Ganigonhi:oh
The Good Mind Meets the Academy

Canadian journal of Native Education, 31(1), 184-197.

David Newhouse
Trent University

This article documents and examines the experience, challenges, and lessons of the Department of Indigenous Studies at Trent University as it worked over a 30-year period to bring Indigenous Knowledge into the intellectual life of the university. Bringing Indigenous peoples into the academy is a fairly straightforward project. It is, however, only the start of a new intellectual project in Canada: the creation of Indigenous universities and the creation of Indigenous spaces in Canadian universities. Both projects involve more than the physical presence of Indigenous peoples. They involve an active teaching and research engagement with the knowledge that Indigenous peoples have created over millennia.

Before all words are spoken, we send greetings to the universe and to all living things.
We give thanks for the rising of the sun and the light and life that it brings.
We give thanks for another day of life.

I start in this traditional fashion with words of thanksgiving: the words that come before all others. Historic Haudenosaunee protocol requires a formal acknowledgement of the other, a ceremony "at woods edge," as it is called. It signals to those whose village we are about to enter that we have arrived, asks for permission to enter, and gives time to refresh ourselves from the journey. It allows time to collect our thoughts, to pay our respects, to thank the universe and our protectors for their watchfulness, and allows our prospective hosts to ready themselves. The ceremony at woods edge is an important aspect of Haudenosaunee diplomacy. It begins with the Thanksgiving Address, which reminds us of the nature of the universe, its structure and functioning, the roles and responsibilities of all aspects of it, and creates an attitude of humility and gratitude.

I acknowledge the original inhabitants of this land and their descendents who have lived here for a few millennia and whose way of life has changed significantly over this time.

I also acknowledge the institution of the university in which we as professors and students work and study. Universities have their origins in a distant land close to 900 years ago. Like the original inhabitants of North America, they have survived the ages and have been transformed, often by forces that they have been unable to resist. The contemporary university has its roots in the European Enlightenment, an intense period of intellectual and philosophical debate that emphasized the primacy of reason as the way to knowledge and to the good life. Haudenosaunee philosophers of the Good Mind would agree that reason is indeed important. However,

as I discuss below, they would add the importance of balancing reason with passion.

Starting in this traditional way helps us to consider how might we extend our traditional practices to our scholarly endeavors? Can we create norms of scholarship that are appropriate to our understandings of the work of the university? Ought our scholarly endeavors to be consistent with our cultural practices? This article reflects my experience as a faculty member since 1993 and Department Chair of Indigenous Studies at Trent University with bringing Indigenous Knowledge and Indigenous Knowledge-holders into the university. I was born and raised at Six Nations of the Grand River in the Longhouse religion in a family of ceremonialists. My family has been involved in thinking about tradition in a contemporary world for a century, starting with my great-grandfather Seth Newhouse, who challenged the prevailing view at the turn of the 20th century about the need to begin to communicate what we now call Indigenous Knowledge in English, both written and oral. We are no strangers to controversy.

Trent brought Indigenous Knowledge into the university as cultural knowledge in the 1970s and Indigenous Elders as holders of Indigenous Knowledge as professors of Native Studies[1] at the same time. The project was seen as important for the university and Aboriginal communities. We have a 30-year history of working with Indigenous Knowledge (IK) in an academic setting. I start by placing the IK movement in the contemporary social political environment and then move on to our experiences at Trent. I hope that this helps to demonstrate that addressing the issues surrounding IK are important to the future of Indigenous higher education and to Canada.

Indigenous Knowledge in the Contemporary Political and Social Environment

Indigenous people in Canada live in a time I call *after great pain*, although the effects of great pain are still evident. Indigenous peoples are in the process of creating political places of dignity and respect in the Canadian federation through the self-government movement, the treaty and land claims processes, and the healing movement. In many places this work is undertaken in collaboration with non-Indigenous allies who wish to help Canada live up to its past promises and contemporary multicultural ideals. In universities contemporary Indigenous scholars have developed a postcolonial[2] consciousness that imbues their work. Taiaike Alfred's (1999, 2005) writings on Haudenosaunee political theory, Marie Batttiste's (2000) work on Indigenous Knowledge and education, John Borrows' (2002) work on Aboriginal law, and Willy Ermine's (2005) work on Indigenous philosophy and ethics are excellent examples of this consciousness. Their scholarship is imbued with an awareness of the history of the poor treatment by the Europeans who established this country, has a

critical awareness of colonial effects, and proposes how to deal with these effects.

Indigenous peoples have been part of the university experience in North America since their establishment in the 17th century. We have been mascots, students, administrators, professors, and objects of research. There is, after 100 of research, much written about Indigenous peoples: some of it is even true and useful. It would be fair to say that Indigenous peoples did not go to universities to find themselves or to study themselves, to learn about their culture or how their societies functioned. Indigenous peoples were enticed to enter universities as preparation for high-level participation in the labor market or to meet the goals established for them by groups outside Indigenous communities. The university served as another instrument of assimilation. The first Indigenous person, Caleb Cheeshahteaumauk a Wampanoag, graduated from a North American university in 1665 (Monaghan, 2005). One of the oldest universities in the United States, Dartmouth College, was established in 1769 to train Indians to serve as ministers who would then spread Christianity and civilization among their people.

Despite the efforts directed to transforming them, Indigenous peoples shared their knowledge with those working inside the institution. The knowledge shared with early anthropologists helped to establish the discipline. The knowledge shared with professors like Abraham Maslow (in Hoffman, 1999) and Carl Jung (1963) added to the rafters[3] of the discipline of psychology. The work of William Fenton, Arthur Parker and other anthropologists and historians led to the development of the discipline of ethnohistory. Today IK is shaping disciplines such as health studies and environmental studies. Political studies and law, among other disciplines, have similarly benefited from their engagement with Indigenous peoples and their ideas. Indigenous peoples were often seen as a way of learning about the evolution of human beings, as a glimpse into a human past. It would be fair to characterize the relationship throughout most of its history as a one-way transfer of knowledge and benefit, that is, from Indigenous peoples to university. The history of Indigenous-university relations remains to be written, although there is a good start in *Science Encounters the Indian* (Bieder, 1995), which provides a foundation for examining the early relationship.

In 1972 the National Indian Brotherhood, now the Assembly of First Nations, released a position paper entitled *Indian Control of Indian Education.* This document argued that Indians ought to have control over their own education, both process and content. Indian control would enable Indian peoples to shape the education of their children in ways that would strengthen culture and provide a solid basis for societal participation as Indians. Over the last 30 years Indigenous people in Canada have vigorously pursued this policy direction. It has stimulated discussion and

change at all three levels of education: primary, secondary, and postsecondary. One of its results has been the development of a network of 52 Aboriginal-controlled postsecondary education institutions across the country. Some of these are independent diploma-granting institutions that are part of the provincial systems such as the Nicola Valley Institute of Technology; others are private institutions similar to tribal colleges in the US such as the First Nations Technical Institute; and others are affiliated or partnered with universities or colleges such as the First Nations University of Canada. In universities, departments or programs of Indigenous studies (or Native studies, First Nation studies, or Aboriginal studies), and other programs emerged, often as a way of attracting Indigenous students and making the institution relevant to Indigenous community needs.

The curriculum over the last few years has reflected an Indigenous desire for cultural transmission, identity development, and market skills. Much effort has been made to ensure that the system does not "get rid of the Indian" (Titley, 1986) as Duncan Campbell Scott would have wished, but to create a self-confident, modern Indigenous person fully capable of meeting the challenges of the contemporary world and living a good life as an Indigenous person.

Over the last three decades, Indigenous peoples have stood up and begun to speak for themselves, using the skills and knowledge gained from this curriculum. They speak back to a system that saw and generally continues to see them only in negative terms, that saw them as marginal and offering little to contemporary life and even less to the broad political, social, and cultural debates of the day. This speaking back in my view is an important aspect of the decolonization movement as we are experiencing it in Canada. Decolonization is a multifaceted process, but it starts with a single statement: I am a person, fully conscious, self-determining, and able to think and speak for myself. I am not you nor am I the image that you have created of me.

Through the process of decolonization, we as Indigenous peoples come to the table with something of value to offer to the world. This something has come to be called *Indigenous Knowledge* (IK). IK is the knowledge that we have developed over generations: the theories of the universe and how it works; the nature of human beings and others; the nature of society and political order; the nature of the world and how to live in it; and human motivation among many other aspects of life. This knowledge has been transmitted from generation to generation, thought about, discussed, refined, discarded, reinforced, and subjected to continual analysis and testing. It has not been static. IK shows how to live in a world of continual change for it is based on a foundational philosophical tenet: the world is constantly in process of transformation and movement. Hoping for stability and certainty in the material world leads to suffering. We live in a world where we as human beings are the last created and the most de-

pendent on other forces for our survival. We are at once powerless and powerful: our bodies are powerless; our minds are powerful. These are Indigenous philosophical statements about the nature of human beings and the universe.

One of the central aspects of modern Indigenous societies is the desire to use IK as a key-informing basis of contemporary life. This is not to say that the knowledge of others is not useful or helpful. It is, however, to place IK at the center in a position of centrality or primacy. To ignore other knowledges would be inconsistent with traditional teachings about what it means to be an educated person. In fact many Indigenous Elders insist that we learn and engage with the knowledge of others. We can interpret the Guswentah, the two-row wampum that signified the relationship between Haudenosaunee and various European settlers in the early arrival period, in a way that supports their position. The Guswentah consists of two rows of purple beads separated by three rows of white beads. It looks like two purple parallel lines on a bed of white.

The separateness and parallel nature of the two rows has been used as an argument for the creation of a state of complete separateness from each other. We canoe alone, so to speak. The two rows denote a relationship and in my view a dialogue between nations and cultures; the three white rows signify the ethics of this dialogue: respect, honesty, and kindness. There is much to be said for noninterference in national political affairs, but not much in favor of other aspects of separateness. Not engaging with the knowledge of others, denying the knowledge of others, is inconsistent with a Guswentah philosophy of engagement. In fact engagement is required in order to live well with those with whom one shares the world.

Learning, reason, and oratory have always been marks of an educated person in Haudenosaunee society. Similarly, so was a facility to speak languages other than one's own. Learning the other's knowledge was also considered important, as important as learning the knowledge of one's own society and culture. The highest compliment that one can make of an Iroquoian person is to say that they are *of good mind.*

The good mind is the consciousness ideal postulated by Haudenosaunee philosophical thought. What does it mean to be of good mind? A good mind is balanced of reason and passion, ever negotiating the dance that the two undertake. A good mind is ever thinking of how to foster peace between peoples, the world, and all its inhabitants. Important here is the idea of balance and the ideas of reason and passion. Haudenosaunee philosophers, not being influenced by Descartes, did not conceive of a separateness of mind and body; no statement *I think, therefore I am* animates Haudenosaunee philosophy. Reason—the ability to think logically, rationally, and to express oneself well in words and passion—that is, the feelings are related and mutually influential. Both are deemed necessary for the good life.

Passion, especially anger, is seen as destructive. The founding story of the Iroquoian confederacy conceives of a time when humans were ruled entirely by passion. There was war everywhere, brother fought brother, cousin fought cousin, blood was everywhere. Such was the effect of passion. Iroquoian philosophers say, "passion drives reason from the table." On the other hand, reason alone leads to sterility and is equally destructive. Reason robs one of passion, forcing one to look with coldness and distance at human beings and the world. Our minds are made up of reason and passion. Neither can be denied, nor should they be denied. We ought to act with reason tempered by passion.

The central ceremony of Iroquoian life is the condolence ceremony, invented by the Peacemaker and practiced by Hiawatha. Its purpose is to bring reason back to the table. With this feather, I wipe the obstructions from your eyes so that you may see again, from your ears so that you might hear again, from your throat so that you may speak again. Grief has driven reason from the table and impaired our ability to see, hear, and speak. It is a symbolic return to the good mind, a mind balanced of reason and passion.

Our preference is to build educational institutions that explore and transmit our ideas, ideas like that of the good mind. (I might go as far as to say that the foundational idea for an Indigenous university ought to the good mind.) This project has proven to be somewhat difficult, mostly due to the single-mindedness of the adherents to the Enlightenment project. Enlightenment universities favor reason over passion. I am not arguing against reason, science, a desire for objectivity, or empiricism. I am arguing that reason is not enough. The idea of the good mind sustained us in the past and can continue to sustain us in the future.

In my view, one of the fundamental purposes of a university is to help us to understand the world and ourselves and to transmit our knowledge to a new generation of people. It ought also to help us explore what a good life is. And in the 21st century, it ought to foster highly creative, innovative human beings adept at creating or, if you will, uncovering new truths. A university ought to bring the best of human knowledges into dialogue so that we might better understand the universe.

Until recently the knowledge of our ancestors as represented by Indigenous Knowledge was not considered worthy of inclusion in this dialogue. It was, however, considered worthy of study as folklore or local knowledge in the Geertzian (1985) sense. Indigenous Knowledge as Indigenous Knowledge was not part of any university-level curriculum until the early part of the 21st century. It was present in the research reports of others, but not as taught by Elders. The problem was that it was not produced as a result of the scientific method, did not result in peer-reviewed publications, and was, therefore, not part of the dialogue that academics have with each other, as my colleagues are fond of saying. The

reasoning process behind it was not visible, and as a result it did not meet the test of verifiability that was necessary for it to be accepted as real and true.

The construction of a category of knowledge called Indigenous Knowledge is a powerful act of decolonization. It makes visible in a real and tangible way the intellectual efforts of Indigenous peoples; in fact it allows for Indigenous intellectuals and in the process creates something that can be explored by the academy. The construction of IK also attempts to place boundaries around colonization and provides the basis for a way forward. The desire to use IK in daily life creates an intellectual project that can be understood and explored by the university.

IK has some commonly accepted characteristics that have been agreed on by a growing group of Indigenous scholars such as Cajete & Little Bear (1999), Brant-Castellano (2000), Battiste (2000), and Ermine (2005) among others. It comes about as a result of a long, intimate relationship with a particular environment, is based on careful, long-term observation and testing of hypotheses, is tested regularly through use and practice, is modified according to changing environmental conditions and reason, and is rooted in Indigenous understandings of the nature of the universe. In IK reason and passion are intertwined. IK is transmitted through practice, ceremony, and instruction. IK rests on a spiritual foundation. By spirit I mean a sense of the interconnectedness of things and a sense that we live in a sea of energy that animates everything. The universe is alive.

IK is multidisciplinary in nature. Its most common and best-known discipline is TEK, Traditional Environmental Knowledge. The Inuit speak of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit or Inuit Traditional Knowledge (ITK), and the government of Nunavut is working out how it might be incorporated into the daily workings of the government and its programs (Nunavut, 2003). Another example is Gayanashagowa: The Great Binding Law expresses the social and political philosophy of the Haudenosaunee and is at the center of their self-government efforts (Dennis, 1993). The Wet"suwet"en described their approach to peacemaking based on their view of the nature of human beings and their interactions to the judge in the 1991 Delgamuukw case (Mills, 1994).

I hope that you have a sense that IK is a complex of ideas and practices based on Indigenous views of the universe. How do we bring IK into Enlightenment universities? Can we create IK scholars who research and teach in their intellectual spaces? Can we transmit IK through university courses? What is IK research? What constitutes an IK publication? How do we evaluate IK scholars? These are some of the questions that we face when we bring IK into the university. I now turn to our efforts in Trent.

Indigenous Knowledge at Trent

At Trent since the 1970s in Native studies, now Indigenous studies, we have been teaching about Indigenous cultures at the undergraduate level

in a variety of ways: formal course-based teaching involving readings and discussions of Elders' teachings, experiential placements, summer camps, annual Elders' gatherings, and more recently weekly traditional teaching workshops. Our approach has been to provide a sufficient foundation so that students who wish to learn more can do so with the knowledge that they will not commit grave errors and can do so respectfully, that is, in accordance with Indigenous protocols.

This was not called Indigenous Knowledge teaching; we taught cultural knowledge. This changed in 1999 when we started a doctoral program in Indigenous studies. By this time the discourse of IK was firmly established in intellectual discourse. We began an extended conversation about what it was, what aspects of it we could bring into the university, who could teach it, how they would teach it, and who could learn it. Our PhD vision statement places IK at the center of the program. This means in practice what we had to grapple with. Saying it was easier than doing it. We did have at the time two and a half decades of teaching cultural knowledge and working institutionally with Elders as holders of traditional knowledge. What had we learned from this experience that might guide us as we developed the doctoral program?

Our first conclusion was that the teachers of IK should be Elders. We have had Elders as members of the faculty since 1975: Fred Wheatley, who taught Nishnaabewin and Anishnaabe culture, and Chief Jake Thomas, who taught Mohawk language and Iroquoian culture. Both were tenured faculty members appointed without the usual academic credentials, but on the basis of their cultural knowledge and Indigenous credentials. Lately we have had Shirley Williams and Edna Manitowabi: Shirley to teach Nishnaabewin and Edna to teach a course appropriately called Indigenous Knowledge. Shirley became the first professor in Canadian history to become a full professor on the basis of IK.

In order to do this, we have had to grapple with the idea of Indigenous scholarship and with the criteria that we would use to appoint Indigenous Knowledge-holders to tenured faculty positions. Our appointment and tenure criteria define scholarship broadly and allow for the use of Elders, from the cultural group of the person under consideration, in the evaluation of Indigenous Knowledge scholarship. The university-wide decision-making processes involving chairs' and deaconal committees and the Board of Governors approved our criteria. Our tenure review process rests on the widely accepted idea of peer review and extends the peers to a group not usually considered by the university as part of its internal process.

Second, we concluded that the historical structure of university courses based on reading, reflection, discussion, and writing did not suit well the teaching of IK. Teaching IK required a hands-on experiential approach, an apprenticeship of sorts consistent with Indigenous approaches to learning.

The teaching had to engage both reason and passion. At the undergraduate level we have created courses that provide this experience in a setting away from the university, in a natural environment, and that focus on the teachings of a particular group. We learned that a pan-Indigenous approach did not make sense and caused more confusion among students than it solved. Accordingly, we separated Anishnaabe IK from Haudenosaunee IK. At the graduate level we also wished to provide an opportunity for extended study with Elders. We put in place a Bimaadiziwin/Atonhetseri:io option that would provide this. Students have an opportunity to spend a term working with an Elder, learning in depth from him or her. This option occurs away from the campus under the leadership and direction of a director of studies, an Elder himself. The inclusion of this option is important to our academic mission. Approximately half the students in the doctoral program have taken part in this option.

We also found that learning IK was different from learning about IK. The task of learning IK requires a mindful presence and a keen understanding of self as well as an ability to reflect. Learning IK is in my view akin to studying the humanities. It requires not only knowledge of content, but also knowledge of one's own values, perspectives, and attitudes or at least a willingness to explore them. Learning IK is transformative. It changes a person in unexpected ways. It makes you keenly aware that you are living in an interconnected world, that the world is alive, that there is an animating energy/spirit, and that we are only a small part of the universe. Learning IK teaches humility, gratitude, and forgiveness, an awareness of the cycle of life and death, and how to begin to live in a powered universe. This is the knowledge that one gains from studying the humanities.

Third, we found that we could not ignore our own behavior. Given the interwoven nature of knowledge and spirituality, how should we behave? How should our students behave? Deciding to study IK in the views of the Elders with whom we were working required a high level of commitment, a sense of humility, and most important, an open and honest heart with a desire to use the knowledge for the betterment of humankind. Self-aggrandizement was not part of the package.

In terms of learning from Elders, we had to learn how to question differently. In the university, everything is open to probing, to questioning, to examination through the use of reason. The knowledge-holders were also subject to examination, to challenge, and to continual questioning. What was unsettling was not that these things were occurring. After all, there is a long intellectual tradition in Indigenous societies. What was unsettling was that they occurred in a climate of disrespect or what many interpreted as disrespect. How does one question an Elder? In the academy we ask professors questions all the time, asking direct questions

and expecting direct answers. A lack of understanding is often interpreted as a problem in explanation, a problem of telling rather than a problem of listening. Elders would respond to questions with stories, fully expecting the student to answer his or her own question. Students want answers. We have had both to teach how to respond to each other and to learn how to relate to one another in a new way.

Bringing IK holders into the academy has also meant that we have had to think about expectations for a professor who is an IK-holder. The academy requires that as professors, we have a research program that results in a steady stream of published books, papers, and conference presentations among other things. This research is often funded through a variety of grant programs. The university academic culture requires that we demonstrate that we are active and productive scholars. By active and productive, they mean that we produce a steady stream of output, that our research is funded, and that we transmit this knowledge through teaching and writing. Above all, our work is to result in "net new knowledge." It is important that this new knowledge be produced as a result of the research or inquiry efforts of the professor. When confronted with the question of newness about the output of Indigenous Knowledge scholars by my Dean, who is a philosophy professor, I asked, What net new knowledge has European philosophy and philosophers contributed to humanity over the last few hundred years? Is not a significant part of philosophical scholarship grappling with the ideas of those who came before and interpreting them for a contemporary time? How is this different from what Indigenous Knowledge-holders do? The question has not been asked again.

The problem of expectations of IK faculty is illustrated by one of our Elder faculty who was nominated for a research award. She had produced a lexicon of Nishnaabemowin (Ojibwa language) obtained by interviewing Elder speakers. It was the first such text produced. The committee deliberated about whether her work was research; whether it was original, that is, was net new knowledge; or whether she had just written down something that was already in existence. I wondered aloud why an anthropologist could get a doctorate for doing the same thing and demonstrated that several scholars had received their degrees for producing Indigenous lexicon dictionaries. How can the same activity and output be research in one academic discipline and not in another?

We have had to convey what Elders do in the language of the academy so that it can be understood in its terms rather than our own. We conceptualized and described the work of Elder faculty as research. Attending and participating in medicine camps became field work and plant research. Giving interviews to other academics for publication became published papers. Participation in ceremonies has become workshop participation; leading ceremonies has become keynote addresses. We began a conversation about oral texts, Indigenous research methods, In-

digenous epistemologies, and cosmologies that was intended to help us and others understand better how to think of academics as knowledge-creators in addition to their role as knowledge-transmitters. The purpose of these conversations was to make some of the rules of knowledge creation visible and subject to review as they are in other disciplinary areas. An Elder's CV would then look similar in some respects to those of other academics. The texts to which it refers would be written and oral like those of the rest of us in the academy.

Students also had expectations about what they would find when they arrived here. They came expecting to engage IK and IK-holders and to come to their own conclusions. They came expecting an intellectual dialogue similar to that with which they were familiar. Learning about IK was fairly straightforward and easy. Learning IK challenged their understanding of themselves. However, as they grappled with it, it began to appear in their written work: papers, thesis proposals, and dissertations. It also began to affect their individual behavior in unexpected ways.

We were confronted with practical questions: what knowledge can we bring into this place? (All except ceremonial or sacred knowledge. How do we know what is sacred or ceremonial? Ask). Who can learn it? (All who desire and who come to learn it with an open heart and sincere desire to learn). How do we evaluate their learning? (In the standard way, through written papers and oral presentations. In the IK courses and the two apprenticeship options, students make presentations in the presence of Elders who then question them on what they learned). What type of grades should we give: Pass/Fail or letter grades? What constitutes an A? This was the subject of much debate and is still not resolved to everyone's satisfaction. Those who argue for pass/fail speak of the difficulty of evaluating degrees of IK knowledge; those who argue for letter grades argue for the use of grades in scholarship and other awards evaluation processes.

We worked on our responses to questions like these through a process of dialogue and discussion, not only with ourselves as academics, but with Elders and community members. For us the university is not an ivory tower distant from everyday life and concerns, but an important part of everyday life. What we do within it affects others. We do not undertake our work only for our own egos, but with and for our communities. It makes sense, then, to have them involved. Our advisory councils: Elders' Council, the Aboriginal Education Council, and Indigenous Studies PhD Council, provide guidance and advice. As in any community, there is diversity of opinion and here is no exception. We might describe our efforts as an effort to come to one mind, to use a Haudenousannee metaphor again.

These are the issues that arise from our move to bring IK into the academy. I am reminded, however, that IK is already in the academy. It

has been for many years. Many PhD-holders have received their degrees studying, documenting, and teaching about it in a variety of fields. Yet few of the IK practitioners or knowledge-holders are present in the academy as fully fledged members of the academy like tenured professors.

A large and growing global dialogue in IK is taking place. In a Google search I found 2.0m sites. Google Scholar lists 275,000 articles. Scholars' Portal shows 4,300 articles published on IK since 1981. The global academic literature on IK has become voluminous and inexhaustible. The academic dialogue represented by this literature is divided into two parts: a large critical dialogue about IK situating it clearly in the postcolonial, anticolonial critique of the West, and a smaller content dialogue of IK. The first academic dialogue receives most of the attention; it is what gets us published and what provides us with legitimacy in the eyes of the academy. The second is the more challenging aspect of the dialogue as it involves learning with both reason and passion. It is also the most difficult part to teach.

With each change of administration, we learned that we had to educate a new group about IK: deans, vice-presidents academic, and presidents. It is not part of their education and experience as faculty members, and consequently they have many questions. We continually have to discuss and make visible the foundations of our discipline. Each administration states that they are in support of IK in the academy, yet a new generation seems reluctant to bring IK-holders into the academy, even given our 30-year history of success in doing so. The reluctance to bring IK-holders into the academy is akin to wanting to teach physics without hiring physicists.

The academy is a powerful institution. It is not immutable. Its rafters have been extended many times over the centuries. Bringing IK into it will not destroy it, nor will it shake its foundations. The primacy of reason is important to human survival, even to those who hold to the idea of the good mind. Bringing IK into it is a project of dialogue, discussion, and debate. It requires the creation of an atmosphere that supports a broad definition of inquiry, the interrelatedness of reason and passion, the notion of truths rather than Truth, and above all accepts that Indigenous people have something to offer beyond opportunities for research into social problems.

For many the spiritual aspects of IK are problematic. They are seen as inappropriate for inclusion in an Enlightenment institution and as inimicable to the reasoned work of the academy. For us as Indigenous peoples as for many others, the spiritual facilitates our work. It makes us think of relationships and connections, of impact and effect, and awakens our consciousness to new truths. The spiritual also reminds us of the ethics of our work, to approach it, as the Anishnaabe say, in a good way and as the Haudenosaunee say, with a good mind. The spiritual also reminds us of

our responsibilities as academics to tell the truth, to be conscious of our method, to be aware of our emotions and their effects, and above all, to do no harm.

It is possible to do all these things without a spiritual foundation, as our Enlightenment colleagues will tell us. This is indeed true. Yet for us it would not be consistent with the idea of the good mind and would be asking us to forget who we are. It would not be in keeping with the dialogue postulated by the Guswentah. It would be asking us to continue the old assimilationist activities of the university.

I am reminded of Hiawatha and the Peacemaker's work to convince Atatarho of the message of peace. They came to him and told him the message. He was unable to hear, saying, "No, not yet." They continued their work, bringing others to the message. Each time they came back and were greeted with the response: "No. Not yet." Finally, they stood in huge numbers before the Atatarho. He saw and was convinced. Hiawatha combed the snakes from his hair and his mind became the good mind. His body was straightened and he accepted the message. Our numbers are gathering.

These are the measure of my words. I hope that you found something of interest. I thank you for the opportunity to share them with you.

And now that the words have been spoken and our business is concluded, we cover the fire and return to our homes and families. May you find them in good health and joyful at your return. May you journey well.

Notes

[1]The Department of Native Studies was established as the Indian-Eskimo Studies Program in 1969, became the Department of Native Studies in 1972 and the Department of Indigenous Studies in 2006. Its name change over the years reflects the changing nomenclature used to refer to the original inhabitants of Canada. In this article I use the term *Indigenous* to reflect our recent decision. It is intended to connote a commonality of global experiences of original peoples with nation-states.

[2]I acknowledge that the term *postcolonial* is disputed and that some argue that the period of colonialism is not over, so there can be no *post* or *after*. I use it here as a marker in a change in consciousness, that is, an awareness of the forces of colonialism.

[3]*Added to the rafters* is a term for the addition to a longhouse to accommodate another family. I believe that it is important that we use ideas and concepts from our own cultures inside the academy as part of our work as Indigenous scholars. This practice grounds our work in our own intellectual traditions and reinforces our desire to foreground Indigenous ideas.

Acknowledgments

This article is based on talks given at the University of Sudbury Ethics Project and Algoma University College in November 2007. I extend thanks to the faculty and students who provided commentary on the ideas and for helping me to clarify them.

References

Alfred, Taiaike. (1999). *Peace, power, righteousness: An Indigenous manifesto.* Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, Taiaike. (2005). *Wasase: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom.* Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Battiste, Marie. (2000). *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Bieder, Robert. (1995). *Science encounters the Indian, 1820-1880: The early years of American ethnology.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Borrows, John. (2002). *Recovering Canada: The resurgence of Indigenous law.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Brant-Castellano, Marlene. (2000). Updating Aboriginal traditions of knowledge. In G. Sefa Dei, B. Hall, & D. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledges in global contexts: Multiple readings of our world.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Cajete, Gregory., & Little Bear, Leroy. (1999). *Native science natural laws of interdependence.* Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Books.

Dennis, Matthews. (1993). *Creating a landscape of peace: Iroquois-European encounters in seventeenth-century America.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Ermine, Willie. (2005). *Ethical space: Transforming relations, A report for the Tri-Council on Ethics.* Ottawa: Tri-Council on Ethics

Geertz, Clifford. (1985). *Local knowledge.* Scranton, PA: Harper Collins.

Hoffman, Edward. (1999). *The right to be human: A biography of Abraham Maslow.* Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill.

Jung, Carl. (1963). *Memories, dreams, reflections.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Mills, Antonia. (1994). *Eagle down is our law Witsuwit'en law, feasts and land claims.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Monaghan, E.J. (2005). *Learning to read and write in colonial America.* Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Nunavut. (2003). *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit Katimajiit established.* Iqaluit, NV: Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth, Government of Nunavut.

Titley, Brian E. (1986). *A narrow vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the administration of Indian Affairs in Canada.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.