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Kia Tu Ki te Tahi. When we stand, we stand as one

Globally, colonialism has disconnected Indigenous peoples from their culture, community and land. It has left an indelible footprint on the education aspirations of Indigenes, often leaving them locked out of education systems and blaming them for their lack of ‘success’. Emanating from social justice through inclusion, equity and power sharing, indigenisation is not merely an add-on deriving from another world perspective: it presents opportunities to challenge cultural preconceptions and the way we order the world.

Indigenisation advances authentic cultures and fosters the sharing of knowledge with non-indigenous peoples. It nurtures the adoption of Indigenous values and practices in our work and daily lives, and creates pathways for adaption to local ways.

Junctures invited submissions on the theme of indigenisation and received response to the call from authors in the Cook Islands, Norway, Australia, Taiwan, Canada, South Africa, and Aotearoa, New Zealand.

From the Cook Islands, Wynne posits that for indigenisation to occur, the power exerted by the dominant culture needs to be deconstructed. An inequality of power has marginalised Indigenous communities, stripped them of their autonomy and their influence in education, employment and governance. To engage in indigenisation, questions of inequity and parity need to be addressed before a dialogue of partnership can begin.

And the conversation cannot be on the terms of those who have captured and maintained power; it should be led from the ground up, by those who are seeking a voice and a share of the power. He asks that indigenous peoples be given the space to plot their own course in how they their values and practices are adopted in their work and daily lives. For people of indigenous cultures who walk in two worlds, the ‘truth’ about themselves that has been perpetuated by the colonizer, by those who write the history, must be changed.

Education can reduce barriers to engage with indigenous communities: endorsing indigenous world views and cultural identities brings real and transformative benefits to the institution, and incorporating indigeneity into objectives and goals allows the socio-cultural needs of indigenous populations to be addressed.

Mane presents Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, as a case study in which this has only partially been achieved, and achievement seems to be going backwards. With rare exception, Maori are still on the periphery of what is the norm in mainstream tertiary institutions.

Frequent restructuring and deployment of neo-liberal business models has caused the polytechnic and institutes of technology sector to lose focus on learning and people. These are impediments to progressing Maori aspirations in tertiary education: Maori have been marginalised in a colonial system that has rejected the notions of Maori knowledge systems and science. The spirituality of all things, integral to Maori knowledge systems, needs to be acknowledged if indigeneity is to be achieved; opportunities for students to validate their own identities and belief systems need to be fostered.
Solliid and Olsen write about indigenising education in Norway to achieve recognition of the indigenous Sámi people: education is the most effective means for the Sámi to achieve recognition of language and culture. It has the potential to develop multiple senses of belonging and citizenship, both nationally and locally. In the classroom, a cultural interface is created that seeks a renegotiation of the ‘other’ to the norm.

In the municipality of Gáivoutna-Kåfjord-Kaivuono, they observe how Indigenous education works and is evolving within the framework of the national curriculum: local demands, needs and diversity are winning space within national demands and regulations. They acknowledge the ongoing evolution of the community; changes run both parallel and contrary to those in the general community. These do not seek an endpoint but are an ongoing co-creation of shared values and cultural capital.

In Canada, there has in the last fifty years been a recognition of a need to improve Indigenous people’s participation in higher education. A number of manifestos have been developed, with institutions pledging engagement. The summary report in 2015 of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada on residential schools resulted in a Calls to Action to redress the legacy and devise a process of reconciliation.

Residential schools were sponsored by the government and established to assimilate Indigenous children into Euro-Canadian culture. From the 1870s to 1996, more than 150,000 children were taken from their families and sent to the schools. There, they were stripped of their language and culture, and suffered abuse, trauma and injuries, resulting in thousands of deaths.

BCampus formed the BCampus Indigenisation Project, which collaborated with Indigenous educational leaders and British Columbia post-secondary education institutes to create a series of online indigenisation resources. The outcome of consultation and collaboration with First Nations people are five guides; they are living resources that can grow to adapt to future initiatives to support indigenisation.

The Indigenisation Project intends to enable institutes to develop means to allow Indigenous students to experience education in resonance with their lives, worldviews and ambitions. Non-Indigenous people are invited to work and live well alongside Indigenous, and be responsive to the development of social, economic, and education needs of Indigenous peoples.

Ray, Bannerman and Wabano examine indigenisation in the larger context of Northern Ontario. They are critical of what has been achieved to date: many post-secondary institutions have made declarations of commitment to Indigenisation through various protocols, but there has been little evidence of implementation that resonates with Indigenous peoples’ expectations.

In an attempt to address this, 6 northern colleges in Ontario developed an Indigenous quality assurance project to develop Indigenous quality assurance standards. This involved understanding the meaning of quality assurance from an Indigenous people’s perspective and creating a quality process and standards that reflected their culture.

Conventional measures of success reflect the context in which they are set and do not always align with Indigenous people’s contexts. Indigenous knowledge holders identified the concept of quality as ‘weweni’ in the Anishinaabe language, conveying ‘that good way’ and ‘looking after something properly’. This means shaping learning that reflects the world view and education needs of the local Indigenous people to ensure the well-being of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. By positioning indigenisation in quality assurance, its responsibility is dispersed across the institution – it is Indigenous led, but everyone’s responsibility.

In Taiwan, a shift in paradigm from the indigenous community being the objects (subjects) of research to becoming partners in research is occurring. Hsieh, Chang and Lakaw reflect on Indigenous research ethics practices and propose a shift from obtaining research consent to collaboration. The Indigenous peoples’ basic law mandates that individual as well as collective consent is secured for research. However, a diversity of decision-making processes among the communities, and nations, means it was very difficult to devise a protocol that would suit them all.

The authors suggest a platform of Indigenous community members and knowledge experts, and academics serving as consultants would offer an alternative. They would facilitate dialogue between communities and researchers through the research cycle, and ensure community voices are heard. It is hoped this would foster collaboration and partnership between the Indigenous peoples and academic institutes, with outcomes that are beneficial to the local communities.
Writing from Johannesburg, Tomaselli asks us to recalibrate the relationship between discourse and power, and to indigenise that relationship. In academic discourse in Africa, there is resistance to accepting other perspectives than the established Cartesian knowledge production and subject-object dualism. Consequently, academia gets to legitimize meaning and hold and maintain power.

Applying the Western norms discourages African schools of thought and ways of making sense. Submission to academic journals from African scholars are prone to rejection because if they do not conform to the ‘Western’ norm in style. Tomaselli challenges peer-reviewers to examine their own assumptions, to be accepting of and to incorporate other perspectives in the academic discourse. There are many ways of knowing and of consciousness, and an Indigenous epistemology may cultivate a communal cultural memory rather than the individualistic subject. He suggests other, Indigenous, perspectives would enrich academia.

Rowston sees in the prison graffiti of Dylan Voller marks of an activist. Voller was on numerous occasions incarcerated for spurious reasons and experienced racially motivated physical and mental abuse in prison. Defacing prison walls with graffiti is not only material destruction of a white institution: graffiti is a transgressive text reclaiming sovereignty when blackness is criminalized through the justice system. It is under the constant threat of erasure as walls are methodically whitewashed, ensuring messages are not seen - the space is re-appropriated by the authorities.

Writing on the walls can be seen as resistance to settlers’ practice of publishing books. Neither authored nor published, graffiti has an illegitimacy in literature. Before the colonisation, aboriginal text was in the form of marking on the earth - rock art in the form of symbols and images served to tell ancient stories and record history. Reading rock art is to acknowledge Indigenous knowledge systems and sovereignty. Graffiti is a symbol of the struggle for sovereignty as it tests the authority of the colonisers and challenges them to find a way to determine meaning in the text, and to shape an authentic response.

Indigenisation requires a suspension of the power held by the dominant, colonising culture: it asks they relax their grip on the Indigene and to adopt behaviour they are unfamiliar with, to interact along unfamiliar cultural norms and patterns. It is an invitation to co-construct a culture of the best of both worldviews, technologies and cultures, where each partner integrates elements of the ‘other’ in shaping a new ‘normal’.
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