai'i, a group of Native Hawaiians in the diaspora, and [Acjachemen] a federally unrecognized tribe formalized through a

---

12. See Chapter Three for an explanation of how settler claims to Indigenous identity are settler colonial acts.

ratified treaty." Vaughn describes how the ratification of this treaty, in addition to affirming the sovereignty of both Indigenous peoples, rejects a relationships based on contest over sovereignty, challenges a settler colonial structure, and is an act of Indigenous resurgence:

> By engaging in these relationships, Hawaiians embody an understanding of 'āina [land] and kuleana [responsibility], which simultaneously works against the state logics of recognition. These acts of sovereign embodiment honor kupuna, or ancestral knowledge, and serve the greater lāhui [nation]. (230)

> Engaging in a praxis of kuleana that acknowledges responsibilities to land held by other Native communities is a recognition of our interdependence and is one of the many expressions of ea [Native Hawaiian sovereignty] (238).

The "recognition of our interdependence" speaks to Indigenous matrices of structural relationships, in which transformed Indigenous/non-Indigenous roles could fit. Goodyear-Ka'ōpua (2014) emphasizes that ea refers to more than just sovereignty and also "refers to "the mutual interdependence of all life forms and forces" (5) and "reflects not a supreme authority over territory but a sacred connection to the land requiring dutiful, nurturing care" (7). Ea is one example of a matrix for structural relationships based on Indigenous principles rather than domination and power. Supporting and adhering to Indigenous structures of relationship and kinship is another way settlers can help disrupt the current structural relationship based on power. Goodyear-Ka'ōpua shares the story of Ed Greevey as an example of a settler who takes the initiative to find a role in supporting the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, by developing and centering relationships to Kanaka Maoli organizers and by turning certain privileges, "his skills and the resources to which he had access," into assets for the movement (25). Mandy, Rena, Summer, and Kapalikū expressed that their settler project partners do this as well.

45

Barriers and Prerequisites for Transformation

To summarize, participants in this study identified barriers and also prerequisites for transforming personal and structural relationships between Indigenous peoples and settlers. One main barrier is settler ignorance, closed-mindedness, and unwillingness to change. Chai and Kapalikū point out that to transform a relationship we "need consent of both sides" (session 3). Chai expands on what this means:

> "If we're going to create a new vision or new way of interacting, both parties have to want that and agree to do that. And so how do you create a mindshift in a group either who is ignorant and oblivious or maybe who doesn't actually want to give up some of their power? " (session 4)

This barrier points to the necessity of transforming settler consciousness to support Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination. The group identified conflicting worldviews and cultural differences—in values, relationship expectations, communications styles, language, ideologies, and so on—as another significant barrier. While transforming settler consciousness is a necessary first step, this study and framework focuses on the second barrier. The discussions in this study highlight how developing shared understandings is foundational to transforming the structural relationship. They also identify the role of education in transformation, for both Indigenous resurgence and settler transformation.

Settler Transformation Praxis

Project partners' stories illustrate components of a settler transformation praxis, or the practices and processes for settlers to reconceptualize and change their position in relation to Indigenous peoples and help actualize structural transformation. The stories

speak to questions of "how do we think about our identities in relation to Indigenous peoples?" and "how do we act in individual relationships?" Therefore, this praxis is not only transformation of consciousness; it also entails action. Alyssa's story in the "Settler Position/Responsibility" section demonstrates that one practice may be to consciously take a supporting or team member role and always ask, "Well does this make sense for me to be the person to help?" as Alyssa does. Alyssa's consideration about position aligns with Kapalikū's and Summer's discussion about how position informs responsibility. Earlier themes showed that another action is taking initiative to understand Indigenous people's understanding of values with the intention of having shared expectations for relationships. The following stories describe how settler participants think about their identities in relation to Indigenous peoples. TY reflects on her relationship with Summer:

> Just thinking about being not ethnically Hawaiian but living here, your friendship has just influenced that journey too of trying to figure out my own identity. Because when I was growing up and when I was in college in California, it was like "Oh I feel like I really want to be more connected with this Japanese heritage." And then I went to Japan, "Ok I feel more connected but this isn't my entire identity." So then when I came back, "Ok I want to be in closer relationship with ʻāina and how can I be a good "settler" [...] And just interacting with you and having conversations with you has really influenced my thinking about my identity as a Japanese person living here. (session 2)

During my conversation with Rena, I spoke about how she has influenced how I think about my identity:

> When I met you, seeing how grounded and strong you are in your Navajo/ Diné culture, it was very inspiring to see that because I think for a while I was just so unsure about who I was and it was to a point where I was trying to avoid who I am, like avoid my heritage. Getting to know you, it inspired me to reconnect with that [heritage] and come back into that.

Yeah I've learned so much from you about the way to honor who you are. (session 2)

For settlers who still have connections to homelands and cultural identities of those homelands, reconnecting to those identities may be one way of moving away from identities derived from membership in a settler state and also privilege Indigenous genealogical connections to this Land. Gordon (2017, 47-48) introduces the idea of being "in-difference" and asks us to challenge "the assumption that the powers that oppress us are not only bigger than us, as the spatial reasoning has it, but also the source of who we are and even what we are capable of." Thinking about being "in-difference" raises the question: who are we (and who can we be) outside of the structures that oppress us? I extend Gordon's concept of being "in-difference" to consider who we are and can be outside of the structures that we benefit from. Settler transformation praxis asks settlers to be "in-difference," and reconnecting to pre-settler heritage identities can one way to practice being "in-difference" from settler colonialism. Chai describes various practices that he has engaged in to reconnect with his Panamanian heritage:

> Studying the language was one big aspect. I think it's interesting because I know from what I've heard people say and observed in Hawai'i, it's kind of a similar thing that I went through where you're kind of disconnected from your culture [...] forgetting your language, forgetting your culture and your history, and then having to re-learn it, rather than just being brought up in it fully. So taking the time to learn Spanish in school was important to me, and then being able to travel in different parts of was a part of that also, Mexico, Peru, Honduras, other places and also having the chance to go to Panama and meet relatives that I hadn't really been connected to. (session 2)

Chai speaks to how erasure of settlers' genealogical ties is a necessary mechanism to "emplace" settlers (Hiller 2017, 422). TY also describes some of her reconnecting practices:

48

for me definitely through food and trying to write down some of my obachan, my grandmother's, recipes. And that's also involved learning more of the language because we didn't really grow up speaking Japanese at home. But yeah one of the main reasons why after undergrad that I went to Japan was to strengthen my relationship with my grandparents there and develop more of a sense of identity I guess. [...] I'm really interested in meeting more people who are of Asian/Japanese descent who have similar interests as me, like farming, or growing food, and sustainable agriculture. [...] I just feel more of a connection with the people who are Japanese or another particularly East Asian heritage who have gone through that journey and have similar values and interests like that. (session 2)

TY describes how shared experience is a significant part of identity. Settler participants mentioned the following reconnecting practices: learning/speaking mother language, continuing traditions, making and eating heritage foods, visiting homeland, learning about knowledge systems, connecting with other people of similar identity, and more. Reconnecting to heritage identities is only one possible way to engage in settler transformation praxis. Settlers who no longer have any ties to homelands or pre-settler heritages may engage in other ways. The participants in this study uncovered a few potential components of a settler transformation praxis: taking a supporting or team member role, reflecting on position and appropriateness of responsibility based on that position, taking initiative to understand of Indigenous values, and reconnecting with heritage identities. As settlers engage in settler transformation praxis, we can continue to grow and uncover what constitutes this praxis.

CHAPTER 3

ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

There are two core assumptions for the proposed framework for settler

responsibility: (A) that all parties involved already have at least a basic level shared

understanding of historical and contemporary contexts of Indigenous-settler relations for

the place where they are; and (B) that parties involved are open to and committed to

transforming that structural relationship. Participants had identified these assumptions

during discussions. Because Indigenous peoples should get to determine what historical

and contemporary contexts are important and because these contexts differ for each

Indigenous people, I do not address them in this study. Instead, to address the first

assumption, I will provide an overview of the current structural relationship between

Indigenous peoples and the U.S. settler state. Regarding the second assumption, I suggest

that openness and commitment to transforming the structural relationship requires the

settler party's support of Indigenous sovereignty and a willingness to aid in

decolonization. I describe what each of these requirements means based on literature

reviews of Indigenous sovereignty and decolonization.

Assumption A: Shared Understanding of Contexts

Current Structural Relationship or What Does "Settler" Mean?

Because settler societies are founded on the genocide and dispossession of

Indigenous peoples (Wolfe 2006), identities derived from participation or membership in

a settler society (i.e. American, Canadian, New Zealander, Australian, etc.) cannot be

separated from unjust relationships of power. In order to legitimize itself, the U.S. settler

state claims "inheritance of identity and land" from Indigenous peoples and uses a

"guardian / ward relationship [to] juridically and morally validate [the] inheritance"
(Lomawaima 2016, 90). Members of a settler society are the beneficiaries of Indigenous
genocide and dispossession, whether settlers currently recognize those facts or not. Since
settler colonialism is a "structure not an event" that requires the elimination of
Indigenous peoples (Wolfe 2006, 402), a member of or a participant in a settler society,
benefits from *and* is complicit in the ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples. Settler
responsibility to Indigenous peoples is not one of reconciliation or reparation, but of
dismantling settler colonial structures, including the settler state.[13]

As Wilkins and Lomawaima (2001, 5) succinctly state, "The relationship between
American Indian tribes and the U.S. federal government is an ongoing contest over
sovereignty." Settler colonialism is the structure that imposes the "contest over
sovereignty" and creates a "compartmentalized world, [a] world divided in two" (Fanon
1963, 5). In other words, settler colonialism creates a binary relationship between
Indigenous peoples and settlers. Because settler colonialism is a structure, Wolfe (2016)
and Fujikane (2008) identify that the difference and relationship between "Indigenous"
and "settler" is structural. The value of the Indigenous/settler binary is in naming this
current structural relationship rather than in creating identity categories. The purpose of
naming the binary is not for individuals to choose (or contest) identities, but to
understand how they relate to larger structures of settler colonialism. Identity-focused
debates about who is/isn't a settler, as well as "types and degrees of settler," distract from

---

13. "Reconciliation" is problematic since there were no conciliatory relations to begin with (Carter
2018, 565) and is based on politics of inclusion (a euphemism for assimilation), which does not require
settlers to confront how they perpetuate and benefit from structures of settler colonialism (Alfred 2009,
151-152). "Reparation" is problematic because it implies atonement for past wrongdoing, but does not do
anything to stop ongoing abuse (Simpson 2011, 21).

dealing with the actual structures of settler colonialism (Saranillio 2018, 29; Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel 2014, 12-15). Preston (2015, 7) points out an interesting characteristic of how settlers relate to Indigenous peoples: "Indigenous peoples exist as 'Indigenous' if there exists no settlers but settlers only exist in relation to Indigenous peoples by settling on Indigenous land."[14] It may be more helpful to think of "settler" as a status, a position in relation to others, rather than an identity. Thinking of one's own identity centers the self, while thinking of one's own status necessarily draws in relation to others. Therefore, thinking of "settler" as a status or a structural position instead of an identity may help refocus settler priorities towards accountability to Indigenous peoples.

Fujikane argues that an individual's settler status is determined by (1) "their relationship to Indigenous peoples in a settler state" (12), and (2) their complicity in US colonialism via support of American democracy and a civil rights framework (20, 1-4)— or I would argue via membership or participation in a settler state. Fujikane illustrates that the following do not exempt someone from settler status: not being the initial colonizer, lack of colonial intent, the nature of their relationship with white settlers or the settler state, and lack of political power (7, 12, 20). The function of complicating or, worse, blurring the binary (Wolfe 2016, 9) is to create spaces in which the settler is absolved from complicity—exempt from being held accountable, from any "obligations to indigenous [sic] peoples" (Fujikane 2008, 7). While settler colonial structures are

---

14. Because "Indigenous" is an identity, the question of "Who is Indigenous/Native?" is complex, especially in regard to people with mixed/multi-racial identities, politics of recognition, blood quantum, and tribal enrollment (Wilkins and Wilkins 2017; TallBear 2013). Indigenous peoples should determine who their people are. Indigenous scholars have argued that race, blood quantum, and tribal enrollment are all Western constructions, and do not determine Indigeneity (Garroutte 2003; Simpson 2014; Sturm 2002). They assert that genealogy and other Indigenous conceptions of peoplehood should take precedence.

dominant, anyone who is not Indigenous to the Land will benefit from and be structurally complicit in settler colonialism, even if they actively work to help dismantle it.[15]

Debates about the binary center on whether certain people should be considered settlers—for example, "early groups of Asian laborers imported [to Hawai'i] by the plantation owners or recent Asian immigrants who had and have no political power" (Fujikane 2008, 7) or Black people who are descendants of enslaved African Indigenous peoples. While outwardly these debates about the Indigenous/settler binary appear to be about identity, I suggest that they are ultimately about whether someone has a responsibility to Indigenous peoples and what that responsibility entails. Wolfe (2016) argues that creating a third space for Black people who are descendants of enslaved African Indigenous peoples, still creates opportunities for denying complicity and avoiding responsibility.[16] Day (2015, 113) presents a compelling counterargument that not considering Black people settlers allows for a more nuanced understanding of how settler colonialism operates. Drawing on Coulthard (2014), Day argues that "race and colonialism," and I would add other structures of oppression, converge to "form the matrix of the settler colonial racial state" that is the U.S., emphasizing that there is no one structure of oppression that all other oppressions can be reduced to, that causes all others (113). Day argues that binaries, such as the Indigenous/settler binary and the "black/non-black binary," do reduce all other systems of oppressions to the one named in binary. Using Day's understanding of binaries, one might assume that naming the binary to

---

15. Settlers who are "adopted" or "naturalized" by Indigenous communities also still structurally benefit from settler colonialism. For a full discussion on identity, peoplehood vs. nationhood, membership vs. citizenship, and the politics of enrollment, see: Wilkins and Wilkins 2017.

16. Amadahy and Lawrence (2009, 107) also affirm that Black peoples are complicit in settler colonialism: "Black peoples have not been quintessential "settlers" [...]; nevertheless, they have, as free people, been involved in some form of settlement process."

acknowledge complicity in an oppression or even enacting solidarity has to mean discounting your own experiences or struggles against oppression.[17] While Day's approach to countering reductionist thinking is problematizing the Indigenous/settler binary, Trask's (2004) and Saranillio's (2018) explanations of multiple, overlapping binary oppositions provides a better solution. The explanation of multiple binary oppositions accounts for Day's analysis that structures of oppression cannot be reduced to each other, while providing a way to name how specific structures of oppression are expressed in specific power relationships. Multiple overlapping binaries show that responsibility to Indigenous peoples does not have to mean discounting other struggles against oppression. And in fact, Tuck and Yang (2012, 28) "argue that the opportunities for solidarity lie in what is incommensurable rather than what is common across these efforts." The fact that non-Indigenous people have a responsibility to Indigenous peoples does not mean that Indigenous peoples do not have a responsibility to address how they might be complicit in other oppressions, such as anti-Blackness. The focus of this study, however, is on settler responsibility to Indigenous peoples.

An assumption of this study is that anyone who is not Indigenous to this Land, regardless of any qualifiers (i.e. being Indigenous to another place, not having come here willingly, etc.), has a responsibility to the Indigenous peoples of this Land. Even scholars who problematize the Indigenous/settler binary agree that a complication of the binary does not absolve any groups from responsibility to the Indigenous peoples of this Land (Dei 2017, 8; Day 2015, 107). Based on this assumption, the binary that I use could be

---

17. There is a question of whether associating the term "settler" with Black people does violence to Black people. This might be a question that Indigenous people and Black people could address, and the framework that I propose later offers methods for addressing such questions.

named "Indigenous/non-Indigenous;" however, "non-Indigenous" does not implicate a power relationship or the structure of settler colonialism as "settler" does. For this reason, I will continue to refer to the binary as Indigenous/settler, and use "settler" to indicate anyone who is not Indigenous to this Land. As long as settler colonial structures are dominant, anyone who is not Indigenous to the Land will benefit from and be structurally complicit in settler colonialism, even if they actively work to help dismantle it.

By thinking about "settler" as a status rather than an identity, we as settlers can focus on our role in settler colonialism and decolonization, and "position indigenous [sic] peoples at the center, foregrounding" our relationship with them instead of continuing to center ourselves (Fujikane 2008, 9). The Indigenous/settler binary is a useful tool to remind all non-Indigenous people of our responsibility to Indigenous peoples and to hold us accountable as we take ownership of and responsibility for our settler status.

Assumption B: Openness and Commitment from Settlers

Transforming the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers requires dismantling settler colonial structures that seek to prevent such transformation; in other words, it requires decolonization. Because the current structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers is based on a contest over sovereignty, openness and commitment to transforming the structural relationship also requires the settler party's support of Indigenous sovereignty. In this section, I first define decolonization for the context of this project and describe one interpretation of how settlers can aid in decolonization. Second, based on a literature review of Indigenous sovereignty, I suggest that settler support of Indigenous sovereignty means challenging the structures that constrain Indigenous peoples' ability to exercise their sovereignty.

Decolonization

Indigenous scholars theorize decolonization both as a process that counters settler colonialism and a lens for envisioning a world in which settler colonialism has been dismantled (Alfred 2009; Sepulveda 2018; Smith 2012; Tuck and Yang 2012). In addition to being a "structure not an event," Wolfe (2006) describes settler colonialism as a land-centered project that requires the elimination of Indigenous peoples to make way for settler permanence. Because settler colonialism is a land-centered project, Tuck and Yang (2012, 7) argue that decolonization is first and foremost material, requiring the repatriation of all land—or rematriation, as Newcomb (1995) proposes.[18] While scholars like Tuck and Yang contend that there will be no settler state in a decolonized world (13), absence of a settler state does not necessarily mean absence of any non-Indigenous people or nations.[19] Some scholars envision the possibility of a decolonized world that allows for the coexistence of Indigenous and non-Indigenous nations on this Land. Alfred (2009, 156) even argues that *"the only possibility of a just relationship* between Onkwehonwe [original people] and the Settler society is the conception of a nation-to-nation partnership between peoples" (emphasis added), based on the following rationale:

> If the goals of decolonization are justice and peace, then the process to achieve these goals must reflect a basic covenant on the part of Onkwehonwe and Settlers to honour each others' existences. This

---

18. While Newcomb (1995, 3) originally conceptualizes rematriation as a process " 'to restore a living culture to its rightful place on Mother Earth,' or 'to restore a people to a spiritual way of life, in sacred relationship with their ancestral lands, without external interference'," Indigenous feminist activists and scholars, especially those from traditionally matriarchal or matrilineal societies, have strategically expanded the concept to address how cisheteropatriarchy is inextricable from settler colonialism.

19. Some argue that because settler colonialism is a zero-sum game (Wolfe 2006) and because the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the settler state is an ongoing contest over sovereignty, one cannot support both Indigenous and settler state sovereignty. From this perspective, settler support of Indigenous sovereignty means supporting Indigenous sovereignty over settler state sovereignty.

honouring cannot happen when one partner in the relationship is asked to sacrifice their heritage and identity in exchange for peace.

Given the "logic of elimination," structures of settler colonialism, including the settler state, prevent such a coexistence (Wolfe 2006, 387). While mutually respectful nation-to-nation relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are possible, moving towards this kind of relationship would still require a dismantling and transformation of the *settler* state.

For this study, I define decolonization as the process of dismantling the structures of settler colonialism, including the settler state, in order for Indigenous peoples to rematriate land, restore Indigenous structures, and fully exercise self-determination. Giddens (1979) provides a helpful understanding of structures and social transformation. They describe structures as patterns of social relationships and interactions that continue in time (60-62) and note that these patterns are also the rules that affect how individuals act (66, 69).[20] In this study, some participants found terms such as "pattern of colonialism" more helpful than "structural relationship." For them, the word "relationship" seemed to connote an individual level, making "structural relationship" vague and contradictory. Giddens illustrates how social systems are reproduced through the feedback loop between structures and actors (76) and defines power as the ability of participants in a social system to influence the reproduction or transformation of social interactions (93). Giddens assumes that power is "integral to the constitution of social practices" (54), but takes Western constructions for granted. While power is integral to *Western* social practices, it is not the basis of all social structures and systems.

---

20. I am using "they/their" as default pronouns, unless the author specifies pronouns, to challenge the gender-binary as a normative structure.

Regardless, Gidden's understanding of structures and social transformation aligns with Alfred's interpretation that a part of decolonization—dismantling settler colonial structures—is "remak[ing] the relationship between Onkwehonwe [original people] and Settler" (Alfred 2009, 34). Since this "remaking" entails a transformation of the current structural relationship that is based on power and a contest over sovereignty, a first step for settlers to aid in the transformation process can be supporting Indigenous sovereignty.

Indigenous Sovereignty

Wilkins and Lomawaima (2001, 250) define sovereignty as the set of inherent rights and responsibilities of a people or nation to "exercise political, economic, and cultural self-determination." Examples of a sovereign's rights and responsibilities include: jurisdiction over land and peoples, territorial integrity, self-government, self-definition (including defining membership), self-education, treating with other nations, and more (Wilkins and Lomawaima 2001; Barker 2005). Barker (2005, 21, 26) demonstrates how the meaning of sovereignty is "historically contingent" and dependent on the social "historical and cultural relationships in which it is articulated." In Western conceptions, sovereignty emanates from civility (Holm et al. 2003, 17) determined by Western markers of "reason, social contract, agriculture, property, technology, Christianity, monogamy, and/or the structures and operations of statehood" (Barker 2005, 3). Western nations denied Indigenous peoples as sovereigns based on this conception and claimed the right to "discover" lands and the right to conquest (Barker 2005, 4). Because of the Western ideological origins of sovereignty, Alfred (2005) argues that sovereignty is an inappropriate goal for Indigenous peoples. Alfred also contends that "the uncritical acceptance of the classic notion of sovereignty as the framework for

discussing political relations between people" is a barrier to transforming the relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers (41-42). However, discussing sovereignty is important because, as Wilkins and Lomawaima (2001, 5) describe, it defines the current structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and the settler state:

> At stake are fundamental questions of identity, jurisdiction, power, and control. Who defines tribes? The federal government, through the process of recognition? Or states? Or tribes themselves?

The settler state contests and constrains Indigenous sovereignty by denying Indigenous peoples as sovereigns, denying rights, or defining Indigenous sovereignty or rights in a way that is convenient to the settler state (Alfred 2005, 36). Barker (2005, 19, 1) details how Indigenous peoples have employed sovereignty as a specific legal and discursive strategy to "refut[e] minority status" as defined by the settler state and advance "political agendas for decolonization and social justice." Indigenous scholars and activists have contested Western notions of sovereignty by asserting that Indigenous sovereignty "is inherent in being a distinct people" (Holm et al. 2003, 17) and emanates from "relationships with specific lands" (Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2014, 4). Barker offers a definition of Indigenous sovereignty that encompasses these ideas: the set of inherent rights and responsibilities of a people "that emanat[e] from historically and politically resonant notions of cultural identity and community affiliations," especially relationship to Land (20).

This project takes up the question of identity and addresses the hegemonic structures of U.S. settler colonialism that constrain Indigenous peoples' ability to exercise their right to self-definition. These structures include: politics of recognition (Coulthard 2014); "racialization of the 'Indian'" (invention of an "Indian" identity) to erase

Indigenous sovereignty (Barker 2005, 17); imposing definitions based on settler ideas of "cultural authenticity, racial purity, and traditional integrity" (Barker, 17); false narratives of settler inheritance of Indigenous identity and the story of how the U.S. came to be (Lomawaima 2016, 90); settlers' "civility" taking precedence over Indigenous peoplehood (Barker, 3); and more. These false, hegemonic narratives ensure settler dominance by defining Indigenous peoples in relation to, and in a way that is convenient to, the settler state. Indigenous peoples challenge these structures by articulating their own definitions of who they are.

Barker poses the following questions about identity that help determine what sovereignty means and how it matters for Indigenous peoples; they are also helpful in determining how settlers can support Indigenous sovereignty: "What kinds of identities did they [social actors who invoke sovereignty] have stakes in claiming and asserting? In relationship to what other identities?" (21) If the U.S. claims inheritance of Indigenous identity and redefines Indigenous peoples in relation to the settler state, then settlers can challenge the hegemonic structures by upholding Indigenous peoples' self-definitions, interrogating their own identity as members of a settler state, and redefining themselves in relation to Indigenous peoples. Interrogating and transforming settler identities disrupts the hegemonic narratives that "emplace" settlers (Hiller 2017, 422) and *replace* Indigenous peoples (Wolfe 2006). One goal of this study and framework is to explore what possibilities unfold when settlers engage in these actions.

CHAPTER 4

FRAMEWORK FOR SETTLER RESPONSIBILITY,

PART I: STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION

The proposed framework has two components, each addressing settler

responsibility on a different scale. The first component addresses the structural level

responsibility and the second addresses the level of individual relationships. I suggest that

settler responsibility on a structural level requires work to transform the structural

relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers; I suggest that this role involves a

settler transformation process parallel to Indigenous resurgence. For the second

component of the framework, I propose a shared process between Indigenous and settler

parties for identifying settler (and Indigenous) responsibilities within individual or

community relationships. This study included a trial run of the process, and I revised the

process methods based on participants' contributions.

Indigenous Resurgence

A transformed relationship is made possible through processes of Indigenous

resurgence. Thus, Indigenous resurgence could be considered Indigenous peoples' role.

Indigenous scholars' articulations of Indigenous resurgence show a parallel process of

transformation for settlers. Indigenous resurgence refers to a transformation from a

colonized existence to a decolonized, liberated existence through the regeneration of

Indigenous and Indigenist structures (social structures, governance structures, knowledge

systems, education, healthcare, and so on), processes, and ways of being (Alfred 2009,

34; Corntassel et al. 2018, 17; Simpson 2011, 17).[21] Alfred (2015) grounds the Indigenous resurgence paradigm in three principles: rootedness in the land, accountability to community, and transformation guided by traditional cultural teachings. Corntassel et al. (2018, 17) describe how Indigenous resurgence encompasses the "ways that Indigenous people renew and regenerate relationships with land, waters, cultures, and communities." Simpson (2011, 17) describes Indigenous resurgence as a "reclaim[ing] the Indigenous contexts (knowledge, interpretations, values, ethics, processes) for our political cultures." If decolonization focuses on dismantling settler colonial structures, then Indigenous resurgence focuses on regenerating the contexts and structures that can replace settler colonialism. Regenerating Indigenous structures is essential because, as Fanon (1963, 40) warns, without building the structures that will replace colonial structures, we run the risk of falling back into colonial structures after dismantling them.

Simpson also notes the difference between Indigenous resurgence and Indigenous sovereignty—whereas Indigenous sovereignty efforts focus on "demand[ing] political relationships based on recognized Indigenous nations and alternatives to rights-based approaches" (19), resurgence "refocuses our work from trying to transform the colonial outside into a flourishment of the Indigenous inside [...] rebuild[ing] our culturally inherent philosophical contexts for governance, education, healthcare, and economy" (17). Simpson clarifies that resurgence is not simply a return to the past, but is a process of applying traditional teachings to present contexts; Alfred (2009, 34) expresses the

---

21. Rigney (1999, 115-17) grounds the concept of "Indigenist" in Indigenous feminist theory. They differentiate "Indigenist" from "Indigenous" in that it is rooted in three principles: (1) "resistance as the emancipatory imperative;" (2) "political integrity" meaning "Indigenist research [and projects] is undertaken by Indigenous" peoples only; and (3) "privileging Indigenous voices."

same idea and adds that Indigenous resurgence involves transformation: "Regeneration means we will reference ourselves differently both from the ways we did traditionally and under colonial dominion [...and] will result in a new conception of what it is to live as Onkwehonwe." Regeneration of Indigenous contexts and structures allows for the transformation of the relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers. Alfred (2009, 48-49) notes that "[i]t is in fact one of the strongest themes within indigenous [sic] American cultures that the sickness manifest in the modern colonial state can be transformed into a framework for coexistence by understanding and respecting the traditional teachings." Simpson expresses a similar idea: "Transforming ourselves, our communities and our nations is ultimately the first step in transforming our relationship with the state" (17).

Settler Transformation

Transforming the structural relationship is not the responsibility of only Indigenous peoples. If Indigenous peoples' role can be focusing on the "inside" work, regenerating structures that allow for the transformation of the relationship, then what might a settler role be? Alfred (2009, 35) describes how Indigenous resurgence offers a parallel process for settlers:

> [T]hey will discover that while we are envisioning a new relationship between Onkwehonwe and the land, we are at the same time offering a decolonized alternative to the Settler society by inviting them to share our vision of respect and peaceful coexistence.
> The non-indigenous will be shown a new path and offered the chance to join in a renewed relationship between the peoples and places of this land, which we occupy together.

It is important to recognize a settler transformation process specifically as *parallel* to honor that the roles for Indigenous peoples and settlers within decolonization are distinct,

63

and that Indigenous people require "separate spaces of doing work as Indigenous people" (Robinson in Carter, Recollet, and Robinson 2017, 210). Participants of this study highlighted the importance of position and positionality in defining roles and responsibilities.

I use "settler transformation" to indicate transformation of the structural position of "settler," rather than individual transformation of consciousness, just as Indigenous resurgence refers to transformation on a structural, not just individual, level. Although individual relationships are connected to structural relationships, as participants pointed out in this study, qualities of an individual relationship may not reflect the structural relationship and structural analyses may not appropriately describe every individual relationship. Because "settler" is a structural position in relation to Indigenous peoples, settler transformation can only occur through transforming the structural relationship with Indigenous peoples. While settler transformation is structural, *settler transformation praxis* can describe how settlers may relate to, engage with, and work to transform structures on an individual level. The concept of settler transformation praxis extends Anthony-Stevens's (2017, 99) "on-the-ground, everyday praxis of supporting Indigenous projects of […] sovereignty" and could be considered a parallel to Corntassel et al.'s (2018) "everyday acts of resurgence." Stirling (2015, 78) uses the term "settler decolonization" to describe ways in which settlers may engage in processes of decolonization; however, as Stirling defines it, settler decolonization focuses on "decolonizing the colonizer." Stirling admits that "[s]ettler decolonization can appear as a contradiction and there is much theoretical work to be done to fully detangle the political implications of settlers actively dismantling colonization and colonial privileges" (84).

The concept of "settler decolonization" is a contradictory for a couple reasons. First, settlers have not been colonized unless they are Indigenous to another land, and with the term "settler decolonization" we can forget that settlers are the beneficiaries of settler colonialism. Second, processes of decolonization are about dismantling structures, not just changing individuals, and Stirling identifies an "unresolved tension" in their research which is premised on settler decolonization: "no matter how much individuals seek to decolonize themselves, settler-colonial societies remain solidly based in colonialism and colonial systems of exploitation" (373). As I mentioned earlier in the "Methodology" section, this research takes up the "unresolved tension" of individual versus structural transformation. Components of Davis, Hiller, et al.'s (2017, 402) "transforming settler consciousness" more accurately describe what settler transformation praxis entails:

> Our current understanding of transforming settler consciousness is:
> - Creating narratives, processes and practices that hold settlers accountable to their responsibilities as beneficiaries of colonization, both historic and ongoing.
> - Naming and upsetting the status quo, and challenging the power dynamics that perpetuate settler colonialism.
> - Building just and decolonized relationships with Indigenous peoples, the land, and all beings.
> - Engaging in an ongoing, complex and dynamic process grounded in a lifetime commitment, which occurs at the level of the individual, family, community and nation.

As a phrase, "transforming settler consciousness" does not necessarily connote action beyond changing perspective nor does it connote active engagement in relationship-building. Therefore, for this study, I use "transforming settler consciousness" to refer to shifting of perspective or gaining awareness, without any substantial action. Davis, Hiller, et al.'s research suggests that the majority of initiatives for "transforming relations" in Canada do not actually address the four components that they listed:

Each of the initiatives [...] represent entry points to different stages in this unfolding process, not panaceas for transformation in and of themselves. Our analysis showed that most of these initiatives represent early "learning" stages, and that a disconnect exists between these and later stages that actually confront settler positionalities and privilege.

Instead, this study seeks to help build a praxis that explicitly does "confront settler positionalities." Key questions that can guide settler transformation praxis include: What is my position in relation to Indigenous people? In a just and equitable relationship, what would my position be?

Settler transformation praxis may address questions of identity. As suggested earlier, settlers can challenge the hegemonic structures that constrain Indigenous peoples' ability to exercise their right to self-definition by upholding Indigenous peoples' self-definitions, interrogating their own identity as members of a settler state, and redefining themselves in relation to Indigenous peoples rather than the settler state. I argue that the emplacement of settlers relies not only on erasure of Indigenous presence but also erasure of settler ties to their homelands and other heritage identities. Methods that I share later in the proposed framework for settler responsibility begin to uncover what components of a settler transformation praxis might be.

Despite the potential for parallel transformation, Indigenous scholars note that, for the most part, settlers are not doing their part. Alfred (2005, 48-49) points out, "Yet there has been very little movement toward an understanding or even appreciation of the indigenous [sic] tradition among non-indigenous people," while Simpson (2011, 18) states, "it seems rather futile to be engaged in scholarly and political processes, trying to shift these relationships when there is no evidence there exists political will to do so on the part of the [settler] state." Alfred (2009) and Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel

66

(2014) also warn that there needs to be more than just intention or willingness to transform the relationship. Alfred (2009, 180) stresses that the process must be rooted in decolonization—active participation in dismantling the settler colonial structures that maintain the current power relationship:

> There is great danger in attempting to negotiate structural changes to our relationships before our minds and hearts are cleansed of the stains of colonialism. In the absence of mental and spiritual decolonization, any effort to theorize or implement a model of a "new" Onkwehonwe-Settler relationship is counter-productive to the objectives of justice and the achievement of a long-term relationship of peaceful coexistence between our peoples.

Meanwhile, Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel specify that settler solidarities with Indigenous peoples must: center Indigenous articulations, be relationship-based and context specific, and focus on settler responsibilities and accountability to Indigenous peoples—or they might reproduce settler colonial relationships. The second component of the framework for settler responsibility expands on the specific qualities and practices that are important for settler solidarities.

CHAPTER 5

FRAMEWORK FOR SETTLER RESPONSIBILITY, PART II:

SHARED PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Individual level responsibilities depend on personal and community relationships. For the second component of the framework, I propose a shared process between Indigenous and settler parties for identifying settler (and Indigenous) responsibilities within individual or community relationships. The goal of the process is to develop shared expectations for relationships and therefore roles/responsibilities and accountability, which expectations inform. Participants in this project identified that relationships inform responsibilities and accountability, and cultural values and ontologies inform relationship expectations. The study included a trial run of the process, and I revised the methods based on participants' contributions.

The shared process for identifying responsibilities focuses on four methods: (1) developing shared meanings and understandings of terms/concepts, which are foundational to having shared expectations, (2) gathering stories about who we are in relationship to each other, (3) examining existing daily practices in individual relationships that gesture to a different structural relationship, and (4) using creative processes to imagining structural relationships in a shared world beyond settler colonialism. These methods draw from three examples of decolonial, anticapitalist, antiracist, feminist praxis compiled in *Feminist Freedom Warriors* (Mohanty and Carty 2018): Okazawa-Rey's "wonderful thinking" (27), Pratt's process of "collective imagination" (58), and Aída Harnández-Castillo's call to "destabilize your certainties"

and "search together" (83). The methods proposed for the shared process could be considered a form of "popular-education gatherings," which Okazawa-Rey describes as necessary to foster "wonderful thinking":

> Engaging in "wonderful thinking" requires us first to create popular-education gatherings—intergenerational, multi-identities, cross-issue, cross-sector—wherever we are located and, whenever possible, across geographies. To share local knowledges and personal experiences; to look deeply into and through differences and identities that consistently divide; to apply various critical theoretical perspectives, including socially lived theories; and to generate collective identities, shared structural analyses, and compatible visions of justice, sustainability, and genuine security are radical, potentially transformative acts. (27)

Each of the methods incorporates one or more of the activities listed above. In particular, the method of developing shared meanings through discussion includes creating "shared structural analyses;" the methods of gathering stories and examining existing practices rely heavily on "shar[ing] local knowledges and personal experiences;" and the method of imagining structural relationships seeks to grow "compatible visions" of a shared world beyond settler colonialism. The open-endedness of these methods reflects Aída Harnández-Castillo's suggestion to "destabilize [o]ur certainties" and instead "search together" (83). "Searching together," rather than setting an intended outcome, allows for more possibilities. Similarly, Pratt encourages "collective imagination" because, "As I went through that process, my ability to imagine differently was changed, and other possibilities opened up to me" (57). The goal of the shared process is to imagine together through collective work, rather than rely on individual imagination, and explore what possibilities unfold when settlers center their relationships with Indigenous people(s).

In this sense, the shared process may be what Carter, Recollet, and Robinson (2017) call "reworlding," what Smith (2012, 153) calls a project of "envisioning" or a

process within decolonization that Laenui (n.d.) calls "dreaming." While Smith's

"envisioning" and Laenui's "dreaming" were conceptualized based on projects of

resurgence in Indigenous communities, I extend them here in this framework to help

theorize and apply the parallel process of settler transformation. Reworlding entails

> Indigenous desirous futurities, and the creation of processes and
> possibilities for imagining worlds [...] a process of dreaming new worlds
> into being, a refusal of being stilled, and the activation of a radical
> imagination whereby social change is created through different forms of
> nuance and style" (Carter, Recollet, and Robinson 2017, 212-213).

Carter, Recollet, and Robinson also give examples of ways in which settlers may

participate in the process of reworlding, by redefining the story of who they/we are in

relation to Indigenous peoples and to Land. Carter recalls how "Andy Curtis [...] a non-

Indigenous theatre worker explored these questions [of position and responsibility]

during his partnership with" Indigenous colleagues:

> As he began to encounter and understand "different ways of holding
> stories," and as he became more comfortable working within hitherto
> unfamiliar processes, he was able to weave himself into these stories and
> processes—to recognize himself and acknowledge himself personally
> accountable to them: "Who am I *now* in this place?" he asked. What, he
> was asking, is my responsibility to *this* Story? What are the actions I must
> pursue to live out my duty to this encounter in this historical moment? [...]
> Curtis's testimony models the courage and generosity of a soul that
> *hungers* for transformation. It offers possibilities of reworlding through
> engaged collaboration within which the stories *to and for* which we are
> accountable are recognized, acknowledged, and shared (222, emphases in
> original).

Although this example describes individual level transformation of consciousness, the

consideration of position, responsibility, and accountability provides helpful hints about

praxis that leads to settler transformation. In the following sections, I describe each of the

methods in detail, and how they address position, responsibility, and accountability.

These suggested methods do not have to be used in any particular order and may even be used simultaneously.

Method 1 - Developing Shared Meanings Through Discussion

The goal of this method is to develop shared meanings and understandings for the terms and concepts with which we use to speak about relationships. This method is an extension of Ermine's (2007, 202) concept of "[e]ngagement at the ethical space [which] triggers a dialogue [between Indigenous peoples and Western societies] that begins to set the parameters for an agreement to interact modeled on appropriate, ethical and human principles." Similarly, participants in the study underscored that having shared understandings, especially of values, is foundational to having shared expectations for relationships, and that these shared relationship expectations then inform roles, responsibilities, and accountability. Therefore, developing shared understandings is foundational to transforming the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers. Some participants also mentioned that these kinds of conversations do not happen often enough and appreciated the chance to engage in this way. Based on feedback and comments from the participants, some recommended discussion topics include:

- Identifying shared definitions for terms that help us explain historical context and existing structural relationship: Indigenous, settler, settler colonialism, etc.
- Conception of and expectations for relationships: Identifying types of relationships (to whom are we accountable), characteristics of "good" relationships

- Conceptions of values and value systems - especially the specific Indigenous people's value system, specific values (respect, responsibility, etc.)

- Conceptions of place/land, role, responsibility, community member, visitor.

- Individual vs. structural relationships

The following are example discussion prompts, including ones used in the study and ones developed based on participants' contributions and insights:

- How would you describe good relationships?

- What values are important to you and guide your relationships?

- What does the term [choose a value] mean for you?

- How do you define the term "settler"? When is the term "settler" useful? When is it not?

- What are settler responsibilities and roles? What are Indigenous peoples' responsibilities and roles? Have we done that and how can we do it better?

- Is the idea of Indigenous peoples as hosts and non-Indigenous people as guests helpful?

- What are your Indigenous kinship systems or other Indigenous conceptions of structural relationships? Would these be a good model for a transformed relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers?

Method 2 - Gathering Stories About Who We are in Relationship to Each Other

This method helps Indigenous and settler participants remember stories of who they are, how they met, and how their individual relationships have influenced how they think about themselves. The goal of this method is to uncover ways in which settlers are

reconceptualizing how they think about their identity in relation to Indigenous peoples, or engaging in settler transformation praxis, and what Indigenous people might have observed or think of it. Prompts for this story-gathering method might include:

- Self-identification

    o   What are some of your favorite activities?

    o   Where do you live? Is that where you grew up?

    o   How would you describe who you are?

    o   What place feels like home and why? How would you describe it to someone who's never been there?

    o   What's your strongest memory of a childhood place that was important to you? What activities did you and your family do in that place?

- Family Background / Cultural Heritage

    o   Tell me a little more about your family background.

    o   What languages did you speak or hear people speaking growing up?

    o   What kinds of food would your family make for everyday meals? For special occasions?

    o   How connected to your family background/cultural heritage(s) did you feel growing up? Do you feel more or less connected now?

    o   What are ways that you have tried to maintain connection or reconnect with your cultural heritage(s)?

- Relationship to Your Project Partner(s)

    o   How do you know your project partner(s) and how long have you known them?

o How has your relationship with your project partner(s) affected the way
you think about your identity?

o How do you think your identity affects your relationship with your project
partner(s)?

Method 3 - Examining Existing Daily Practices

Scholars and activists have suggested that the utopian is less a desirable vision of the future and more a process that is already happening: "a way of conceiving and living in the here and now […] to protect the future" rather than needing a guarantee that the bad will not repeat (Gordon 2004, 127); or a daily process "to define, build and practice how we will treat each other and work together (HAVOQ 2011, 6). Feminist scholar Sara Ahmed urges us "to enact the world we are aiming for: nothing less will do" (2014, 170). Corntassel et al. (2018, 17) theorize the connection between daily action and a transformed world for contexts of Indigenous resurgence; they ask:

> How do your everyday actions reflect your relationships with people,
> places and practices? Often daily practices are overlooked during
> discussions of community resurgence and self-determination movements.
> By looking more closely at everyday acts of resurgence, we can identify
> and better understand ways that Indigenous peoples renew and regenerate
> relationships with lands, waters, cultures, and communities. These daily
> convergences of people, places, and practices help us envision life beyond
> the state and honor the relationships that foster community health and
> wellbeing.

The method of examining existing daily practices extends the idea of "everyday acts of resurgence" to settler transformation praxis and seeks to identify ways in which Indigenous peoples and settlers are already practicing different kinds of relationships. This method also draws on Davis's (2010) *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, in which Indigenous and settler contributors share detailed

examples of how individuals, communities, and organizations are practicing relationships that deviate from and resist a settler colonial relationship. The following are potential prompts for examining existing practices:

- What are cultural practices used to maintain good relationships?

- What are practices that we (project partners) have used to grow and maintain our specific relationships?

- How do we make sure we are responsible in growing and maintaining good relationships?

- What are ways that we can move the structural relationship (rather than individual) between Indigenous peoples and settlers toward the kinds of good relationships we talked about?

- Are there examples of traditional or non-traditional practices for dealing with family/community members who have acted in a disrespectful or harmful way? How might these practices inform how we think about how the structural relationship between Indigenous peoples and the U.S. as a settler state can be transformed?

- In Canada there are a lot of "truth and reconciliation" programs and committees. However, many First Nations scholars and communities see these as empty gestures of acknowledgement and apology without really doing anything to change the structural relationship. How do we make sure we don't go down that path?

Method 4 - Using Creative Processes to Imagine Structural Relationships in a Shared

World Beyond Settler Colonialism

For this method, I describe the following: why imagining worlds is necessary,

"seeking balance" rather than perfection as a guiding measure, Indigenous futurity as

spatial and genealogical, and using creative processes to help us foster imagination. As

we work to transform structural relationships it seems essential to imagine a world that

we are trying to work towards. Indigenous feminists Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013, 14)

articulate that a part of hegemony and maintaining the dominance of current structures is

making them seem "natural, without origin (and without end), and inevitable." This kind

of certainty about existence is a mechanism to destroy hope and a will for change. Bloch

([1954] 1995, 196) identifies that hope is intimately tied to imagination and that the

foundation for hope is a belief in what is "really Possible," what is possible because it

does not yet exist, as opposed to the "objectively Possible," what we think can happen

given extant conditions. Creations of "Indigenous futurisms," which seek to "envision

Native futures, Indigenous hopes, and dreams" (Dillon 2012, 2), resist hegemonic

narratives and show us that the structure of settler colonialism is not inevitable or

unchangeable. They liberate Indigenous (and maybe settler) imaginations from

constraints of the world as it exists. Dillon (2012) articulates how Indigenous futurisms

are acts of self-determination and Indigenous resurgence in which Indigenous peoples tell

and live their own stories instead of living by the settler narratives that have been scripted

for them. Dillon also suggests that "all Indigenous futurisms are narratives" of

decolonization because they directly "confron[t] the structures of racism and colonialism"

(10-11). For Dillon, a more appropriate term for the process of decolonization is

"biskaabiiyang, an Anishnaabemowin word connoting the process of 'returning to ourselves'" (10).

As we imagine and envision possibilities, we should be wary of seeking a perfect world. Perfection is a kind of absolute, the certainty of no flaws, and the desire for perfection points to the "fascist, totalitarian impulse that lurks behind Western futurism" (H. L. T. Quan).[22] Dillon (2012) identifies that "seeking balance" is a goal for Indigenous futurisms, pointing out that Native peoples are already living in a dystopia and that this "Native Apocalypse is really that state of imbalance" (9, 12). Values or principles identified during the process for developing shared meanings, may also serve as guides for the imagining process. For example, Diné participants in this study identified hózhó as an important guiding principle.

Throughout a process of imagining, dreaming, and envisioning, it is also important to consider Indigenous conceptions of futurity, outside of the Western conception, which is linear, temporal, and rooted in individualism. Because Western conceptions of futurity assume that the future (and the past) is disconnected from the present, settlers may use such future-oriented language and visioning, to "escap[e] from Indigenous issues in the present" (Saranillio 2018, 24). The disconnection of present from past and future can also reduce the scope of our thinking to our own individual life/time. In contrast to Western conceptions, Indigenous futurity (and history) is *spatial* and *genealogical* moreso than temporal, connecting and holding individuals accountable to Land, to past and future generations, and to their people. Basso's (1996, 32) account of

---

22. H. L. T. Quan, September 12, 2020, Arizona State University seminar: JUS 691.

Apache ontologies shows how a spatial history may be constructed *in the same way* one

might a spatial futurity:

> thinly chronological, and rarely written down, Western Apache history as practiced by Apaches advances no theories, tests no hypothesis, and offers no general models. What it does instead, and likely has done for centuries, is *fashion possible worlds*, give them expressive shape, and present them for contemplation as images of the past that can *deepen and enlarge awareness of the present*. In the country of the past, as the Apaches like to explore it, the place-maker is an indispensable guide. / And this in a powerful sense. For the place-maker's main objective is to speak the past into being, to summon it with words and give it dramatic form, to *produce* [emphasis in original] experience by forging ancestral worlds in which others can participate. (emphasis added except where indicated)

In the process of "fashion[ing] possible worlds," we see many similarities to Carter,

Recollet, and Robinson's process of reworlding. And in considering Karyn Recollet's

questions, we might think about how these ideas of spatial history extend to futurity:

> How do we gesture futurity, how do we gesture toward being rhizomatically rooted this way? […] Isn't decolonization just activating spaces by unearthing stories and scales as spatial trajectories toward futurity? We need to remap the fluidity and collapse of time/space to consider our future ancestors […] "Our future ancestors" acknowledges these scales […] We need to reframe the language through which we speak about our worlds, our realities (Carter, Recollet, and Robinson 2017, 217).

Both Recollet and Basso describe how Indigenous projects of creating possible worlds is

a fluid, collective endeavor, that arise from connection to place. Participants in this study

repeatedly referenced future generations and futurity in connection to place.

Indigenous contributors in Part 1 of Davis's (2010) *Alliances* draw on their

traditional social structures to imagine transformed relationships with non-Indigenous

people. This method extends this imagination activity in two ways: (1) seeing what

possibilities emerge when Indigenous persons and settlers imagine together, and (2) using

creative processes to facilitate imagination. Carter, Recollet, and Robinson (2017) identify how creative processes such as dance/choreography, filmmaking, drama can be methods of reworlding that help us think, feel and be in different ways, similar to how the Apache place-maker creates "the country of the past" and "produces experience" through oral storytelling. Looking to these creative practices and practitioners can help us foster imagination, especially when we're out of practice. Creative processes are the backbone for this proposed method of imagining structural relationships in a shared world beyond settler colonialism. This method also draws from Etherington's (2015, 63) transformational process for settler students using "performance-based learning," in which students are asked to use creative work and performance "to present ideas face-to-face rather than simply write about them, which is the dominant Eurocentric model of learning". For the study, I had planned the creative process as a reflection process, mirroring the structure of Etherington's "performance-based learning." I presented the group with the following creative process prompts:

Create something together that…

- Expresses feelings that came up through this whole process (group conversations and project partner conversations)
- Represents how you see your relationship with your project partner
- Represents your hopes for how your relationship might continue and grow

For folks who are physically distancing, your safety is priority! You can choose to do/make something collaboratively if you feel it's safe or each do/make something individually and exchange. It will be your choice of format, but here are some example ideas:

- Performance - make music, create a dance, oral storytelling, spoken word, scripted conversation, short play, etc. Record your performance + talk about what it represents.

- Food - Make food together, send each other a recipe to make, or make food and exchange. Take photos/video of what you make + write down why you chose those foods.

- Garden, care for the land, or make plant medicine together.

- Make a drawing, photo collage (digital or physical), comic strip, or something else.

- Writing - poetry, essay, word cloud/collage

- Make something wearable - knit, sew, weave, bead, or dye something.

However, due to the energy and time already committed to the discussions, all participants decided to opt out of the creative process, which I had stated was optional. For future applications of this method, I suggest that creative processes be incorporated not (only) as a reflection piece, but as a tool to help foster imagination and to help guide the exploration process. I revised this method to include two additional activities that can be incorporated from the beginning. One activity is to read, watch, or listen to works of Indigenous Futurisms (short stories, novels, videos, music, comics, performances, art, etc.), and then have a discussion based on the work. Below is a list of suggested works, but the list is not exhaustive:

- Books - *Walking the Clouds: An Anthology of Indigenous Science Fiction*, edited by Grace L. Dillon; https://bookriot.com/sff-books-by-indigenous-authors/

- Comics – Moonshot: The Indigenous Comics Collection, Volume 1-3; *The Sixth World* by Kayla Shaggy (https://gumroad.com/l/sixthworldone)

- Films - http://web.pdx.edu/~dillong/native/syllabus.htm ; https://www.nfb.ca/indigenous-cinema/

- Performing Arts – New Native Theatre (https://newnativetheatre.org/); Spiderwoman Theater (https://www.spiderwomantheater.org/); Red Sky Performance (http://www.redskyperformance.com/), Native Earth Performing Arts (https://www.nativeearth.ca/); Atamira Dance Company (https://atamiradance.co.nz/); Descendance (https://www.descendance.net/); Bangarra (https://www.bangarra.com.au/)

- Art – IAIA Indigenous Futurisms (https://iaia.edu/event/indigenous-futurisms-transcending-past-present-future/); Loom Indigenous Art Gallery (https://loomindigenousartgallery.tumblr.com/)

The other activity is to create something together (play, dramatic dialogue, oral story, poem, dance, song, drawing, painting, comic strip, etc.) based on a prompt. Below are some suggested prompts.

Present day scenario:

- A small group of visitors, of an Indigenous people of another region, have come to learn about past and current successes in your community. What are you proud of in your community that you would like to show them?

- You are representatives for [the Indigenous project partner's people] and a non-Indigenous entity. You are meeting to discuss the naming of place, and the best

way to move forward with regard to the name of the place where you both are.
What do you discuss?

Near future scenario:

- It is 2040 [or 20 years from your current year], your community has expanded on the successes that you described in the first prompt, and the best possible things have happened. You are sharing with a group of children the story of change that has happened in the past 20 years. What story do you tell?

Farther future scenario:

- It is 50 years after the dissolution of the U.S. It was a smooth transition since communities have been growing the structures to replace it since before the dissolution.

  - What does a day in the life of your future descendant look like?

  - You are representatives from two sovereigns: [the Indigenous project partner's people] and a non-Indigenous entity. You are meeting to negotiate a plan for the rehabilitation of [a currently threatened or harmed Indigenous site, such as Kaho'olawe, abandoned uranium mines on Dine Bikeyah, or Oak Flat]. Make a creative work portraying this negotiation.

  - Your community is hosting a seed exchange gathering between "nations", who has come and what conversations do you overhear at this gathering?

  - You are traveling to another "nation" to visit a friend, what is your journey like?

Since the participants were unable to do the creative process, I asked my co-facilitator Waquin Preston to try out the method with me, using the following prompt: "The U.S. no

82

longer exists; your community is hosting a seed exchange gathering between 'nations,' who has come and what conversations do you overhear at this gathering?" This is a quick story that Waquin told based on the prompt. I recorded the story while he was telling it and transcribed it.

. . .

So the echidnas are there with all the other animals. They all brought some excellent seeds, and they're all sniffing at them. They put them all on the table, in the middle of a table, and they all go up and sniff at them. The animals are trying to decide, how should we split up these seeds? And they start arguing.

Then one echidna gets up on to the table and says, "Liiissten. Listen up you animals," and shakes their paw. "Alright, we're gonna divide the seeds by who has the funniest story. And whoever has the funniest story will have the first pick of twenty seeds. And so first up will be the babies." And the babies didn't quite know how to talk yet, but they would babble in their baby language. And nobody quite understood, except for those same animals as the baby, and they would chuckle.

So next up would be the elders, and they started their stories with the creation story of their people. So, stories could take up to three days to complete. And for all of the animals, it became an endurance *test. All of the animals were listening and trying to stay awake. It was a draw at the end because none of the animals could stay up long enough to laugh at the stories.*

So the echidnas had to get up again and say, "Alright, listen up you animals. This is what we're gonna do. You're going to tell us how big your peoples are. And then we'll divide up the seeds by that." And the bear said, "We are very large.*" And the echidnas*

said, "Aahm…no…no." So the echidnas had to get up again and say, "Alright you

animals, you need to take this seriously. We've been here for several weeks now, and we

all want to go home." And so the animals finally started to cooperate and take it

seriously.

Finally, the echidnas were able to distribute the seeds between the animals. And

the animals said, "Thank you echidnas," and they all started getting ready to go home, to

make their journey home. And they packed up their little bags, and they packed up their

seeds. And the echidnas said ok, "To commemorate this moment, we shall all plant one

seed here." And the animals said, "Oh ok." And they all planted a seed. And they all

waved to each other and then they left.

. . .

This story brings up several interesting questions about social structures and structural

relationships, which we could ask about a world that we want to work towards. In this

story, the animals welcome the presence of babies, in contrast with contemporary U.S.

society where it is inappropriate to bring children into work-related spaces or nation-to-

nation meetings. The animals also value babies' contributions, even having them speak

first, with elders speaking next. Dehyle and Swisher (1997, 141) describe how

Indigenous pedagogies emphasize modeling, where children are expected to learn

through observation rather than through verbal instruction, which dominant pedagogies

rely on:

> The conditions in Native communities where observation is an essential
> tool of learning are less prevalent in the dominant White society. In this
> mainstream context, siblings often play and interact with a peer group
> separate from each other; parents may be absent from the home for
> extended periods for employment and other adult activities; young
> children are frequently cared for by non-family members; and children

rarely accompany their parents to "adult" social activities. Under these circumstances, learning occurs without a *shared contextual framework*, and the use of language, such as question asking, and verbal interaction becomes a critical means of communication within the Euro-American family. (emphasis added)

The story brings up questions of what does learning within "a shared contextual framework" look like? Seeing how the animals value oral storytelling and Indigenous epistemologies, we might ask: what do decolonizing and Indigenous pedagogies look like in contemporary and future contexts? Seeing how the animals privilege the young and the elders, we might ask, what does a world without ageism look like? In the story, humor and endurance are valued traits. Deloria Jr. (1988, 146) writes, "It has always been a great disappointment to Indian people that the humorous side of Indian life has not been mentioned by professed experts on Indian Affairs." What individual traits does a capitalist, cisheteropatriarchal, white supremacist, settler society value? What traits do we want to value instead?

In the stories, we see an argument between animals, and two attempts to create fair distribution or exchange of seeds. This raises a question of, how might future sovereign entities deal with conflict? What is fair, just, or equitable, and who gets to decide? The seed planting commemoration raises the question, what protocols might we use to grow, maintain, or express commitment to relationships, including relationships to place? The echidna mentions that the gathering has been going on for several weeks, whereas conferences in contemporary U.S. society might last for a few hours or a several days at most. How do we think about time in a decolonized world? What does time *feel* like in a decolonized world? Using this method, the creations may raise more questions,

85

than they provide answers. This is desirable, since the creations are meant to be imperfect, focusing on possibilities, not certainties.

<center>Recommendations</center>

The proposed methods do not have to be used in any particular order and may even be used simultaneously. Each session in the study used a combination of the methods. The proposed methods are meant to be adapted to your specific context, group size, and goals. They can be adapted for community-specific goals, not just academic ones. While I decided to start with a group discussion so participants could get to know each other, after facilitating the whole process, I believe starting with conversations between project partner pairs would have been more beneficial. It would have given participants an opportunity to get warmed up with someone they already know and to start thinking about some of these ideas prior to discussing as a group.

Smaller group sizes may be more effective for discussions, so there is more opportunity for each person to speak and so people who feel uneasy speaking in front of a large group may be more comfortable. If working with a large group, I suggest dividing participants into groups of five to seven for discussions, and then coming back together to share what was discussed. Discussion may also work with pairs. In this study, discussions were held with all seven participants as a group, with project partners and myself facilitating, and as an "on your own" session between just project partners.

Though I presented the imagining and creative method last, I highly recommend incorporating it from the beginning to help participants think in different ways and also to remind ourselves that doing social transformation work does not always have to be tedious and draining. It can also be fun and inspiring.

<center>86</center>

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In discussing the role of "Indigenous knowledge recovery" in decolonization,

Waziyatawin Angela Wilson (2004, 361) speculates:

> It was not inevitable that Western knowledge would conquer Indigenous
> knowledge, or that our ways of life had to end. At any point in history we
> could have worked jointly toward conditions that would facilitate the
> return of Indigenous ways of being while appreciating the knowledge that
> supported those ways. Even now this is not an impossible task.

This research holds Wilson's hopeful vision at its core. In proposing a framework for

settler responsibility, I hope to help inspire settler action beyond spreading awareness and

shift the focus beyond apology and guilt. Responsibility can decenter the settler and

instead center Indigenous peoples and our relationships with them. Settler responsibility

can also bridge structural and individual transformation. In addition to identifying

individual level responsibilities, each of the proposed methods targets a specific barrier to

transforming the structural relationship. The method of developing shared understandings

through discussion addresses the barrier of conflicting worldviews and cultural

differences. The method of gathering stories about who we are in relationship to each

other addresses the barrier that settlers have few models for how to engage in settler

transformation praxis. The methods of examining existing practices and imagining

potential structural relationships address the belief that a world beyond settler colonialism

is impossible or unrealistic. These four methods address how we may engage in

decolonization on a personal level.

The relationships between the project partners of this study deviate from and

resist the characteristics of a settler colonial relationship—as Summer said of her

relationship with TY, "we have a family relationship, we're sisters." These types of relationships are proof that a different structural relationship is possible. By choosing a different way of interacting, individuals challenge the social rules of interaction and break the patterns—they challenge the structure. Through our interactions in personal relationships, we can uncover, imagine, and grow the structures that will replace settler colonial structures. As the participants remind us, however, non-conforming interactions in one relationship does not equal a changed pattern. We also need to challenge the hegemonic ideologies, narratives, and mechanisms that maintain the structure of settler colonialism. Participants mentioned that a beginning step to challenging hegemonic narratives is to learn the true history of Indigenous-settler relations, and they also offer ways to extend this learning. Alyssa suggests that as settlers learn the true history we should "accept it […] and elevate Indigenous peoples"; TY suggests that we may use this knowledge to "reflect on how we may be perpetuating oppression/racism/etc."; Rena suggests that an important action is to say, "I own it and it won't happen again," and follow through on that commitment. Participants also indicated that constantly considering position and positionality in relation to Indigenous peoples is one way to center Indigenous peoples. As Kapaliku indicated, "Your placement in that circle reflects your responsibility to that community or some of the larger roles that you play." Since position informs responsibility, constant reflection on position and positionality may also be one way to hold ourselves accountable. We might ask ourselves, "Well does this make sense for me to be the person to help?" as Alyssa does. Future applications of the proposed methods may help to identify other components of a settler transformation praxis.

In thinking about potential structural relationships beyond settler colonialism, the participants of this study illustrated that finding a model may not be the right goal because a singular model may not fit all contexts. Mandy's comment reflects the Indigenous participants' thoughts on a host/guest model: "I feel like if this were the model, I would be bending over backwards to make non-Indigenous people feel comfortable." Indigenous participants unanimously responded that a host/guest model is inappropriate because the roles are inequitable in terms of responsibility—the burden would be on Indigenous peoples as "hosts." Such models also focus on human relationships. Before identifying characteristics of "good" relationships, participants thought it was important to identify who we are accountable to, emphasizing non-human relationships including land and ancestors, as well as future-generations. Instead of a model, participants suggest that identifying foundational values to guide transformation and relationship-building processes may be more appropriate. Values are "the foundation of how we interact with one another" as Summer described; Mandy's example of the Diné principle of hózhó shows how values are context-specific in a way that models are not; and participants showed how values can bridge structural and individual transformation. Although a singular, static model may be inappropriate, participants pointed to modeling—which has long been the dominant method of knowledge transfer within Indigenous epistemologies—as an effective tool for social transformation. Mandy described her method for transforming relationships within Native communities, as well as relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people: "re-teaching [others] what a good relationship looks like […] modeling it within our program, within our community, with other peers."

89

Participants' stories gestured to an Indigenous futurity that is more spatial and genealogical than temporal. Their stories raised questions that future discussions and studies might take up: What kinds of sovereign entities might exist in a world beyond settler colonialism? How might settlers who no longer have ties to ancestral homelands or pre-settler heritages engage in settler transformation praxis? What does it mean to be both in diaspora and occupying Indigenous homelands? What would Indigeneity mean in a decolonized world? There wasn't a chance to try out a creative method, since I had planned it as an optional reflection tool and participants opted out due to significant amount of time already contributed. Instead of using creative methods as only a reflection tool, I suggest that they be used from the beginning to help people imagine and think in different ways. While this study focused on the structural relationships, we can also use the four methods to think about how other things would be (or not be) in a decolonized world, for example gender, food systems, Land, education, language, family structures, governance, justice, ability/disability, approaches to mental and physical wellbeing, history, and countless other things. Value systems extend to these examples as well.

Settlers, let's not stop at awareness and ideological support. They are such low standards. With such a low bar we will just stay where we are until Indigenous peoples push us, and that is what has been happening for too long. Let us hope for more, hope that we can do much better than that. Let's see what happens when we don't wait for Indigenous people to do all the work for us—when they don't have to do double the work of Indigenous resurgence and holding us accountable. Let's see what can happen when we hold ourselves accountable. Let's help to imagine and create a world beyond settler colonialism.

REFERENCES

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2005. "Sovereignty." In *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-determination*, edited by Joanne Barker, 33-50. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

———. 2009. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2015. "A Talk by Taiaiake Alfred: Research as Indigenous Resurgence" (video of lecture). CarletonSPPA. Accessed April 14, 2020. https://youtu.be/myIUkzbiG_o.

Amadahy, Zainab, and Bonita Lawrence. 2009. "Indigenous Peoples and Black People in Canada: Settlers or Allies?" In *Breaching the Colonial Contract: Anti-Colonialism in the US and Canada*, edited by Arlo Kempf. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.

Anthony-Stevens, Vanessa. 2017. "Cultivating Alliances: Reflections on the Role of Non-Indigenous Collaborators in Indigenous Educational Sovereignty." *Journal of American Indian Education* 56, no. 1: 81-104.

Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. 2013. "Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy." *Feminist Formations* 25, no. 1 (Spring): 8-34.

Barker, Joanne. 2005. "For Whom Sovereignty Matters." In *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-determination*, edited by Joanne Barker, 1-31. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Barnhardt, Ray, and Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley. 2005. "Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Alaska Native Ways of Knowing." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36, no. 1: 8-23.

Basso, Keith H. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Battiste, Marie, and James (Sa'ke'j) Youngblood Henderson. 2009. "Naturalizing Indigenous Knowledge in Eurocentric Education." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 32, no.1: 5–18.

Bloch, Ernst. [1954] 1995. *The Principle of Hope*. Vol. 1. Translated by Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice and Paul Knight. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brayboy, Bryan McKinley Jones. 2005. "Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in Education." *The Urban Review* 37, no. 5 (December): 425-446.

Brubacher, Tim. 2008. "Beyond Good Intentions: Critical Race Theory and the Role of Non-Indigenous Allies." Master's thesis, Trent University. Accessed October 10, 2020. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Cajete, Gregory. 1994. *Look To The Mountain: An Ecology Of Indigenous Education*. Skyland, NC: Kivaki Press.

———. 2015. *Indigenous Community: Rekindling the Teachings of the Seventh Fire*. St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.

Carter, Jill. 2018. "Research and (Re?)Conciliation: Imagining Eighth Fire Scholarship in Action." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 45, no. 4 (December): 550-568.

Carter, Jill, Karyn Recollet, and Dylan Robinson. 2017. "Interventions Into the Maw of Old World Hunger: Frog Monsters, Kinstellatory Maps, and Radical Relationalities in a Project of Reworlding." In *Canadian Performance Histories and Historiographies*, edited by Heather Davis-Fisch, 205-231. Toronto, ON: Playwrights Canada Press.

Castagno, Angelina E., and Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy. 2008. "Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Youth: A Review of the Literature." *Review of Educational Research* 78, no. 4 (December): 941-993.

Champagne, Duane. 2007. "In Search of Theory and Method in American Indian Studies*." The American Indian Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (Summer): 353-372. https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2007.0028.

Chazan, May. 2019. "Making home on Anishinaabe lands: storying settler activisms in Nogojiwanong (Peterborough, Canada)." *Settler Colonial Studies* 10, no. 1 (May): 34-53. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2019.1605963.

Corntassel, Jeff, Taiaiake Alfred, Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noenoe K. Silva, Hokulani Aikau, and Devi Mucina, eds. 2018. *Everyday Acts of Resurgence: People, Places, Practices*. Olympia, WA: Daykeeper Press.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Davis, Lynne, ed. 2010. *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Davis, Lynne, Jeff Denis, and Raven Sinclair, eds. 2017. "Pathways of Settler Decolonization." Special issue, *Settler Colonial Studies* 7, no. 4.

Davis, Lynne, Chris Hiller, Cherylanne James, Kristen Lloyd, Tessa Nasca and Sara Taylor. "Complicated pathways: settler Canadians learning to re/frame themselves and their relationships with Indigenous peoples." *Settler Colonial Studies* 7, no. 4 (2017): 398-414. DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1243086.

Day, Iyko. 2015. "Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiblackness, and Settler Colonial Critique." *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 2 (Fall): 102-12.

DeCuir-Gunby, Jessica T., Patricia L. Marshall, and Allison W. McCulloch. 2011. "Developing and Using a Codebook for the Analysis of Interview Data: An Example from a Professional Development Research Project." *Field Methods* 23, no. 2: 136-155.

Dei, George J. Sefa. 2017. *Reframing Blackness and Black Solidarities through Anti-colonial and Decolonial Prisms*. New York: Springer.

Deloria Jr., Vine. 1988. "Chapter 4: Anthropologists and Other Friends." In *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, 78-100. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press.

Deloria, Jr., Vine and Daniel Wildcat. 2001. *Power and Place: Indian education in America.* Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Resources.

Deyhle, Donna, and Karen Swisher. 1997. "Research in American Indian and Alaska Native Education: From Assimilation to Self-Determination." *Review of Research in Education* 22: 113–194.

Dillon, Grace L. 2012. *Walking the Clouds: An Anthology of Indigenous Science Fiction*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Ermine, Willie. 2007. "The Ethical Space of Engagement." *Indigenous Law Journal* 6, no. 1: 193-203.

Etherington, Matthew. 2015. "Aboriginal Perspectives and Issues in Teacher Education." *Journal of American Indian Education* 54, no. 2 (Summer): 52-68.

Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fine, Michelle. 2018. *Just Research in Contentious Times: Widening the Methodological Imagination*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fujikane, Candace. 2008. "Introduction: Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai'i." In *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*, edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, 1-42. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Garroutte, Eva Marie. 2003. *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1979. "Chapter 2: Agency, Structure." In *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*, 49-95. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noelani. 2013. *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2014. "Introduction." In *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty*, edited by Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaika'ala Wright, 1-33. Durham: Duke University Press.

Gordon, Avery F. 2004. "16 - Some Thoughts on The Utopian." In *Keeping Good Time: Reflections on Knowledge, Power, and People*, 113-132. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Grande, Sandy. 2004. *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

HAVOQ. 2011. "Undoing Borders: A Queer Manifesto." *The Undoing Borders Zine*. Horizontal Alliance of Very (or Vaguely or Voraciously) Organized Queers. San Francisco. Accessed October 12, 2020. https://undoingbordersblog.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/undoing-borders-letter-size.pdf

Hiller, Chris. 2017. "Tracing the Spirals of Unsettlement: Euro-Canadian Narratives of Coming to Grips with Indigenous Sovereignty, Title, and Rights." In "Pathways to Settler Decolonisation," edited by Lynne Davis, Jeff Denis, and Raven Sinclair. Special issue, *Settler Colonial Studies* 7, no. 4: 415-440.

Holm, Tom, J. Diane Pearson, and Ben Chavis. 2003. "Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies." *Wicazo Sa Review* 18, no. 1 (Spring): 7-24.

Indigenous Action Media. 2014. "Accomplices Not Allies: Abolishing The Ally Industrial Complex." Indigenous Action Media. May 4. Accessed November 23, 2019. http://www.indigenousaction.org/accomplices-not-allies-abolishing-the-ally-industrial-complex/.

Jensen, Niels Rosendal. 2016. "Social Pedagogy in Denmark." *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria* 27: 103-127. https://doi.org/10.7179/PSRI_2016.27.04.

Kidwell, Clara Sue. 2009. "American Indian Studies: Intellectual Navel Gazing or Academic Discipline?" *The American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (Winter): 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.0.0041.

Laenui, Poka. n.d. "Processes of Decolonization." iisaak teachings. Accessed March 19, 2020. https://iisaakteachings.com/processes-of-decolonization-by-poka-laenui/.

Laden, Abigail. 2020. **"**Allies of the Movement to Protect Mauna Kea: Non-Indigenous Solidarity in Kanaka Maoli Protectivism." Master's thesis, University of Hawai'i at Hilo. Accessed October 10, 2020. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Lee, Lloyd L., ed. 2014. *Diné Perspectives: Revitalizing and Reclaiming Navajo Thought*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. 2016. "The Mutuality of Citizenship and Self-Determination: Proposing Alternatives to Adversarial Binarism in United States/Native American Relations." In *The Settler Complex: Recuperating Binarism in Colonial Studies*, edited by Patrick Wolfe, 83-98. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.

Mertens, Donna M. 2007. "Transformative Paradigm: Mixed Methods and Social Justice." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1, no. 3 (July): 212-225.

Miles, Matthew B., A. Michael Huberman, and Johnny Saldaña. 2014. "Chapter 4: Fundamentals of Qualitative Data Analysis." In *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpede, and Linda Carty, eds. 2018. *Feminist Freedom Warriors: Genealogies, Justice, Politics, and Hope*. Chicago: Haymarket Books. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Newcomb, Steven. 1995. "Perspectives: Healing, Restoration, and Rematriation." *American Indian Ritual Object Repatriation Foundation News & Notes* (Spring/Summer): 3. Accessed May 4, 2020. http://ili.nativeweb.org/perspect.html.

Onwuegbuzie, Anthony J., Wendy B. Dickinson, Nancy L. Leech, Annmarie G. Zoran. 2009. "A Qualitative Framework for Collecting and Analyzing Data in Focus Group Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 8, no. 3: 1-21.

Preston, Waquin. 2015. "Diné Decolonizing Education and Settler Colonial Elimination: A Critical Analysis of the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act." Master's thesis, Arizona State University. Accessed September 29, 2019. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Rigney, Lester-Irabinna. 1999. "Internationalization of an Indigenous Anticolonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and Its Principles." *Wicazo Sa Review* 14, no. 2: 109-121.

Rodríguez, Juana María. 2014. *Sexual Futures, Queer Gestures, and Other Latina Longings*. New York: New York University Press.

Romero, Mary E. 1994. "Identifying Giftedness Among Keresan Pueblo Indians: The Keres Study." *Journal of American Indian Education*, 34: 35-58.

Romero-Little, Eunice, Christine Sims, and A-dae Romero. 2013. "Revisiting the Keres Study to Envision the Future: Engaging Indigenous Pueblo Youth, Elders, and Teachers in Intergenerational Collaborative Research and Praxis." In *Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Their Communities*, edited by Django Paris and Maisha T. Wynn, 161-173. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Saldaña, Johnny. 2001. "Chapter 4: A Survey of Qualitative Data Analytic Methods." In *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. 2018. *Unsustainable Empire: Alternative Histories of Hawai'i Statehood*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Schugurensky, Daniel. 2014. "A Social Worker, A Community Development Worker and an Adult Educator Walk into Bar: On Strange Bedfellows and Social Pedagogy." *Postcolonial Directions in Education* 3, no. 2: 360-395.

Schugurensky, Daniel, and Michael Silver. 2013. "Social Pedagogy: Historical Traditions and Transnational Connections." In "Social Pedagogy in the 21st Century," edited by Daniel Schugurensky and Michael Silver. Special issue, *Educational Policy Analysis Archives* 21, no. 35 (April): 1-16. http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1362.

Sepulveda, Charles. 2018. "Our Sacred Waters: Theorizing Kuuyam as a Decolonial Possibility." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 7, no. 1 (September): 40-58.

Simpson, Audra. 2007. "On Ethnographic Refusal: Indigeneity, 'Voice', and Colonial Citizenship." *Junctures* 9 (2007): 67-80.

Simpson, Audra. 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2011. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed. New York: Zed Books.

Snelgrove, Corey, Rita K. Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel. 2014. "Unsettling Settler Colonialism: The Discourse and Politics of Settlers and Solidarity with Indigenous Nations." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 3, no. 2 (October): 1–32.

Stephens, Paul. 2013. *Social Pedagogy: Heart and Head*. Bremen, Germany: EHV.

Stirling, Carolyn J. 2015. "Decolonize This - Settler Decolonization and Unsettling Colonialism: Insights from Critical Ethnographies with Indigenous and Allied Educator-Activists in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the United States of America and Canada." PhD diss., University at Buffalo, State University at New York. Accessed November 2020. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Sturm, Circe. 2002. *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

TallBear, Kim. 2013. *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. 2000. "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony: 'Locals' in Hawai'i." *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2: 1-24. Accessed November 11, 2019. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.17953/amer.26.2.b31642r221215k7k.

———. 2004. "The Color of Violence." In "Native Women and State Violence," edited by Andrea Smith and Luana Ross. Special issue, *Social Justice 31, no. 4* (98): 8-16. Accessed April 29, 2020. https://www.jstor.org/stable/29768270.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (September): 1-40.

Vaughn, Kēhaulani. 2019. "Sovereign Embodiment: Native Hawaiians and Expressions of Diasporic Kuleana." *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* 11, no. 1: 227-245.

Vizenor, Gerald. 2008. "Aesthetics of Survivance: Literary Theory and Practice." In *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence*, edited by Gerald Vizenor, 1-24. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Weaver, Jace. 2007. "More Light Than Heat: The Current State of Native American Studies." *The American Indian Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (Spring): 233-255. https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2007.0026.

Wilkins, David E., and K. Tsianina Lomawaima. 2001. *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Wilkins, David E., and Shelly Hulse Wilkins. 2017. *Dismembered: Native Enrollment and the Battle for Human Rights*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Wilson, Waziyatawin Angela. 2004. "Introduction: Indigenous Knowledge Recovery Is Indigenous Empowerment," *American Indian Quarterly* 28, nos. 3 & 4: 359-372.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December): 387–409. Accessed October 7, 2019. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240.

———. 2016. "Introduction." In *The Settler Complex: Recuperating Binarism in Colonial Studies*, edited by Patrick Wolfe, 1-24. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.

APPENDIX A

ASU IRB EXEMPTION FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

EXEMPTION GRANTED

K Lomawaima
CLAS-SS: Social Transformation, School of (SST)
-
K.Tsianina.Lomawaima@asu.edu

Dear K Lomawaima:

On 5/11/2020 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	A Framework for Settler Responsibility and Accountability: Enacting a Position of Guest through Co-Construction of Gifting Protocols
Investigator:	K Lomawaima
IRB ID:	STUDY00011872
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Clarification Request Responses 28-04-2020, Category: Other; • Consent Forms 16-04-2020, Category: Consent Form; • Protocol - Settler Responsibility 28-04-2020, Category: IRB Protocol; • Recruitment Methods 16-04-2020, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Supporting Documents 16-04-2020, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 on 5/11/2020.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

If any changes are made to the study, the IRB must be notified at research.integrity@asu.edu to determine if additional reviews/approvals are required. Changes may include but not limited to revisions to data collection, survey and/or interview questions, and vulnerable populations, etc.

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Lilian Kong
       K Lomawaima
       Lilian Kong

APPENDIX B

ASU IRB APPROVAL FOR PROTOCOL MODIFICATION

APPROVAL: MODIFICATION

K Lomawaima
CLAS-SS: Social Transformation, School of (SST)
-
K.Tsianina.Lomawaima@asu.edu

Dear K Lomawaima:

On 5/26/2020 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Modification / Update
Title:	A Framework for Settler Responsibility and Accountability: Enacting a Position of Guest through Co-Construction of Gifting Protocols
Investigator:	K Lomawaima
IRB ID:	STUDY00011872
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Consent Forms 21-05-2020, Category: Consent Form; • Protocol - Settler Responsibility 21-05-2020, Category: IRB Protocol; • Recruitment Methods 21-05-2020, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Supporting Documents 21-05-2020, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);

The IRB approved the modification.

When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the "Documents" tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Lilian Kong
        K Lomawaima
        Lilian Kong