



Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies

Elizabeth Carlson

To cite this article: Elizabeth Carlson (2016): Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies, *Settler Colonial Studies*, DOI: [10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213](https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213>



Published online: 21 Oct 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies

Elizabeth Carlson

Faculty of Social Work, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

ABSTRACT

Indigenous scholars have called on settler people to engage in processes of decolonization. To investigate how white settler individuals living on Indigenous lands occupied by the Canadian state are responding to that call, it was necessary to articulate a comprehensive research approach that centralizes Indigenous sovereignty and disrupts colonial research dynamics. This article focuses on the articulation, grounding, and deployment of an anti-colonial research methodology by a white settler scholar. Though developed in the context of a specific project, this approach has much wider relevance and application possibilities. I demonstrate the values and practices of the anti-colonial research methodology to academia generally and settler colonial studies specifically.

KEYWORDS

Anti-colonial research; Indigenous sovereignty; anti-colonial practice; relational accountability; research community

Theory removed from the land, removed from practice, and detached from the contexts that give it form and content propose a decolonizing strategy that risks metaphorizing its constitutive ground [sic].¹

Disconnection, a result of white settler colonial socialization, elevates the risk of detached theorizing noted by Martineau and Ritskes. With increasing engagement of white settler scholars in theorizing decolonization, scholars who carry this colonial socialization and the scholarly practices associated with it, it is no surprise to observe theory devoid of its connections to practice (action) and to land. Eurocentric scholarly hegemony venerates detachment and abstraction. Connection to practice is further disrupted by the propensity for those who identify as *settler* to frame the term as synonymous with non-indigeneity rather than centring its 'set of responsibilities and action'.² This article engages current and critical examples from the context of Canadian state-occupied Indigenous lands in order to articulate protocols and strategies of anti-colonial scholarly practices. In defining settler colonialism as a structure,³ what often 'slides from view' in settler colonial scholarship are the 'ongoing processes by which settler dominance is actively reconstituted as a set of actions, occupations, deferrals, and potentials'.⁴ This can result in a clash between the 'good intentions' of conscientious settler scholars and the actual impacts of their academic activities and outputs. For this reason, clear and practical anti-colonial research methodologies are required to help settler scholars work in concert with the resurgence work of Indigenous scholars towards relationally accountable decolonial change.⁵

The significant developments in research on settler decolonization in the last decade and the increasing pace at which new literature is emerging risks creating the impression that this work is breaking entirely new ground and is without precedent. However, this is mistaken. There are white settler individuals who have engaged in decolonization, solidarity, and/or anti-colonial work for decades. My larger project is to understand the efforts, challenges, and outcomes of such individual engagement, to draw larger lessons to inspire and support other white settler individuals, and to explore relationally accountable protocols/practices for creating anti-colonial social change. For such an investigation to be consistent in both its practices and outcomes, the research processes, practices, and methodology must reflect the anti-colonial and decolonial content and aims of the study. This paper therefore has a dual aim: to explore methodological interventions into the disparity between the theoretical content and research practices of settler scholars, particularly white settler scholars who seek to subvert colonialism through the articulation of an anti-colonial research methodology, and to extend this discussion to the disparities between anti-colonial and decolonial theory and academic practices of white settler scholars in general and settler colonial studies specifically.

Settler colonialism, social work, positionality, research, and practice

Denunciations of settler colonialism, although expressed for centuries by Indigenous peoples, are emerging across academic disciplinary boundaries.⁶ My own work is situated in the field of social work, where I have practiced as counsellor and therapist for over 25 years. Social work, a practice-based discipline, has accorded significant attention to addressing issues of domination and exploitation.⁷ In particular, the Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE/ACFTS) calls for 'critical analyses of power relations, the dismantling of inequitable social structures, and solidarity with populations that experience poverty, oppression, and exploitation'.⁸ However, in Canada, as in other settler colonial contexts, social work as a discipline has been slow to also acknowledge its role as an agent of colonialism and oppression.⁹ In recent years, its scholars and practitioners have begun to engage anti-colonial analyses and practice tools to contribute to the work of decolonization and anti-colonialism. This shift has come, in no small part, as a result of the insightful analyses made by Indigenous social work scholars such as Blackstock, Hart, Rowe, Sinclair, and Yellow Bird, among others.¹⁰ These scholars critique settler colonialism as it is embodied in social work and articulate anti-colonial and Indigenous social work paradigms and practices, influencing my own scholarship and practice.

Having focused my doctoral studies around colonialism, anti-colonialism, and decolonization, and having continued to practice as a therapist during this period, I had a unique opportunity to deliberately explore ways of applying my growing knowledge into my practice with individuals and families and into my organizational work. I became increasingly attuned to relational and organizational practices that reproduce and disrupt settler colonialism.

Indigenous research methodologies

Indigenous social work scholars Hart, Absolon, and Sinclair¹¹ have made significant contributions to the establishment of a solid body of literature on Indigenous (and Indigenist)

research methodologies, complementing key works by Smith, Wilson, and Kovach.¹² Such scholars critique the extractive, dispossessing, and pathologizing impacts of mainstream research practices on Indigenous peoples, lands, and knowledges. They explain that Indigenous methodologies emphasize Indigenous worldviews, ontologies, and epistemologies. Indigenous methodologies embody reciprocity, land and place, balance and holism, self-determination, knowledge as collective and relational, relational accountability, social locatedness, connection, honouring Indigenous- and place-based protocols and norms, and decolonization. There are compelling reasons to consider Indigenous methodologies in any research study that has anti-colonial or decolonial aims.

Is it possible for a non-Indigenous researcher to use these methodologies; and if so, can they be applied to the context of an investigation of the experiences of white settler subjects? Kovach identifies 'Indigenous methodologies require situational appropriateness, which means that they can only be actualized when the whole context is relevant.' She continues: 'situational appropriateness then asks the questions: Do you have an Indigenous worldview, history and experiences? Can you position your process in an Indigenous worldview and framework?'¹³ For settler scholars lacking early socialization by Indigenous families and communities, decades of cultural immersion and learning, and the impacts of identifying as and being identified as 'Indigenous', it is likely impossible to answer 'yes'.

What does this mean for me? I am a settler of European descent (Swedish, Saami, German, English, and Scots-Irish), and many of my ancestors experienced colonization in Europe before they took part in the early colonial settlement of Anishinaabe territories occupied by what would become the state of Wisconsin, and Omaha territories occupied by what would become the state of Nebraska. They, and subsequent generations, passed on settler-colonizer and white supremacist legacies and socialization to me. I am resident on Indigenous sovereign lands: Treaty 1 territory and the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Métis peoples, currently occupied by the province of Manitoba and the state of Canada. I reside on these lands by virtue of my relationship to and reliance on settler colonial society and structures. Therefore, *settler* is my primary positionality in this context. Macoun and Strakosch question whether settler scholars should claim to have 'clear access to knowledge of Indigenous people'.¹⁴ My understanding of Indigenous knowledges is limited. These carry stories and meanings beyond my awareness. I do not believe I would understand and embody the values and practices of Indigenous methodologies in the ways Indigenous communities might. This is not to say that, as a resident on Indigenous lands and a Treaty partner, I am not responsible to learn local Indigenous protocols and to seek to understand Indigenous ontologies, epistemologies, languages, and teachings. I clearly am. It is to say, however, that claiming an Indigenous research methodology does not feel like an ethical fit for me. Settler scholars like myself, therefore, require methodological options for conducting appropriate and decolonizing research that do not rely on attempting to implement Indigenous research methodologies.

Anti-oppressive and empowering methodologies

Having engaged with theories and practices of anti-racism decades earlier, and having studied anti-oppressive theory and practice throughout my social work education, I realized that these knowledges would also have something to offer in guiding my

methodological choices. Critical race, feminist, anti-racism, and participatory action/activist methodologies, with their focus on power dynamics, hegemony and hierarchies, and their emphasis on relationships between the personal and the political, are all instructive for articulating an anti-colonial research methodology. They utilize research methods that seek to equalize power, embrace humility, emphasize critical reflexivity, attend to subjectivity and emotion, promote the participation and self-determination of research participants and communities, engage accountable relationships, give and share reciprocally, share control and ownership, and collaboratively contribute to social change.¹⁵ They often utilize participatory action and critical narrative research methods. Ideally in Participatory Action Research the research focus, questions, and processes originate from the community itself, the researcher takes the role of co-participant, the participants become co-researchers, and the research benefits the community.¹⁶

Articulating an anti-colonial research methodology

Having identified the need for a research methodology that achieves greater consistency between the content, process, and aims of scholarship seeking to disrupt settler colonialism, and having been inspired by Indigenous and anti-oppressive methodologies as well as grassroots activist knowledges and practices, I pursue the articulation of a specifically anti-colonial research methodology that can be used by a white settler researcher with white settler research subjects. I believe this is my responsibility as a white settler. However, I suspect peoples of various sociopolitical identities and designations may find something useful here. In articulating this anti-colonial research methodology, I first clarify my definition of anti-colonialism. Then I address the ways the positionalities of researcher and participants influence this process and practice.

Anti-colonialism and its research applications

Kempf locates the emergence of a formal discourse of anti-colonialism with the resistance of colonized writers such as Fanon, Cabral, Memmi, Césaire, and Gandhi.¹⁷ Kempf's theory does not take into account the resistance and writing of Indigenous people in North America. However, centuries of contextualized Indigenous resistance to settler colonial assaults on lands, communities, and bodies should be taken into consideration. There is an increasing tendency of late among some scholars to approach anti-colonialism as resistance to any form of domination or imposition,¹⁸ and the term is also being used in generalized ways in social movement organizing.¹⁹ However, if we are to view colonialism in Canada and the US as a specific form of domination with specific referents, as *settler colonialism*, 'predicated on the dispossession of Indigenous peoples' lands and political authority',²⁰ 'founded upon Indigenous erasure', and 'ultimately about the pursuit of land for settlement',²¹ we can arguably envision an anti-colonialism that is specific to settler colonial forms of domination in localized contexts. If the 'homogenizing of various experiences of oppression as colonialism' obscures one's relationship to settler colonialism and neglects to address Indigenous sovereignty, Indigenous rights, and the de-occupation of Indigenous lands,²² the homogenizing of anti-oppression (e.g. anti-capitalism, anti-racism, and feminism) as anti-colonialism risks reproducing a similar dynamic.

For Indigenous Knowledges and Social Work scholar Michael Hart, Indigenous resurgence is the centre of anti-colonialism. Indigenous resurgence pushes outwards from this centre, re-claiming space that had been occupied by settler colonialism.²³ Anti-colonialism involves the recovery of traditional knowledge as a strategy that resists the replacement of Indigenous ways and knowledges with Western ways and knowledges, processes endemic in colonialism.²⁴ Similarly, for Leanne Simpson, anti-colonial strategies ‘foster the political mobilization to stop the colonial attack on Indigenous Knowledge and Indigenous Peoples’ and ‘require the recovery of Indigenous intellectual traditions, Indigenous control over Indigenous national territories, [and] the protection of Indigenous lands from environmental destruction’.²⁵ A strength, for Hart, of using the term and concept ‘anti-colonialism’ is that there can be no mistake, that it communicates the reality and current presence of the structures and practices of (settler) colonialism. He notes that terms like *postcolonialism* or even *decolonization*, facilitate the ability of academics to position colonialism as being something of the past, as in ‘colonialism is over and now we can decolonize’.²⁶ Dei also sees anti-colonialism as rooted in Indigenous ways of knowing, interpreting the experiences of colonized peoples on their own terms, and ‘evoke[ing] intellectual understandings not forced through Eurocentric lenses’.²⁷ Anti-colonial thought is situated knowledge of colonized subjects.²⁸

White settlers and anti-colonialism

Colonizers are significantly limited in their knowledges of colonialism and anti-colonialism, since they do not share the subjectivity, history, and positionality of the colonized, and because ‘the site from which we oppress is the site on which we least cast our gaze’.²⁹ White settlers face limitations, if not impossibilities, in the ability to interpret colonized peoples’ experiences on their own terms, and to develop understandings not explicitly or implicitly distorted by settler colonial privilege, Eurocentrism, or white supremacy. Therefore, Dei aptly questions ‘whether the dominant/colonizer should know and critique colonialism, imperialism and oppression without the input of those who have received, and continue to receive the brunt of the colonial encounter and its violence’.³⁰

These limitations and challenges to white settler anti-colonialism should engender humility in the anti-colonial practice of white settler scholars. With Indigenous resurgence at the centre of anti-colonialism, the roles of white settler academics are at the periphery, making space, and pushing back against colonial institutions, structures, practices, mentalities, and land theft. Taking up the challenge to participate effectively in anti-colonial practice is more difficult and demanding than may be imagined. Fear, entitlement, and denial prevent many white settler people from engaging in anti-colonial practice. I argue that even though participation in anti-colonial practice on the part of white settlers a limited possibility, it remains a moral and ethical responsibility. Participating in and reproducing colonialism compromises our personal and collective integrity.

When research involves a white settler researcher and white settler participants, is the use of an anti-colonial methodology possible? Can I be ‘colonial’ or ‘anti-colonial’ in my relationship with other white settler peoples? With a structural, specified, and local settler colonial context-based definition of anti-colonialism, I do not believe so. Those familiar with structural anti-racism theory around reverse racism may see a relevant parallel: ‘a key component of racism is power – structural and institutional power’.³¹ When not

supported by 'a system of inequality and oppression constructed within a society', individual acts of discrimination do not constitute racism.³² Settler colonialism in lands occupied by the Canadian state, as a system of inequality and oppression, does not support colonial discrimination against white settlers. This is not to say that we are not currently emotionally and morally harmed by settler colonialism even as it structurally benefits us. But we are not colonized here. When, in research relationships between white settler peoples a higher set of ethics is upheld, increasing the self-determination and participation of research subjects and upholding values of reciprocity does not in itself constitute anti-colonialism. This is so even though such practices will reinforce kinder and more humane habits and ways of being.

Despite these conclusions, research conducted in Indigenous territories currently occupied by the Canadian state, even when it involves white settler researchers with white settler participants, takes place in spaces of Indigenous sovereignty. And the project in which my search for appropriate methodological approaches arose involved more than the relationships between a white settler researcher and white settler participants. Settler colonial research which would promote anti-colonial, decolonial, and solidarity content and aims must occur in relationship and dialogue with Indigenous peoples, involve meaningful consultation with and oversight by Indigenous scholars and knowledge keepers, and draw upon work by Indigenous scholars. Thus, such research will embrace a perpetual Indigenous presence and relationality, irrespective of the white settler researcher-participant dyad, making an anti-colonial research methodology pertinent and necessary. As Leanne Simpson states,

Academics who are to be true allies to Indigenous Peoples in the protection of our knowledge must be willing to step outside of their privileged position and challenge research that conforms to the guidelines outlined by the colonial power structure and root their work in the politics of decolonization and anticolonialism.³³

Eight principles of an anti-colonial research methodology for settlers

Reflecting on and working through Indigenous, feminist, anti-racism, critical race, and participatory action/activist methodologies and the inspiration they provided, I propose eight principles to guide my anti-colonial methodology.

1. *Resistance to and Subversion of Settler Colonialism.* Anti-colonial research resists and subverts settler colonialism in process, dynamics, and outcomes. It contributes towards anti-colonial change in and with peoples, relationships, organizations, communities, institutions, and governments. It acknowledges and problematizes the reality and impact of historical and contemporary settler colonialism and it recognizes the illegitimacy of the current settler presence on the land. It ultimately works towards the building of a new society on Indigenous peoples' terms.
2. *Relational and Epistemic Accountability to Indigenous Peoples.* Anti-colonial research on the part of settlers occurs within the context of Indigenous sovereignty. It requires relational accountability with Indigenous peoples. Standpoints, epistemes, perspectives, and experiences of Indigenous peoples are honoured, foregrounded, and valued. Researchers engage with indigeneity and Indigenous people respectfully, learning and observing context-specific cultural norms, protocols, and languages. It is important

that settler peoples who engage in anti-colonial research maintain relationships and dialogues with Indigenous peoples in general, and regarding our research in particular and at all stages of research. Research is congruent with the well-being of Indigenous peoples as they define it.

3. *Land/Place Engagement and Accountability.* As connected to relational accountability to the Indigenous peoples of the lands where we reside and research, anti-colonial research is accountable to the land herself. Anti-colonial research acknowledges, respects, and engages with the protocols and natural laws of the Indigenous lands where it is conducted. It attends to narratives of place and place-based memories,³⁴ and to specific land-based histories. Research avoids causing further harm to the land and works directly or indirectly to return lands to Indigenous peoples. Further, anti-colonial research honours relationship and connection with non-human beings on the land.
4. *Egalitarian, Participatory, and Community-based Methods.* Anti-colonial research prioritizes participation and egalitarianism. Participants and community members contribute to the shaping of the research and the research design. Ideally, the research follows an expressed need of a community and the self-defined well-being of Indigenous peoples. Co-authorship occurs in ways that acknowledge those who contributed significantly to the research. The researcher embodies humility and does not elevate herself as the expert. A researcher does not seek commodification or profit from the research, and with co-researcher/participant permission, disseminates the research as widely as possible in order to contribute to greater social change.
5. *Reciprocity.* Anti-colonial research values reciprocity. Rather than focusing on taking for one's own advancement, anti-colonial settler researchers focus on what they can give, contribute, and collectively build. Researchers use their time, energy, fundraising efforts, and resources in order to give as much as, or more than, what is being received from Indigenous groups and communities.
6. *Self-Determination, Autonomy, and Accountability.* Anti-colonial research seeks to safeguard the self-determination and autonomy of those involved in research. Those involved make choices regarding their involvement, anonymity, and participation. Research methods are flexible so as to promote self-determination in sharing and control on the part of the participants. Participants may take part in the analysis of their data and have the final say regarding how they are represented in the research. Efforts are taken to meet those who contribute to the research in a location that is convenient and comfortable for them. Where people who are not from the white settler researcher's own culture/social location are involved in the research, efforts are made to learn and observe the protocols, cultural norms, and languages of participating peoples.
7. *Social Location and Reflexivity.* Anti-colonial settler researchers examine and explicitly state their own social location with regards to the research and with regards to settler colonialism. They explore the impact of their social location on the research, and engage in critical reflexivity regarding the ways in which they enact and reproduce colonialism. Researchers are explicitly present within the text of research reports, engaging with humility, placing their knowledge within the context of how it was gained, and acknowledging their teachers and mentors.

8. *Wholism*. Anti-colonial research is wholistic. It attends to the heart, spirit, and body in addition to the mind. It attends to values, emotion, history, and context.

These proposals are not new to anti-oppressive and Indigenous methodologies. For white settler researchers it is important to note, again, that there are epistemological and socialization-based limitations to our ability to fully engage them. There may also be institutional limits to their use, which will require creativity to manoeuvre. Limitations of students may include those imposed by university regulations around individual scholarship, while research ethics boards may not be set up for the use of these principles in research.

Eight anti-colonial research principles in practice

The principles of the anti-colonial methodology described above are interventions for research and for academic scholarship in general, and settler colonial studies in particular. Rauna Kuokkanen observes that to:

a large extent, the academy remains founded on epistemological practices and traditions [...] that are reflective of and reinscribed by the Enlightenment, colonialism, modernity, and, in particular, liberalism. [...] Even in the academic spaces that consider themselves most open to 'changing the paradigm', individuals are often unwilling to examine their own blind spots. Nor are they willing to acknowledge either their privilege or their participation in academic structures and the various colonial processes of society in general [...]. Rarely do they examine themselves or the structures, discourses, practices, and assumptions that operate in the academy.³⁵

Adam Lewis argues that for activist researchers, 'the structures of the academy must also be sites of struggle and resistance'.³⁶ Here I engage discussion regarding ways to embody the principles in research, the academy, and/or in settler colonial studies.

Resistance to and subversion of settler colonialism

Putting the principle of resistance to and subversion of settler colonialism into practice, for me, is twofold. For one, it means attention to the ways our scholarly and research practices might actually impact the structure of settler colonialism. When considering this structure, Tuck and Yang urge that we not lose sight of its central operations: Indigenous erasure and land theft/exploitation. Thus, in its most robust sense, subversion of settler colonialism means 'the repatriation of Indigenous land and life'.³⁷ I also return to Leanne Simpson's statement that anti-colonialism works to 'stop the colonial attack on Indigenous Knowledge and Indigenous peoples',³⁸ and 'require[s] the recovery of Indigenous intellectual traditions, Indigenous control over Indigenous national territories, [and] the protection of Indigenous lands from environmental destruction'.³⁹ For me, this principle also means looking at specific colonizing practices and disrupting or subverting these and employing anti-colonial practices in order to push back against colonial institutions to make space for Indigenous resurgence. Although there are many colonizing practices to examine and disrupt, here I focus on control and power, extractivism and land exploitation, white supremacy, hierarchy and arrogance, abstraction, and individualism and ownership. My treatment of the subsequent principles examines ways to disrupt them.

Macoun and Strakosch contend that ‘most settlers who use [settler colonial theory] are concerned to disturb rather than re-enact colonial hierarchies, and seek to contribute to Indigenous political struggles’.⁴⁰ The particular research project out of which this article arises, focuses on the ways experienced white settler anti-colonial, decolonial, or solidarity activists have worked to disrupt and subvert settler colonialism within themselves, their organizations, their relationships, their pedagogies, their connections with land, their communities, and sometimes also in the Canadian government, with a goal of inspiring others to engage in or deepen such work, and of contributing to social change. As has been noted, in subverting settler colonialism, the role of white settler academics is at the periphery, making space for Indigenous resurgence and knowledges, and pushing back against colonial institutions, structures, practices, mentalities, and land theft. In order to do this, anti-colonial settler scholars can sit on departmental and university committees, supporting anti-colonial and anti-oppressive ethical choices to push for changes in Eurocentric and colonial curricula, narratives, policies, and structures. We can seek to disrupt rather than enact colonial values and practices, and engage in anti-colonial actions within the academy. This also applies to our writing:

Settler scholars seeking to challenge colonial power relations should be doubly attentive to the operation of [colonial] narratives, and the way that we as individual scholars perform and deploy academic authority. For us, this has involved the need to interrogate our work – along with other settler cultural productions.⁴¹

When settler scholars subvert colonialism in the academy, the ethics of their work are improved, and potentially more space is made for Indigenous scholars who wish to maintain their own values in the academy.

Relational and epistemic accountability to Indigenous peoples

Arlo Kempf says that ‘where anticolonialism is a tool used to invoke resistance for the colonized, it is a tool used to invoke accountability for the colonizer’.⁴² Relational accountability should be a cornerstone of settler colonial studies. I believe settler colonial studies and scholars should ethically and overtly place themselves in relationship to the centuries of Indigenous oral, and later academic scholarship that conceptualizes and resists settler colonialism without necessarily using the term:

SCT may be revelatory to many settler scholars, but Indigenous people have been speaking for a long time about colonial continuities based on their lived experiences. Some SCTs have sought to connect with these discussions and to foreground Indigenous resistance, survival and agency. Others, however, seem to use SCT as a pathway to explain the colonial encounter without engaging with Indigenous people and experiences – either on the grounds that this structural analysis already conceptually explains Indigenous experience, or because Indigenous resistance is rendered invisible.⁴³

Ethical settler colonial theory (SCT) would recognize the foundational role Indigenous scholarship has in critiques of settler colonialism. It would acknowledge the limitations of settler scholars in articulating settler colonialism without dialogue with Indigenous peoples, and take as its norm making this dialogue evident.

In my view, it is critical that we not view settler colonial studies as a new or unique field being established, which would enact a discovery narrative and contribute to Indigenous

erasure, but rather take a longer and broader view. Indigenous oral and academic scholars are indeed the originators of this work. This space is not empty. Of course, powerful forces of socialization and discipline impact scholars in the academy. There is much pressure to claim unique space, to establish a name for ourselves, and to make academic discoveries. I am suggesting that settler colonial studies and anti-colonial scholars resist these hegemonic pressures and maintain a higher anti-colonial ethic. As has been argued, 'the theory itself places ethical demands on us as settlers, including the demand that we actively refuse its potential to re-empower our own academic voices and to marginalize Indigenous resistance'.⁴⁴

As settler scholars, we can reposition our work relationally and contextually with humility and accountability. We can centre Indigenous resistance, knowledges, and scholarship in our work, and contextualize our work in Indigenous sovereignty. We can view oral Indigenous scholarship as legitimate scholarly sources. We can acknowledge explicitly and often the Indigenous traditions of resistance and scholarship that have taught us and provided the foundations for our work. If our work has no foundation of Indigenous scholarship and mentorship, I believe our contributions to settler colonial studies are even more deeply problematic.

I embody the principle of relational and epistemic accountability by acknowledging here that my interest in the larger study out of which the anti-colonial research methodology is based was inspired by a lifetime of influences. In particular, my work in this area has been influenced by years of guidance from a number of Indigenous and African-American mentors including Nicholas Cooper-Lewter, Nii Gaani Aki Inini (Dave Courchene Jr), Zoongigaabowitmiskoakikwe, and my late brother Byron Matwewinin.⁴⁵ I entered into discussions with Indigenous scholars, friends, and Elders (in particular, Zoongigaabowitmiskoakikwe, Michael Hart, Leona Star-Manoakeesick, and Gladys Rowe),⁴⁶ observing their protocols of gifts and offerings for the feedback I was requesting, depending on the context. In addition, my reading of Indigenous scholarship located the study as a response to a call by Indigenous scholars that settler peoples engage in decolonization processes and work. Throughout the research and writing process I made it a point to attend Indigenous-led community events and gatherings to stay connected to community and continue to learn.

When I met with Leona Star-Manoakeesick, we discussed how Ownership, Control, Access, Possession research principles might relate to my research.⁴⁷ Leona challenged me to think about who constitutes the community that relates to my research as a beginning step, and shared that accountability to Indigenous peoples would also mean accountability to the land. Her input greatly influenced the methodology principles and practices. As I achieved greater clarity about the study, I engaged in formal consultations with a number of other Indigenous scholars, knowledge keepers, and/or activists. Chickadee Richard, Belinda Vandenbroek, Don Robinson, Aimée Craft, Louis Sorin, and Manito Mukwa (Troy Fontaine),⁴⁸ provided guidance, input, and encouragement regarding the initial research design and process, much of which shifted and strengthened my initial thoughts and was readily integrated into the research. I was gifted key insights and values on which to build the research, and meaningful ideas for interview questions and interview participants. During the initial phases of the research, I was inspired by scholarship that urges settler peoples on Indigenous lands who wish to identify themselves in the context of Indigenous sovereignty to learn and use words that local Indigenous

peoples use for them.⁴⁹ A number of individuals helped me in my quest to learn about Anishinaabemowin conceptions of white people – Nii Gaani Aki Inini (Dave Courchene), Rose Roulette, Niizhosake (Sherry Copenace), Daabaasanaquwat ‘Lowcloud’ (Peter Atkinson), Byron Matwewinin, and Pebaamibines.⁵⁰

I further sought to embody relational accountability by centring Indigenous scholarship and literatures in my research proposal and literature review. Aspects of the data analysis process were shared with a smaller group of Indigenous scholars (Leona Star-Manoakesick, Aimée Craft, and Dawnis Kennedy),⁵¹ who provided feedback which shaped the analysis and the writing of the research report. Towards the end of the research process, I organized a research feast, which is described further below. Relational accountability was embodied by sharing the research with the community and receiving feedback from it.

Land/place engagement and accountability

When Leona Star-Manoakesick shared that accountability to Indigenous people involved accountability to the land, I had a hard time envisioning what this would mean for the research. As I muddled through, some aspects became clear to me, although I feel I have a long ways to go in understanding how to embody this principle. For me, one of the purposes of articulating an anti-colonial methodology in the first place was the awareness that I was living and researching on Indigenous territories and in spaces of Indigenous sovereignty. Before the early planning stages of the research and throughout, Zoongigaa-bowitmiskoakikwe instructed me in some land-based relational practices and offerings to engage and connect respectfully. Based on the research consultations, I also included interview questions about participants’ relationships with Indigenous lands, and prioritized this content in the data analysis. As I continued to attend community events and read Indigenous literatures, I became increasingly aware of some Treaty perspectives of Indigenous peoples, through which Treaties are understood to involve a new set of kinship relationships and obligations with Indigenous peoples, Indigenous lands, and the beings that inhabit these lands.⁵² I thought about what this might mean for me both personally and as a researcher. This informed decisions around the research feast, including the invitation that Indigenous research community members lead us in ceremonial protocols (protocols that honour the natural laws of the land) that would carry the research forward in a good way. The pipe carriers offered prayers that the research would create decolonizing change, and also offered prayers for a number of requests that were made by others in attendance. Towards the end of the research process, I reflected that perhaps accountability to the land might entail taking into account the environmental impact of the research – the carbon footprint, resources used, and waste produced. Although I doubt the research will lead directly to land being returned to Indigenous peoples, I do believe that based on content, many of those who were part of the research and those who become exposed to the research will begin to deepen their commitment to land return.

Egalitarian, participatory, and community-based methods

There is no such thing as individual scholarship when we understand ourselves and our knowledges to have been constructed relationally. Further, when our work is based on

information extracted from others, I question whether we should be conceptualizing it as *our work*. I faced difficulties and limitations trying to enact egalitarian, participatory, and community-based methods within the structure of academic endorsed research. During the research feast I hosted, I mentioned these limitations, as I would have liked to engage a community analysis and a co-authored dissertation. Niizhosake (Sherry Copenace) offered the following feedback:

I heard what you were saying about how even though your name is going to be on this paper, that it really belongs to the people. So it really affirms what I've always felt. I've gone to other research conferences, and I've gotten up and spoke where people have gone to Indigenous communities, then they come back and say 'this is my work'. Then I get up and say, 'well I think that work belongs to those hundred Indigenous children that you interviewed and worked with. They're the ones who worked with you so their names should be on that'. And I think that's some of our work. I don't know whose work that is, but to push back against these institutions. And even though they're not allowing you to do that, just to keep pushing, keep pushing that boundary. Keep pushing back. And really, who does, where does the credit go to? And I'm glad you acknowledged that. It's a communal thing. It's a collective thing. It's just not individual, even though there's individuals involved in that work.⁵³

Being asked to propose my research upon admission, I was not able to focus my doctoral research around a direct community request. This institutional practice in and of itself interferes with the ability of the research to come out of a self-expressed community need, and with the ability of the research design to be constructed by community. However, as noted, in indirect ways my research has been called for by Indigenous scholars and activists.

After my initial meeting with Leona Star-Manoakeesick, I thought more about the community of my research, and realized that it would be comprised of many people with whom I have already been in relationship – Indigenous scholars, activists, and knowledge keepers who had offered and would offer guidance, knowledge, and encouragement; local white settler activists, particularly those who I had known through the Decolonizing Network – Manitoba; my academic committee members; and the people who would become research participants. But how would I subvert hegemonic research practices in which researchers hold all of the power? I endeavoured to do this through community consultations and through a number of practices involving the research subjects. Having already discussed my consultations with Indigenous peoples, here I focus on the consultations conducted with local white settler activists. Members and affiliates of the Decolonizing Network – Manitoba who graciously consulted with me were David Camfield, Monique Woroniak, Kate Sjoberg, Leah Decter, Chuck Wright, Linda Goosen, and others.⁵⁴ I asked them, as people who have engaged in decolonization work themselves, what knowledge would help them move forward, and deeper, in their journeys, and what suggestions they had for my research design. The majority of the ideas shared through the consultations with community members (Indigenous and settler) were utilized in the research design and process, enriching them greatly. Some were integrated directly as research methods, interview questions, analysis strategies, and suggested interview participants. Some were integrated by becoming values that would guide my journey and decisions in the research; while some were not utilized if they could not be reconciled with other recommendations, if I did not have the knowledge and understanding to engage them ethically, or if they were not a fit for me personally as a researcher.

Accessibility of the research findings is another way to promote community participation and egalitarianism. A committee member suggested early in the process that I make a film based on my dissertation research. It could be used in classrooms and for educational purposes. As it was a goal that the research would engage the largest number of people possible in anti-colonial social change, I took this seriously and was able to connect with filmmakers Teddy Zegeye-Gebrehiwot, Gladys Rowe, and more recently, Sarah Story, each of whom are helping to make the film possible.⁵⁵ The *Stories of Decolonization* film project is composed of several short films, one of which has been completed, and a longer film, all containing research interview footage in addition to interview and presentation footage by Indigenous activists, scholars, and/or knowledge keepers. Once launched, each film will be made publicly available through online platforms.

Reciprocity

According to Kuokkanen, 'In the academy, Indigenous epistememes need to be recognized as a gift according to the principles of responsibility and reciprocity [...] the gift of indigenous epistememes must be acknowledged through reciprocation.'⁵⁶ Settler colonial studies and anti-colonial settler scholars owe a huge debt to Indigenous oral and academic scholarship and to traditions of activism. Not only has our scholarship (hopefully) been built on the foundation of Indigenous anti-colonial oral and academic scholarship, the content of our work is also dependent on the historical and contemporary presence of the suffering of Indigenous peoples under settler colonialism. As we research, write, publish, gain academic positions and promotions, we are benefiting from Indigenous dispossession. How can we show reciprocity in light of this debt? de Leeuw, Greenwood, and Lindsay note the heavy demands on Indigenous scholars in the academy: 'many Indigenous faculty experience extraordinary, specific, and unique demands for supervision and support of Indigenous students and related university service (representation on committees, participation in initiatives, consultation, etc.)'.⁵⁷ These demands interfere with having time to focus on the types of scholarly achievements that would advance their careers. Leanne Simpson notes the rarely recognized 'real and symbolic normalized violence' and coercion that has 'meant individual sacrifice for Indigenous women in order to obtain the credentials necessary to make the academy less violent toward the next group of Indigenous people coming through the system'.⁵⁸ Simpson suggests that restitution is owed by the academy for its colonizing impacts, which would require that it make 'a conscious decision to become a decolonizing force in the intellectual lives of Indigenous peoples by joining us in dismantling settler colonialism and actively protecting the source of our knowledge-- Indigenous *land*'.⁵⁹

According to Kovach, 'Non-Indigenous critical theorists are strong allies for Indigenous methodologies. They can assist in making space for indigenous methods (protocols, ethics, data collection processes), but also for the epistemic shift from a Western paradigm that indigenous methodologies bring.'⁶⁰ The necessary epistemic shifts may include recognizing and valuing the land as pedagogy and recognizing elders and knowledge holders as those that nurture and generate systems of Indigenous intelligence.⁶¹ As settler scholars, we can listen to Indigenous scholars and students when they articulate the barriers they face in the academy, believe them, and support efforts to remove these barriers. We can resist evaluating Indigenous academic work based on Western academic norms, and can

challenge such norms in the academy.⁶² Leanne Simpson argues that the academy fully fund 'the re-generation of Indigenous thinkers as a matter of restitution for the ongoing damage it has caused and continues to cause Indigenous knowledge systems' and 'take a principled stand on forces that are currently attacking Nisnaabeg intelligence: colonial gendered violence, dispossession, erasure and imposed poverty'.⁶³ How much of our funding and salaries go to Indigenous nations impacted by colonialism? How much of our resources go to funding and attending Indigenous-led land defence? Might we offer assistance and support in the many workload tasks of Indigenous scholars? Can we find ways to support the advancement of their careers? It is important to find ways to give of our time, resources, and gifts in order to support Indigenous scholarship and Indigenous-led activism.

According to Leanne Simpson, the alternative to extractivism is responsibility, relationship, and deep reciprocity.⁶⁴ Reciprocity requires time and resources. Knowing that this was a priority for me, I applied for funding to cover some of the costs of the many gifts and the food I would share throughout the research. Gifts, tobacco, and/or food were offered to those with whom I consulted before and during the research process. In preparation for the research interviews, I spent a fair amount of time sewing symbolic gifts that would be offered to each research participant in acknowledgement of what they were offering to the study. Generally, the time it took to create the gifts reflected the amount of time participants would spend being interviewed. Food and beverages were also shared with each participant during each interview.

Reciprocity was also engaged through the research feast. After preparing for nearly a year, the research community was invited to come together for a celebration. Those who contributed to the research in any way were invited. The purpose of the event was to celebrate and acknowledge all those who have contributed to the research, to offer research findings, to send the research forward in a good way, to give back to the community, and to invite community feedback. Gifts and tobacco were offered to Indigenous activists and knowledge keepers who attended as an invitation to lead us in a pipe ceremony and/or share their feedback. The event was held at a local Indigenous organization offering services to homeless people. A venue donation was made, and honoraria were given to two program participants who helped organizing the event. Honoraria were also given to those who sang during the pipe ceremony and giveaway, those who travelled a distance (to assist with gas costs), and others who took leadership roles in the event. The event began with an acknowledgement of each person who had come, and what they had contributed to the research design and/or the research itself. We shared a large feast together and connected with one another. After we shared food, I gave a brief overview of the research and shared some of the findings. Community feedback was offered, and we ended with a giveaway of blankets, candles, books, and other sewn items that symbolized settler Treaty responsibilities.

Self-determination, autonomy, and accountability to research subjects

Honouring the self-determination and autonomy of others is a scholarly practice that exemplifies respect and prevents interference and coercion. Here, I describe the embodiment of this principle in reference to the researcher–research subject dyad. Shifting the power relationship in this dyad is an ethical practice regardless of the identities of the

research subjects. Although it is recommended that anti-oppressive research utilize less structured interviews so as to more fully promote the self-determination and autonomy of interviewees,⁶⁵ in my larger research study I balanced this approach with relational accountability and community participation in order to include the many interview questions that had been recommended in the consultation sessions. In the end, I designed semi-structured interviews including seven umbrella questions, each with a list of sub-questions. The umbrella questions tended to be broad, allowing the research subjects more freedom. The sub-questions were asked only after the participant had time and space to respond to the umbrella questions.

I also gave research subjects choice as to whether they would be identified in the research, or whether they wished to have their identities disguised. Research subjects were able to choose the location of their interviews. I viewed the interview transcriptions as belonging to the participants, and shared these with them at the earliest opportunity. Research subjects were given the option to take part in the analysis of their data, in this case, the construction of narratives. When they opted out of this task, I constructed the narratives myself. Nonetheless, research participants were given an opportunity to make changes, and most did.

Social location and reflexivity

Even though I had written primarily in the first person in an early draft of my literature review, during a research consultation Dawnis Kennedy noted: 'I don't hear it in your voice [...] with your heart and spirit.' She challenged me to frame my study in terms of what I personally wanted to learn, what my spirit really wanted to know. In mainstream academic scholarship, authors often write as if they are speaking from 'no particular social or historical location at all – what Donna Haraway has characterized as the "God trick"'.⁶⁶ This authoritative and abstracted third person omniscient stance and academic practice enacts an arrogant power dynamic. Anti-colonial practices include emphasizing location and standpoint, resisting neutrality, objectivity, and invisibility. Feminist and standpoint theorists contend that all knowledge is situated knowledge.⁶⁷ Oftentimes scholars, including settler scholars, neglect to identify the standpoint from which they are writing, how they identify, and what their experiences have been. These matter. As Macoun and Strakosch argue, 'When deployed with a neutral descriptive authority, SCT can also re-inscribe settler academics' political authority and re-enact the foundational settler fantasy that we constitute, comprehend and control the whole political space of our relationships with Indigenous people'.⁶⁸ Kathy Absolon and Cam Willett describe self-location in their Indigenous communities as a common and respectful practice, which includes who they are, where they come from, and the places, and persons to whom they are related.⁶⁹ Location accounts for the researcher's context, fosters accountability, and makes clear that the researcher's writings are presented as being the researcher's own view.⁷⁰ de Leeuw, Greenwood, and Lindsay write, 'even the remotest possibility of achieving new insights into decolonizing relationships [...] can only be achieved when settler colonists become more visible, exactly and precisely as non-Indigenous settler colonists whose presences must never be naturalized ...'.⁷¹ Michelle Carey engages an approach in her doctoral work she refers to as the *autobiographicalization of text*, in which she declares her subject position, stating who she is and where she is from in

order to challenge the presumption of the academic author's authority and neutrality, and to signal her desire to relate with Aboriginal peoples and negotiate her identity in the context of their Sovereignty.⁷²

Wholism

Academia is often accused of focusing singularly on the mind, or intellect. Further, Aimée Craft, during a research consultation, shared that academia 'is about carving out small pieces, and dissecting those very small pieces, often not considering the impact of doing that on the whole'. It would have been easy, in my research, to follow these scholarly norms and focus solely on the thoughts or actions of the research subjects I interviewed. Rather, in order to embody the principle of wholism, I attempted to attend to their spiritual and emotional processes and experiences. Using a life-story, content-focused narrative analysis, research subject stories were presented wholistically rather than themes being extracted and abstracted from their life-story contexts and analysed across participants.

Conclusion

Non-Indigenous anti-colonial and settler colonial studies scholars are not immune to having been disciplined and socialized by a colonial academy, and by settler colonial societies in general. Despite our objections, we will have adopted academic and scholarly practices that enact the very colonial dynamics we wish to resist. In this article, I have argued that it is an ethical responsibility of non-Indigenous anti-colonial and settler colonial studies scholars who wish to disrupt settler colonialism in their theorizing to also disrupt colonial structures and practices of the academy. Some may wonder how well the anti-colonial research methodology I describe will fit for research studies beyond the research study for which it was designed. Some may wonder how the principles and practices described here can be embodied in the absence of connections with networks of Indigenous peoples, and in the absence of funding. Some may wonder whether a situation in which larger numbers of settler scholars are seeking to do relationally accountable anti-colonial research might put a strain on the time and energy of Indigenous scholars, activists, and knowledge keepers. Although I believe the answers to these questions will be worked out through the efforts of researchers in their local contexts and/or in their relationships with Indigenous peoples, I wish to share a few final thoughts.

I am not necessarily contending that every research study involving a white settler researcher and white settler research subjects ought to involve this anti-colonial methodology, although perhaps many studies would be ethically improved by implementing some of its principles. I think the research topic, research questions, and research goals play a role in determining which methodology is the best fit for a given study. The study out of which this article arises necessitated such an approach due in part to its focus on anti-colonial and decolonial work, work which has as its foundation relationships with Indigenous peoples. Researchers who wish to embody the values of the methodology articulated here will choose their research questions and design their research accordingly. Where we design research that poses limitations in our ability to enact some anti-colonial principles, and where we still wish to embody as many anti-colonial principles as we can,

we will note these limitations. Even in the study I have undertaken, I faced limitations in my ability to embody the principles as fully as I would have wished.

What I suggest is a fundamental reorientation of research values and practices. The academy is designed to centre and accommodate western/Eurocentric research practices. Much time and energy on the part of faculty members and students is devoted to learning, understanding, and implementing these approaches with their underlying values and principles. Students take courses in order to gain the skills necessary to engage Eurocentric research paradigms and methodologies, and we put forth much effort to demonstrate a high level of rigour and validity within these frameworks. I am curious about the shift that might occur if the academy (and/or individual researchers) put as much time, planning, effort, resources, and rigour into anti-colonial and relationally accountable research paradigms, methodologies, and practices. To prepare, students who aspire to do this type of research might make choices about supporting Indigenous-led efforts and reading Indigenous-authored literatures. Researchers would work to find ways to give to and support Indigenous communities, not out of charity, but out of justice, reciprocity, and love. They would earn trust with Indigenous peoples and communities and would engage in strong reciprocal relationships. Requests would be made in keeping with Indigenous protocols, which the researchers would have taken efforts to learn. The researchers would locate funding sources and think about what they might give and how they might support Indigenous peoples even as they are asking for their assistance. My point is that a Eurocentric-oriented academy does not necessarily equip us well to do anti-colonial research. I wonder how much academia itself might change, as well as the experiences of Indigenous scholars within it, if large numbers of settler scholars were to re-orient in these ways.

Notes

1. Jarrett Martineau and Eric Ritskes, 'Fugitive Indigeneity: Reclaiming the Terrain of Decolonial Struggle through Indigenous Art', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* 3, no. 1 (2014): 11, <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/21320/17382> (accessed September 21, 2016).
2. Rachel Flowers, 'Refusal to Forgive: Indigenous Women's Love and Rage', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 4, no. 2 (2015): 33–4.
3. Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (New York: Cassell, 1999).
4. Mark Rifkin, 'Settler Common Sense', *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos 3–4 (2013): 323.
5. Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom* (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2005); Michael Hart and Gladys Rowe, 'Legally Entrenched Oppressions: The Undercurrent of First Nations Peoples' Experiences with Canada's Social Welfare Policies', in *Social Issues in Contemporary Native America: Reflections from Turtle Island*, ed. Hillary Weaver (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2014), 23–44; Wanda McCaslin and Denise Breton, 'Justice as Healing: Going Outside the Colonizer's Cage', in *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, ed. Norman Denzin, Yvonne Lincoln, and Linda Smith (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2008), 511–30; Leanne Simpson, 'Oshkimaadiziig, the New People', in *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The Liberation, Resurgence, and Protection of Indigenous Nations*, ed. Leanne Simpson (Winnipeg, MB, Canada: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2008), 13–21; Leanne Simpson, 'Liberated Peoples, Liberated Lands', in *Buffalo Shout, Salmon Cry*, ed. Steve Heinrichs (Waterloo, ON: Herald Press, 2013), 50–60; Waziyatawin, *What does Justice Look Like? The Struggle for Liberation in Dakota Homeland* (St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press, 2008).

6. For example, Alfred, 'Wasáse'; Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler colonialism'; Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, 'Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012) 1–40; Emma Battell Lowman and Adam Barker, *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada* (Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, 2015).
7. See, for example: The Canadian Association of Social Workers, *Guidelines for Ethical Practice* (2005), http://casw-acts.ca/sites/default/files/attachements/CASW_Guidelines%20for%20Ethical%20Practice.pdf (accessed January 16, 2016).
8. CASWE/ACFTS, *Vision, Mission, Principles, and Activities*, <http://caswe-acfts.ca/about-us/mission/> (accessed January 16, 2016).
9. For example, Cindy Blackstock, 'The Occasional Evil of Angels: Learning from the Experiences of Aboriginal Peoples in Social Work', *First Peoples Child and Family Review* 4, no. 1 (2009): 28–37; Michael Hart, *Seeking Mino-pimatisiwin: An Aboriginal Approach to Helping* (Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing Company, 2002); Raven Sinclair, 'Aboriginal Social Work Education in Canada: Decolonizing Pedagogy for the Seventh Generation', *First Peoples Child and Family Review* 1, no. 1 (2004): 49, <http://journals.sfu.ca/fpcf/index.php/FPCFR/article/view/10/41> (accessed September 21, 2016).
10. Blackstock, 'The Occasional Evil of Angels', 28–37; Hart, *Seeking Mino-pimatisiwin*; Hart and Rowe, 'Legally Entrenched Oppressions', 23–44; Sinclair, 'Aboriginal Social Work Education in Canada', 49; Barbara Waterfall, 'Native Peoples and Child Welfare Practices: Implicating Social Work Education', in *Canadian Social Policy: Issues and Perspectives*, ed. Anne Westhues (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press, 2006), 223–44; Michael Yellow Bird, 'Neurodecolonization: Applying Mindfulness Research to Decolonizing Social Work', in *Decolonizing Social Work*, ed. Mel Gray, John Coates, Michael Yellow Bird, and Tiana Hetherington (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2013); Michael Yellow Bird and Mel Gray, 'Indigenous Peoples and the Language of Social Work', in *Indigenous Social Work Around the World: Towards Culturally Relevant Education and Practice*, ed. Mel Gray, John Coates, and Michael Yellow Bird (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 59–70.
11. Kathy Absolon (Minogiishigokwe), *Kaandossiwin: How We Come to Know* (Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, 2011); Michael Hart, 'For Indigenous People, by Indigenous People, with Indigenous People: Towards an Indigenist Research Paradigm', in *Wicihitowin: Aboriginal Social Work in Canada*, ed. Raven Sinclair, Michael Hart, and Gord Bruyere (Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, 2009), 153–69; Raven Sinclair, 'Indigenous Research in Social Work: The Challenge of Operationalizing Worldview', *Native Social Work Journal* 5 (2003): 117–39.
12. Margaret Kovach, *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2009); Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999); Shawn Wilson, *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2008).
13. Kovach, 'Indigenous Methodologies', 161–2.
14. Alissa Macoun and Elizabeth Strakosch, 'The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory', *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3–4 (2013): 44.
15. Ackerly et al., 'Feminist Methodologies', 4; J. Ann Tickener, 'Feminism Meets International Relations: Some Methodological Issues', in *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, ed. Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 19–41; Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (New York: Routledge, 2000); S. Laurel Weldon, 'Inclusion and Understanding: A Collective Methodology for Feminist International Relations', in *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, ed. Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 62–88; Sandra Harding, 'Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate', in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual & Political Controversies*, ed. Sandra Harding (New York: Routledge, 2004), 1–15; Daniel Solórzano and Tara Yosso, 'Critical Race Methodology: Counter-storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Educational Research', in *Foundations of Critical Race Theory in Education*, ed. Edward Taylor, David Gillborn, and Gloria Ladson-Billings (New York: Routledge, 2009), 131–47; George Sefa Dei, 'Critical Issues in Anti-racist Research Methodologies:

- An Introduction', in *Critical Issues in Anti-racist Research Methodologies*, ed. George Sefa Dei and Gurpreet Johal (New York: Peter Lang Publishers, 2005), 1–27; Stephen Kemmis and Robin McTaggart, 'Participatory Action Research: Communicative Action and the Public Sphere', in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, ed. Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005), 559–604; Adam Lewis, 'Ethics, Activism, and the Anti-Colonial: Social Movement Research as Resistance', *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest* 11, no. 2 (2012): 227–40.
16. Mary Watkins and Helene Shulman, *Toward Psychologies of Liberation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 266–312.
 17. Arlo Kempf, 'Contemporary Anticolonialism: A Transhistorical Perspective', in *Breaching the Colonial Contract: Anti-colonialism in the US and Canada*, ed. Arlo Kempf (Dordrecht: Springer Science + Business Media BV, 2009), 19–20.
 18. George Sefa Dei and Alireza Asgharzadeh, 'The Power of Social Theory: The Anticolonial Discursive Framework', *Journal of Educational Thought* 35, no. 3 (2001): 297–323; Kempf, 'Contemporary Anti-Colonialism', 15.
 19. Klee Benally, 'Klee Benally on Decolonization', *Deep Green Philly* (Audio podcast, July 26, 2013), <http://www.deepgreenphilly.com/?p=1275> (accessed September 21, 2016). Adam Barker and Jenny Pickerill, 'Radicalizing Relationships To and Through Shared Geographies: Why Anarchists Need to Understand Indigenous Connections to Land', *Antipode* 44, no. 5 (2012): 1721; Tuck and Yang, 'Decolonization is Not a Metaphor', 17–19, 29, 31.
 20. Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 151.
 21. Eve Tuck and Julie Gorlewski, 'Racist Ordering, Settler Colonialism, and edTPA: A Participatory Policy Analysis', *Educational Policy* 30, no. 1 (2016), 210.
 22. Tuck and Yang, 'Decolonization is Not a Metaphor', 17–19.
 23. Michael Hart, personal communication with the author, January 14, 2016.
 24. Michael Hart, 'Anti-Colonial Indigenous Social Work: Reflections on an Aboriginal Approach', in *Wicihitowin: Aboriginal social work in Canada*, ed. Raven Sinclair, Michael Hart, and Gord Bruyere (Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing, 2009), 25–41.
 25. Leanne Simpson, 'Anticolonial Strategies for the Recovery and Maintenance of Indigenous Knowledge', *American Indian Quarterly* 28, nos 3–4 (2004): 381.
 26. Hart, personal communication, January 14, 2016.
 27. George Sefa Dei, 'Mapping the Terrain – Towards a New Politics of Resistance', in *Anti-colonialism and Education: The Politics of Resistance*, ed. George Sefa Dei and Arlo Kempf (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2006), 5; George Sefa Dei, 'Afterword', in *Breaching the Colonial Contract: Anti-colonialism in the US and Canada*, ed. Arlo Kempf (Dordrecht: Springer Science + Business Media BV, 2009), 253.
 28. Ibid.
 29. Dei, 'Mapping the Terrain', 11.
 30. Ibid.
 31. Carl James, "'Reverse Racism?' Students' Responses to Equity Programs', in *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings*, ed. Tania Das Gupta, Carl James, Roger Maaka, Grace-Edward Galabuzi, and Chris Andersen (Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2007), 357.
 32. Ibid.
 33. Simpson, 'Anticolonial Strategies', 381.
 34. Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie, *Place in Research: Theory, Methodology, and Methods* (New York: Routledge, 2015).
 35. Rauna Kuokkanen, *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift* (Toronto, ON: UBC Press, 2007), 1–2.
 36. Lewis, 'Ethics, Activism', 230.
 37. Tuck and Yang, 'Decolonization is Not a Metaphor', 1.
 38. Simpson, 'Anticolonial Strategies', 381.
 39. Ibid.
 40. Macoun and Strakosch, 'The Ethical Demands', 426.

41. Ibid, 433.
42. Kempf, 'Contemporary Anticolonialism', 14.
43. Macoun and Strakosch, 'The Ethical Demands', 436.
44. Ibid., 426.
45. Dave Courchene, Nii Gaani Aki Inini (Leading Earth Man), is of the Anishinabe Nation, and the Eagle Clan. He is an international speaker and Founder of The Turtle Lodge in Sagkeeng, Manitoba, where he shares ancient knowledge of the Original People of Turtle Island; Zoongigabowitmiskoakikwe is Turtle clan of Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, and a traditional helper; The late Anishinaabe Elder Byron Matwewinin was a son, brother, husband, father, grandfather, pipemaker, sundancer, and student of Elders. He adopted me ceremonially (through the pipe) as his sister in 2004.
46. Gladys Rowe is a Swampy Cree Ikwe of mixed ancestry, mother, partner, student, teacher, and community researcher who explores stories of resurgence and decolonization through art creation and film.
47. Leona Star-Manoakesick is Nehiyawak of the Wolf Clan from Thunderchild First Nation, and a Research Associate at the First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba.
48. Chickadee Richard is Anishinaabe from Sandy Bay First Nation, a Winnipeg activist and Clan Mother who has never been idle; Belinda Vandenbroek is Muskego Ininiw, and a carrier of Ininiw language and way of life; Don Robinson is from Bunibonibee (Oxford House) First Nation, and is a clinical social worker active in the social services community for over 25 years; Aimée Craft is an Indigenous lawyer, author, Assistant Professor, Anishinaabe Inaakonigewin scholar, and Director of Research at the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation; Louis Sorin, Indigenous, is President and CEO of End Homelessness Winnipeg, and has been a Social Work Instructor for many years at St. Boniface University. His spirit name is Red Buffalo Man, and he belongs to the wolf clan; Manito Mukwa (Troy Fontaine) is Bear Clan from Sagkeeng First Nation.
49. Carey, 'Whitefellas and Wadjulas'; Jeff Corntassel, 'To be Ungovernable', *New Socialist: Ideas for Radical Change* 58 (2016): 35–37; Paul Spoonley, 'Being Here and Being Pakeha', in *Being Pakeha*, ed. Michael King (Auckland, Penguin, 1991); Paul Spoonley, 'Constructing Ourselves: The Post-Colonial Politics of Pakeha', in *Justice and Identity: Antipodean Practices*, ed. Paul Wilson and Anna Yeatman (St. Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 1995); Farida Tilbury, "'What's in a Name?'" Wadjula Self-labelling and the Process of Reconciliation', *Balayi: Culture, Law and Colonialism* 1, no. 2 (2000): 73–88.
50. Dave Courchene, Jr., see note 56 above; Rose Roulette is from Sandy Bay First Nation, and is an Aboriginal Language Specialist; Niizhosake, Atik dodem (Sherry Copenace) is Anishinabekwe from the east side of Lake of the Woods, the Ojibways of Onigaming; Daabaasanaquwat 'Low-cloud' (Peter Atkinson) is Turtle Clan of Baagwaanish Giizibii (Roseau River) Anishinabe Nation, a member of the Speakers' Bureau of the Treaty Relations Commission of Manitoba, and a strong believer in original forms of Anishinabe Governance and the Clan System; Byron Matwewinin, see note 56 above; Pebaamibines is of the Lynx clan from Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation, and is retired from the University of Minnesota's American Indian Studies department.
51. Minnawaanagogiizhigook (Dawnis Kennedy) is an Anishinaabe law scholar.
52. Niigonwedom James Sinclair, 'Nindoodemag Bagijiganan: A History of Anishinaabeg Narrative' (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 2013), 75–85.
53. Niizhosake (Sherry Copenace), spoken feedback at research feast, Winnipeg, MB, December 20, 2015.
54. Monique Woroniak is a Settler on Treaty 1 territory and the home of the Red River Metis; Kate Sjoberg grew up in Treaty 4 and Treaty 1 territories, where her life is about building better relationship; Leah Decter is an inter-media artist, scholar, and Ph.D. candidate based in Winnipeg-Treaty 1 territory-whose artwork, writing and research engage in anti-colonial methodologies from a critical white settler perspective; Chuck Wright is a settler educator and full-time member of the Indigenous Peoples Solidarity project of Christian Peacemaker Teams residing in Winnipeg/Treaty 1 territory.

55. Teddy Zegeye-Gebrehiwot is a father, husband, brother, filmmaker, and settler of Ethiopian and Greek heritage who lives on Treaty 1 territory; Gladys Rowe is a Swampy Cree lkwé of mixed ancestry, mother, partner, student, teacher, and community researcher who explores stories of resurgence and decolonization through art creation and film; Sarah Story is a 4th generation settler raised in Manitoba's Parkland on Treaty 4 territory. Sarah is a partner, student, and activist-archivist passionate about community archives and oral history. This group has filmed research interviews, become treasured friends, and have shaped my analysis.
56. Kuokkanen, 'Reshaping the University', 3.
57. de Leeuw et al., 'Troubling Good Intentions', 386.
58. Simpson, 'Land as Pedagogy', 15.
59. Ibid, 22.
60. Kovach, 'Indigenous Methodologies', 86.
61. Simpson, 'Land as Pedagogy', 17.
62. Kovach, 'Indigenous Methodologies', 86.
63. Simpson, 'Land as Pedagogy', 17.
64. Naomi Klein, 'Dancing the World into Being: A Conversation with Idle No More's Leanne Simpson', *Yes! Magazine*, March 5, 2013, <http://www.yesmagazine.org/peace-justice/dancing-the-world-into-being-a-conversation-with-idle-no-more-leanne-simpson> (accessed November 17, 2015).
65. Kovach, 'Indigenous Methodologies', 99.
66. Sandra Harding, 'Introduction: Standpoint Theory', 83.
67. Ibid.
68. Macoun and Strakosch, 'The Ethical Demands', 427.
69. Kathy Absolon and Cam Willett, 'Putting Ourselves Forward: Location in Aboriginal Research', in *Research As Resistance: Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-Oppressive Approaches*, ed. Leslie Brown and Susan Strega (Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars Press, 2005), 19–126.
70. Ibid.
71. Sarah De Leeuw, Margo Greenwood, and Nicole Lindsay, 'Troubling Good Intentions', *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos 3–4 (2013): 392.
72. Michelle Carey, 'Whitefellas and Wadjulas: Anti-colonial Constructions of the Non-Aboriginal Self' (PhD diss., Murdoch University, 2008).

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Emma Battell Lowman and Adam Barker for their insightful editorial assistance and support. I also wish to thank Jeff Denis, Lynne Davis, and Raven Sinclair for their editorial help in refining a later draft.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This work was supported by the Manitoba Research Alliance, an affiliate of The Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives; a Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate (Doctoral) Scholarship (SSHRC); a Manitoba Graduate Scholarship; a University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship; an Elizabeth Hill Scholarship, Faculty of Social Work, University of Manitoba; and the Faculty of Social Work Endowment Fund, University of Manitoba.

Notes on contributor

Elizabeth Carlson is an Aamitigoozhi, Wemistigosi, and Wasicu (settler Canadian and American), whose Swedish, Saami, German, Scots-Irish, and English ancestors have settled on lands of the Anishinaabe and Omaha Nations which were unethically obtained by the US government. Elizabeth lives on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Metis peoples currently occupied by the city of Winnipeg, the province of Manitoba, and the state of Canada where she understands herself to be actively complicit in reproducing settler colonial systems and dynamics, and to be simultaneously working to dismantle these. In addition to completing a Ph.D. in social work at the University of Manitoba, she works as a therapist.