

Transcript for Pulling Together: A Guide for Curriculum Developers, Session 4 (February 2, 2023)

Session Title: Incorporating Diverse Sources of Knowledge

BCcampus webinar hosted February 2, 2023

Host: Gabrielle Lamontagne

Facilitator: Tanya Ball

Guest Speaker: Angie Tucker

TANYA BALL:

Alright. So this week we're going to be talking about incorporating diverse sources of knowledge. Yes, happy groundhog day to you. I haven't seen a lot of groundhog needs is the perfect. Alright, let's move right into our song. This is a song called "Boujee Natives." It's by the Snotty Nose Rez Kids. Great band. They have amazing songs. Highly recommend them. Let's go for it.

[🎵 "[BOUJEE NATIVES](#)" BY SNOTTY NOSE REZ KIDS PLAYS 🎵]

TANYA:

Amazing. I love Snotty Nose Rez Kids! Because it gives us so much, so much of our language. Before we jump in, can anyone put in the chat what boujee means? Everyone know what boujee means? No guesses yet. Alright, I guess I'll have to... glam, fancy. Yes, so boujee, we use the word boujee lot to mean fancy. I'd like to say it that my mom's a boujee native because she likes to wear her top hat and she has all of her custom jewelry. She's amazing. In the song. They also have the word neechie. Anyone know what neechie means? boujie is spelled b Boujie? How do I spell "boujee"? How about neechies? Yes, neechie is "friend." So you'll hear us say, Where's our neechie? They're our buddies, our friends, they're like one of us, right? Last word, I'll teach you is skoden. Skoden. That's a really popular, that's actually another song of theirs that they sing is called Skoden. Does anyone know what that means? I'm waiting, maybe the, everyone's waiting to see if the chat will explode. "Skoden" is a really important term. It's huge because it's actually transformed into something else. "Skoden" is basically, it's a mishmash of words that says, "Let's go, then," right? So let's go then. But it's go then. Like let's go, let's do this. Let's just basically like I'm pumped, let's go. So skoden is really cool. It's really great word to know. Check-in, check-in for today. Where we're at. Today we're going to have a special guest, Angie Tucker. She's amazing. We always love having her in these classrooms because she's so knowledgeable. We're going to revisit cultural appropriation and appreciation, talk about cultural protocols. And I'm going to give you some tips on how to evaluate resources because I know a lot of you are educators, so I think that'll be really important information for all of you. Next slide.

So check-in. This is where we're at today, February 2nd, we're on page 37 to 45. That's Incorporating Diverse Sources of Knowledge into Your Curriculum. Next week we're going to be

talking about Developing Awareness of One's Own Role in Indigenization and Reconciliation. And then we have our last week. It's coming so quickly. Man. Next slide, please. So we're going to do some housekeeping right now. I'm going to pass it along to Gabrielle and she's going to get this ball rolling.

GABRIELLE LAMONTAGNE:

Yeah. Thanks, Tanya. So last week we had our pet happenings where people could share their pets. I forgot to show this one off. This is Mia. I'm going to throw her off my lap now though because she's getting her hair all over me. Yeah. We made a little slide show with all of the photos people were able to send through email. But what I didn't know is that when people send things through the chat, the photos don't actually save. If you want to be in the final slideshow link that we'll send out next week, either send me a picture with their names and a little sentence about your pet. I'll put my email in here again. Or you can post to the chat and I'll save it this time. And then we'll send that out next week. Some medicine bags. So I've actually mailed out everyone's medicine bags now, so they should be there within a week. I think that there were a few people from the US too, but I think seven days will be enough to get there. So these actually have everything that you need in it. It has your two pieces of fabric here for your bag. It has the sinew and needle in the string. And we actually get these from a company called Halford. These are tanned deer skin. So we get them from this company that I'll put in the link here as well. Why we get from them is that they source most of their materials from Indigenous hunters in the Treaty 6 region. And they actually pay their hunters in cash when they come in, which is really important and they focus on traditional hunting, traditional tanning, and traditional hiding techniques. I'm really happy to be purchasing from them. And we're hoping if people want, it's totally optional, but on our last day, we usually have a few minutes for people to share their medicine bags if they want. One thing that I learned from last year is that if you're not good at beading or sewing, people actually got fabric markers and that seemed to really work as well.

So we've been getting a lot of questions around use and sharing of the video recordings and slides we've been posting on our website. So just as a general blanket statement, the videos and slides that we post, they actually are open to your use and for sharing. However, can we go to the next slide, please? Our website and generally what we create through the Pulling Together series is under something called Creative Commons, Non-Attribution Licenses. So this is actually what Michelle has put underneath on those beautiful graphics that she recorded. And then this is actually what we have posted on our BCcampus website. If we can go to the next slide, please. So what this means, so you are able to share, copy, and use the material. You're able to have some adaptations, but you must give appropriate credit. So that can mean a few things. That can mean citation, that can mean directly contacting the person. And you have to be really wary about indicating where any changes were made because we don't want to be misrepresenting what people have said, especially when it comes to knowledge or stories. And then you also can't make any money off of what we've created. So, for example, you can't put Kenthen's story within a book that will be sold eventually. But then we kind of have this little

subsection here, where I'm thinking Indigenous protocol can fit around. Under Exceptions would be under the moral rights. So there are some, still, some limitations that aren't actually necessarily spelled out within this term. So can we go to the next slide, please?

So these are just my thoughts. We don't have a standardized one for BCcampus, but I think it's important to think about Indigenous protocol when using or sharing some of the items that we've created, for example, Kenthen or Josh's stories. So it's always good to reach out to the original creator. Sometimes if you have the means, it could be good to ask them maybe to come in and tell the story again in person and have the opportunity to provide an honorarium or give them some sort of thanks. It's good to have prior conversations and boundaries. So I spoke with both Kenthen and Josh and let them know that this will be recorded and let them know that we will be posting it and we'll be transcribing it. If they would've told me, no, I'm not comfortable with that, then we would have just had a session with them and not shared the recording, but allowed them to share the story with you. Reciprocity and thanks for knowledge. So BCcampus does provide honorariums. We also send instructors a gift, So we'd like to send them Sister Sage items, which is an Indigenous-owned company, as well as a few other things. And then we send them a hand-written card from. This is actually artwork by Michelle Stone. She's an Indigenous artist as well. So giving them that extra physical thanks for what they've shared with us. Citation attributions. So I'll actually share this link, but there is a guide for citing Indigenous Knowledge and Elders Keepers. It was created here at NorQuest Library. There's actually a few of them, but this guide is more for academic uses. So if you need to cite an Elder for a paper, like how do you cite an Elder? Why do you cite an Elder or should you cite an Elder? So there's some links in here, but then giving attribution like maybe for doing, just to talk, it's good to name people by first and last name, what region they're from, what their nationality is, sorry, what nation they're from, and what their role is. So giving proper attribution and you'll see that if you look through our graphic recording, they give correct attribution to each person who's a part of the conversation. Correct language and context. So this is why it takes us quite a while to post our videos. Our wonderful It team is actually transcribing these Indigenous languages. Ideally, we'd like to reach out to Josh and Kenthen to have them transcribe, but they have their own life and they're in high demand. So it's just not possible sometimes. This is just an example that I have, that I have from my Land acknowledgment. So I have three different languages here. I have Cree syllabics, Amiskwaciwâskahikan, which is the Cree-English translation, and then English. Sometimes you just have to look at is there a dictionary or person you can ask. So just making sure that you're using the correct languages. And then next slide.

So these aren't necessarily have to do with copyright, but they're under that use and access to Indigenous knowledges and languages. I just wanted to put on people's radar. So there's something kind of new called traditional ecological labels or TK labels So I think that these were originally created in Australia for the Maui tribe and they are actually mostly used for archivists. So these are stickers that would go on the outside of an archivist file box. And they let the archivist know who's actually allowed to access this. So for example it might say TK families. So

that means only the family from the specific nation is able to access it. And sometimes they can get very specific, like you can only access at this time of year for this type of gender. So these are really neat and I'm seeing them being used more and more in North America as well. Then there's also something called OCAP, which I know a lot of different institutions are now doing their OCAP training. But OCAP stands for ownership, control, access, and possession of First Nations data. So you'll remember that Tanya spoke about lots of researchers coming into her community and taking all this knowledge and then taking all this data and just leaving and they don't know what's being used with it or anything. So this gives people more control and access to what's being created by them about them. And you can actually go through as a cohort online. I'll share some of those links. But back to the beginning. So people are allowed to use and access the videos, but just keep in mind some of that Indigenous protocol. I'll pass it to Tanya.

TANYA:

Thank you. Alright, so this week we're going to be talking about some difficult content here. So at this point, I want to take some time to let you all know that there's going to be some triggering content coming up. Because we're on video, that's really nice. You can take a break if you need to take your video off. If you need to take a drink, anything like that. Whatever you need to do for yourself, please take care of yourself and know that this recording, it's being recorded so you can go back and take breaks if you need to. So I'm going to read it off officially. "This week we'll encounter challenging subjects including violence against Indigenous peoples. Please take care of yourself as a part of this presentation." Next slide, please.

Alright, so let's move it onto our special guest. So this is Angie Tucker. She is a fellow PhD student. We're actually in the same cohort and she's motoring along. Angie, I'm going to leave it to you to introduce yourself. Actually, you might do a better job than me. Go for it.

ANGIE TUCKER:

Oh my gosh. Thank you so much, Tanya. It's so, I'm so happy to be here. I was lucky enough to be able to be here once before and I was asked back so that means that regardless of the content that we're covering today, it was considered to be very valuable. But I'll just take a quick brief overview of the work that I've done in the past. And also I'd tell you a little bit about myself. Again, my name is Angie Tucker. I am a citizen of both Manitoba Métis Federation and the Métis Nation of Alberta. I'm originally from Treaty 1 territory, and my family comes from the area of Poplar Point, and they're literally from everywhere. But where my family ended up settling was close to Portage La Prairie in Manitoba. And just outside of that at Poplar Point. My family's, oh gosh. Spences and Norquays and Helots and Murrays and Parenteaus. And the list just goes on. And everybody, of course, married each other. So I'm related to all my other little mothers. Beyond that, who are also members of the Métis community as well. Tanya and I love to tell the story that when I told my dad, who was in my cohort, he was like, Oh yeah, Tanya. You didn't say Tanya herself but he was like, Oh, yeah, I know all of her family members, we actually party together. So I always think that's really cool. And we were connected in that way

just through story, which I think is super important and part of both of our research. But also, I just want to tell you a little bit about my background just so that you can see where I'm coming from as we covered today's information on, I'm sorry, on race and ethnicity. And both of my bachelor's degree and my master's degree are in cultural anthropology. And also very close to biological anthropology as well. Because I was always really interested in how race was constructed and then socially materialized in society. But today, of course, I'm in the Faculty of Native Studies at University of Alberta with a large group of amazing scholars that are fantastic. And they're working on everything from chronic wasting disease to Indigenous feminist politics. And it's such a liberating place to be because there's nothing beyond the... there's nothing that seems wild or like beyond the realm of a regular conversation. It's totally normal to be like, Oh, but how does the deer feel about the changing migratory patterns and it's like, yeah, right. You know, and what evidence is there that our stories with women had sexual relations with the cosmos and everyone's like yeah. So it's really such an amazing place to be that's very open to Indigenous knowledge and learning so much in a really contemporary way. But my earlier work really focused on the importance of identity and reconnecting to our communities. I feel as though so many Indigenous people through so many different actions out of their own control, such as 60s Scoop, residential schooling, and even just basically the agency of families to make decisions earlier on to bring their children closer into urban centres or, there's so many different, marriage and different job opportunities in education and everything else. It's sometimes a little bit difficult to have those connections with the community still, but it's so important to our identities and also our relationships to the Land and the fundamental differences between the rhetoric found in policy in Indigenous knowledge is also something that I generally critique. So basically at the end of the day what I'm critiquing is settler-Indigenous relations, power, deviance from these power structures that exist in society. How people have been created as being criminal, how they're represented. Things like identity politics and how this even portrays, doesn't portray, but eventually leads to really terrible things happening to Indigenous people, such as the disproportionate number of murdered and missing Indigenous women, for example. But right now, I think that these things are also important in today's conversations because basically what happened in the past still materializes today. And the presentation that I'm going to be providing with you today or presenting to you today, sorry, is that is very much from a racial science and an anthropological history to show that racial science in many ways— was not even in many ways— in actual ways, was science. That was believed to be science and was believed to be true and not changing and absolutely demonstratable. And this is where the topics of race and ethnicity today really stem from. And it's horrible, it's terrible. And we know that this is not true today and we'll talk about that later. But otherwise, the work that I do right now is just keeping families. I'm working a lot with the Child and Family Services and the Métis Nation of Alberta trying to create new guidelines and frames for Métis Child Family Services here in the province. And I think that today we have to work towards looking again beyond that traditional idea of who an Indigenous person is. And that's why I loved the video that Tonya shared today. Because it really shows like, hey, maybe this is not the Indigenous person you are expecting. And why is that? So anyhow, with no further ado, I could go on and on talking about all of the things that

I've been currently doing. But as it pertains to this today, I think that as educators we really have to be insurgent and challenge the boundaries of research and of ethnography, and also for what we're presenting in class. So it's a good idea to think about these sorts of things as we approach our curriculum and as we approach our teaching, particularly when we have students of all different backgrounds and so many diverse areas.

So basically for the past 500 years, so much has been said to relate to race. This is also intelligence, sexual behaviour, birth rates, work ethic, lifespan, law-abidingness, aggression, parenting, and even brain size. So scientists looked at all of these things. We've really been made to believe that races are structured in some sort of hierarchical order where some races are assumed to be better than others. Even if you're not racist, your life is still affected by this ordered structure. And some people benefit from the structure more than others do. But racial structure is 100% not a reality at all. It's just a complete fabrication. It's a lie. It's something that people have been taught to believe. Biological scientists state that there is no biological reality to race. You could ask anyone who studies biology and they will tell you 100% this is true. We're actually 99.9% alike. Of course, we have visual and visible differences and that's obvious and that's very clear. But that's not what denotes race. That's just a different and phenotypic variation or phenotypic variation. But there's actually more variation within our groups than between them. And there are absolutely no behaviours that directly correlate with what might be considered human racial characteristics, cultural, maybe, I don't know, I'm really suspicious to even say that as well, but racial, not a chance. Alright, next slide. Awesome.

So what is race? Well, race is again a social construction. This is something that was designed, created, pulled out as science and then people believed it to be true. And race classification is based on perceived physical differences. Racial stratification puts races into a social hierarchy and a physical difference ideology maintains this group in society.

Next slide. And so what this says, this is Anais Nin. And what they're saying is "We don't see things as they are, we see things as we are. And this explains the ideas of cultural imperialism or ethnocentrism. And more broadly in our conversation today, we're going to be discussing a specific kind of ethnocentrism, which is Eurocentrism. Eurocentrism, sorry, specifically and how this has been really the basis for how mainstream Canadian society has been taught to think about race. Ethnocentrism is the practice of viewing the world in a very, from a very European perspective and generally within, a Western perspective. Within and with it, it has an implied belief that this way of knowing is dominant over others and even perhaps superior to other ways of knowing. So there's emphasis in Western knowledge systems on reason and on science and on rational thought. And these all stem from the Enlightenment era. But even though these, sorry, these categories are not static, they don't stay the same, right? They're always changing. So there's always change over time. So ethnocentrism, I'm so sorry. Ethnocentrism isn't just bound to one culture or another. It's difficult to erase years of this cultural training to adopt ways of seeing the world. Yet we're expected to fall into these norms, right? This is like the hegemonic, it's called the hegemony. So it's this hegemonic way that the world is. And

we're supposed to fit within the boxes of these things, particularly in settler contexts like in Canada. Alright, next slide. Perfect, Thank you.

Okay, so a little bit of history just to give you a bit of a background about this. So during the Age of Exploration, during the 15th and 17th century, European ships start travelling around the world. They're looking for new trading routes. They want to find new partners. Basically, they're looking for other people to trade with and other resources to attain in order to feed the capitalistic aims of Europe at the time. So Europe is becoming super highly populated. There's tons of diseases going around like the Black Death, the Plague, this sort of thing. And as explorers began discovering other places, they begin to interact with the people, of course, that they're starting to meet in these new locations. And they're starting to think, Oh, these people are a little different than us. They've got different cultures than we have. This prompted an interest in the Other. Why are they so unique? Why are they, why do they look different? Why are they doing things so differently than we do? So this prompted this interest in also studying and writing about people. And it was difficult for many to deconstruct these physical differences. And people were really judged based on these differences using this bias that Europeans had about their own ways of seeing the world. So up until about the 17th century, many of the theories surrounding humans were Biblically based. God created all things as they were. There was no changing that there was no evidence of evolution. But the European Age of Enlightenment of the 17th and 18th centuries really marked the rise of scientific and rational philosophical thought, which I mentioned just a couple of slides ago, was, was Enlightenment. So the Age of Enlightenment. And this was within the 17th and 18th century. Enlightenment thinkers such as David Hume and John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau, for example, they wrote a number of works on the nature of humankind. So they base their work on this philosophical reason and also rejected religious authority, basically. They asked important anthropological questions. Rousseau, for instance, wrote on the moral qualities of so-called primitive societies and about human inequality. But most writers of the Enlightenment also lacked first-hand experience with non-Western cultures. So this is why in anthropology we always call armchair anthropology. But this does not just stay in anthropology. There's also armchair sociologists. There's armchair psychologists and everything. But with the rise of imperialism, which is imperialism would be described... I guess the definition would be political and economic control over foreign lands. In the 18th and 19th centuries, Europeans came into contact with even more people around the world. And this sparked a new interest in culture. But their observations were highly comparative. They were super assumptive. And early Europeans believed that some people were actually less civilized. And this resulted in these rhetoric of oh, we need to save them. Oh my gosh. They're so far behind and we're so progressive, and we need to bring them up to speed in the modern world. It was awful because what they're trying to do was civilize people and the people that they're encountering, of course, don't need civilization. They have perfectly operating civilizations that are already working. They have laws and structures and languages and everything is just fine. They don't really need help. But this increasing dominance resulted in colonial rule. Economic exploitation and industrialization in many differences or in many distinct places, in different places around

the world. So I would like you to remember the importance of science, right? So this is just a history, but keep science in the back of your mind, like this is scientific for the time.

Alright, Next slide. Okay, So this is Linnaeus. This guy is still in the biology curriculum. If anybody's familiar, they probably know his name already. But he creates our species homo sapiens, or clever humans. But at the same time as creating homo monstrous or monstrous humans who look different than the average person due to their cultural modifications or disability. So of course, they're using what their neighbours look like in Europe as the foundation. And even that is hierarchical as well, but anyone outside of that is different. So he basically wrote disparaging things about different people in the 1758 edition of Systema Naturae. Homo Europaeus was written to be a fair complexion, sanguine temperament and becoming. They have gentle manners, they're acute in judgment. They're governed by fixed laws. And on the other hand, people who were at the polar opposite of that, who would look 100% different than the Europeans would, would be like black people. So, on the other hand, homo afer, as Linnaeus called people, for example, which is not a term at all that we would use today, was deemed to be of black complexion, phlegmatic temperament, crafty, indolent. And many of the characters that were used by Linnaeus to classify races were subjective and completely unscientific. So, for example, hopeful Europeans looking for the next greatest thing. Sad and rigid Asiatics. Easily angered American Natives and calm and lazy Africans. And we still learn about this guy in school. This is what horrifies me. People are always like, Oh, let's talk about Linnaeus, but yeah, no, I think if you talk about Linnaeus, we have talked about what Linnaeus actually was also spreading at the time. Next slide.

So not everyone, of course, agreed with this. Some people were like, I don't know, that sounds really awful. This is Johann Blumenbach and his dissertation on the unity of mankind is recognized for its scientific approach to human variation. His detailed study of skull morphology, and his cultural awareness led them to support a single species of all humans. Thank goodness. There's no division. It's all the same species, as well as the basic equality of all races and peoples. Blumenbach strongly opposed European cultural superiority, thought it was not a good thing at all. And his support and defence all races was to be equal in capability and intelligence. And that was super progressive at the time. This wasn't, like he would have been a real outlier for the time. And people would have argued with them over this theory. However, he concluded that the many varieties of man, as are at present known to be one and the same species. So this is a good thing. Next slide.

Okay, so this is Charles Darwin. So everybody knows about Darwin as well. And his conclusions regarding the survival of species and descent through modification were kind of skewed to give scientific validation to racial theorists' claims. So what this means is when his work came out on The Origin of Species, racial scientists grabbed onto it and were like, Aha, this is proof and I can prove that what we were thinking is right, based on Darwin's theories. So basically his theory was that modification was not a symbol of progression, but rather a response to the environment. But it was misapplied to feed the binary of perfection and of degradation. The

idea of degradation had been widely considered for centuries in the great chain of being and also in classifications. And the twisted conclusion that there was survival of the fittest, which is what everybody kind of grabbed onto, wasn't actually even coined by Charles Darwin, for the record, it was somebody who was working underneath him, who was Herbert Spencer. But utilizing Darwinian theories and applying it to the concept that the strong survived and that the weaker don't. It just provides evidence to justify the execution of scientific racist theory. Next slide.

Alright, so racial theorists continued to be influenced during the 19th century by the desire to categorize homo sapiens into specific groups. This was largely accomplished by analyzing skin colour, but also by exhibiting malformations and class. So many researchers concluded that people who exhibited Nordic physical traits were most superior, while others who did not fit their proposed ideal phenotypic prototype or classified then as inferior. And this is Arthur de Gobineau, for example. He believed that there were some groups of people who had just simply evolved faster than others. This is a degenerative theory that initially chose skin colour as a distinguishing feature to determine the hierarchy of races. He also equated social, political, and economical problems with inferior groups. And these beliefs, as we know, were already very deeply rooted in Europe. Next slide.

So there are these early assumptions that I think we've talked about now just to give you an idea of what this looks like. This is only maybe like 100, 100 years ago, so this is not that long ago. But the assumptions are number one: races are objective, naturally occurring divisions of humanity. Two: there is a strong relationship between biological races and the other human phenomena, such as activities, interpersonal relations, and culture. And by extension, the relative material success of people, therefore, creating a biological notion of race. Race is a valid scientific category that can be used to explain and predict individual group behaviour. And also that to survive. Evolution is natural, it's progressive. This happens. Basically, our domination of other cultures proves that I'm superior over them. And then forcing a culture to then reorganize to look more like yours to help the culture fulfill a natural potential that was being wasted. So this was a really big idea at that time. Next slide.

So Edward Tylor agreed that culture is learned and acquired. So we start to see some people moving along from this idea and thinking there's got to be something more than race here. But he didn't think that this was a biological trait. This was something that was learned and acquired. This was revolutionary against the backdrop of colonialism, racism, social evolution, and also every other dominant ideology at the time, frankly. But his definition is also one of the first anthropological definitions of culture. It removes itself from race, right? So now it's not just race. Now you see culture is coming into the category as well. He does not believe in biological differences, he just believes in cultural stages. This opens the conversation into the idea of ethnicity. Race and ethnicity are woven together. However, they're not always synonymous with each other. So race is the phenotypic variation and the phenotype-based thought. While ethnicity is a group of people who have a shared cultural origin. Race, however, can be a

marker of ethnicity used by a group to define themselves. But it's really complex though, because over time, certain ethnicities were considered races. So e.g. white Europeans were also deemed to be specific races, like Polish or Ukrainian or Jewish. And over time, of course, these ideas have changed. But there are notions that people can be more easily assimilated with ethnicity. The definition of ethnicity is therefore really unstable. And particularly in spaces where people are expected to assimilate into a majority culture. In Canada, of course, this is what we've come to know as the settler culture. Next slide. Thank you.

Okay, so early Europeans had a very mixed view of Canadian Indigenous peoples. So on one hand, they were told that Indigenous groups were really gentle, super receptive. They were helpful and eager to trade. Canada was designed, was thought, I guess to be like the Garden of Eden with so much opportunity. And it was filled with natural and gentleman-like, childlike partners living in the territory. However, as time would pass, people back in Europe began to learn about the warfare and death of Indigenous peoples and their movement from the lands. And they began to really sympathize. Because obviously they know that this is not good what's happening. So in order to combat this, an opposing rhetoric was starting to become invented. And you see this around the same time as Canada is entering into Confederation. But all of a sudden, terms like flesh-eating primitives, Savage, hostile, and beast-like, crafty, loathsome men. This is an opposing rhetoric that was literally invented to make it sound like Indigenous peoples needed to be feared and needed to be controlled. Even early art depicts Indigenous people pillaging villages, molesting women and children, and murdering settlers. But at the time it was believed that is if Indigenous peoples didn't just become extinct, that this was biological fact, and that it was easier to believe that Indigenous peoples were savage, so that the act of colonialization and the removal of Indigenous peoples from their traditional land would seem less cruel. Indigenous peoples needed help because they were savage and uncivilized. And Europeans believed that they would be better off if they just simply adopted European culture and just simply assimilated into society. So what I'm saying is that Indigenous peoples were made irrelevant in older Canadian literature. And we're not afforded modern identities. But rather they were portrayed as non-progressive bodies who remain as past people. Colonization continues to use these racial stereotypes to promote othering behaviour. Next slide.

This is basically scientific racism that we've been talking about. It's defined as the scientific pseudoscience techniques that supports the belief of racism, racial inferiority, and racial superiority. It's the practice of dividing people into distinct races based on phenotype. Next slide.

So eugenicists believe that they can control society by then manipulating its genetic composition. Just like cross-pollinating plants to make an ideal strain that's impervious to freezing or disease, as in plants. But eugenicists were of the opinion that they could also create a supreme intelligent race by restricting members who are deemed racially impure, unintelligent, or defectively feeble-minded. Eugenics obviously is a clear pseudoscience. But it

came into favour in the early 1900s by Darwin's cousin, actually, Sir Francis Galton. If there's anything about what, who is, telling you about social or racial science and talking about race and culture are always, always white, affluent men. Next slide.

So Galton attempted to change race from a taxonomic concept to a biological one. So, e.g., he used anthropometrics to measure the shape and size of skulls and then related those results to group differences and other behaviours, other attributes, of course. Initially his greatest support was in the US. Britain, and Canada also jumped on full 100% on board with this. But it did become more powerful when it entered into the United States in about 1907. Galton believed that the human race could improve by actually selective breeding human beings. He introduced the theory of eugenics, which later became the scientific basis for the security of the Germanic race. He believes that the inherited traits of an individual could be perfected for the benefit of society. And so this is when things start getting pretty scary around this time. But I'd also like to point out that a lot of people tend to equate this sort of eugenics or purity or Arianism specifically on Germany as it is pertained to leading up to the Second World War and of course, the Holocaust. This is something that actually was not born at all in Nazi Germany. It was actually bred from these racial scientists, and it was first adopted in the United States. Next slide.

So a prominent amateur anthropologist and supporter of eugenics named Madison Grant emerged in the US. He became the director of the American Eugenics Society. And he fiercely believed that the strength of the United States was being threatened by increased immigration and extreme levels of poverty. And whenever I think about some of the anti-immigration sentiment in the US, I am always reminded of this past. Next slide.

So he was insistent that those deemed degenerate needed to stop reproducing because they were transferring their negative traits of feeble mindedness, criminal behaviour, sexual deviance, poverty, and genetic defects onto other generations. His theory of the importance of supreme Nordic blood, where blond hair and blue eyes were most effective and stronger, radiated in his work, the passing of the great race. And he further pointed out that the United States and Europe were facing a decline due to the loss of pure Nordic or Aryan in blood. And in Canada, eugenics also occurred in 1928 with the same thoughts as what Madison Grant was saying. They were looking at this thinking, Well, this sounds perfectly reasonable, which doesn't at all, but people were jumping onto this. In 1928, the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, Canada enacted this Sexual Sterilization Act. This Act drafted to somehow protect the gene pool allowed for sterilization of disabled people in order to prevent the transmission of undesirable traits to offspring. And at that time, eugenicists also argued that mental illness, learning disabilities, epilepsy, criminal behaviours, and social defects such as prostitution and sexual perversion, were genetically determined and inherited. Further, it was widely believed that persons with these disorders had a higher reproduction rate than the normal population. And as a result, it was feared the gene pool in the general population was weakening. And during the time the Alberta Sexual Sterilization Act was in effect, 4,800 cases were proposed for

sterilization in the province of Alberta. Keep in mind that this is 1928. Alberta doesn't even become a province till 1905. And so they're quickly in there saying, okay, let's clean up this place and try to make this a little different. And 99% of those cases actually received approval, so they actually were sterilized. The act was disproportionately applied to those socially vulnerable positions, including Roman and Greek Catholics, Ukrainians, and of course, Indigenous peoples, including Métis.

Next slide. Alright, so then we also have human exhibits happening at this time. Europeans and Americans thought it was perfectly fine to display people from other continents at various fairs and human exhibitions. Indeed, thousands and thousands of exotic people would end up being literally kidnapped and taken and put on display as in human zoos. People didn't travel a lot then, so they were a lot of research and a lot of people who are trying to show these differences would literally go to other countries and pick people out of their countries and bring them to the United States or into Europe, and then put them on display so that others could look at them. There were sometimes called ethnological expositions. This sounds very nouveau. But they also were called "negro villages." So the name that they received at some point was a lot. But basically these 19th and 20th century public exhibitions of humans, usually in a natural or primitive state were set up by very ethnocentric European presenters like people like Madison Grant. The usual point of the display was to illustrate the cultural and racial differences between Europeans of Western civilizations and non-European peoples. They were not usually intended as merely entertaining freak shows, but they were sold as actual scientific demonstrations of racial difference. The usual approach was that white people were much more evolved than others and when simply had to compare to see the difference. The further... to further the acts of othering. Ota Benga, who was a Congolese Pygmy, was figured and featured as an anthropological exhibit at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis, Missouri in 1904. And in a human zoo exhibit then again in 1906 at the Bronx Zoo. And amateur anthropologist Madison Grant again, who happened to also be the head of the New York Zoological Society at the time, had him put on display at the Bronx Zoo alongside apes and other animals. And at the insistence of Madison Grant, the zoo director had Oda Benga displayed in a cage with the chimpanzees, then later with an orangutan. The man was labelled the missing link. Thousands and thousands and thousands of affluent people viewed and taunted the spectacle. Saartjie Bartman was paraded naked prior to Ota Benga in the 19th century, she was a Khoikhoi woman, also called the Hottentot Venus. She was considered unique due to her large buttocks, which is steatopygia. This is a medical condition that she had, but she was sold as a freak show exhibit. Her body was the foundation for scientific racism. Many compared her buttocks to that of European women and then use her buttocks as a salient feature in casting her as savage. So early scientists also compared her breasts and labia to European women. So she was often displayed naked. It's horrifying, absolutely horrifying. As you can see, things are so ugly. And if you go by the dates like this is the early 1900s. So not that long ago. Next slide. So obviously people don't agree with this. There are some people that are like, Whoa, hold up, this is horrific. No, this is, no. This is Franz Boas, and he's the father of American cultural anthropology. He's Jewish. And he was not interested in theories that explain

everything or what he would call metatheories. He thinks that this is an absolute waste of time. You can't just say like all this just doesn't work like that. So he was one of the most prominent opponents of scientific racism in the United States. As a sidebar, Madison Grant was involved in many opposing debates over the discipline of anthropology and eugenics against the Jewish born cultural anthropologist Franz Boas, with whom he would not shake hands with, on account of him being Jewish. So Madison Grant wouldn't even shake Franz Boas's hand. Both men had heated public debates and both put names into run for the presidency of the American Anthropological Association. Thank goodness, Boas won. I can't even imagine how racial and cultural studies would have changed, had Grant won. Next slide.

So what Boas did is he spent a large amount of time working with immigration officials on Ellis Island in 1910. He was supposed to assist the country in curbing racial inferiority by taking various measurements of people's skulls. So what he found instead was that craniofacial morphology, or the dimension of one's skulls, had no bearing on one's potential intelligence. He also discovered that American-born children of immigrants had different morphologies than their parents. And he concluded that the variation seen in craniofacial morphology actually had more to do with the environment and diets than it actually did with race. So he rejected eugenics and the notion that race determines one's intelligence. And further concluded that there was no merit at all to racial categories in any way. So Boas really worked to demonstrate that differences in human behaviour are not primarily determined by innate biological dispositions, but are largely the result of cultural differences acquired through social learning. In this way, Boas really introduced culture as the primary concept for describing differences in behaviour between human groups. And saw this as the centre of analytical concept of anthropology. So he saw no biological differences, only emic perspective, so only perspectives of people themselves. And he noted that there was always a cultural explanation for race and human behaviour and that it absolutely did not have to be reduced to stereotypes. Next slide.

So after the First World War, Germany had a concept of this imagined community that would expand throughout Europe to be powerful and strong. So this is like 19, late 1930s. And he aimed to separate from the Jews, were also blamed for a lot of the loss of the First World War. So Hitler had an obsession with a notion of race and space, something that he called Lebensraum because the new Aryan nation would need space to expand. And Grant's work was published in the German language in 1925 about, what's that, 18 years after it was written. And this was further enlightening to Nazi society and Nazi ideology. This publication spoke directly to Adolf Hitler's concept of a strong national identity. One that clearly did not include Jews or anyone else who were deemed inferior at the time. But the grossest part of it all is that Adolf Hitler wrote Madison Grant thanking him for his reliable data. Like he saw this as reliable data. He stated that Grant's book was his Bible on numerous occasions in his writings. Madison Grant studied cranial capacity and the Cephalic Index, just as many others were doing as genetic markers to determine the fitness of the subject. Nazi Germany would adopt these practices to teach academics in universities and also in medical staff in hospitals and in asylums. So you can see that this has been far reaching and this is not the only time that this has happened. I think I

just brought up this because it's probably the most well-known of these sorts of things that have happened around the globe. So that's it. Next slide.

So we probably won't have a lot of time to go to the questions. But I just want you to think and to take away going forward is, how has this history really shaped how we see the Other today. And where do we see evidence of the legacies of scientific racism today as well? What does this history mean to us moving forward? So that's it. Thank you so much. Thank you all for staying with me. I know it was very difficult to cover, but I so appreciate your time. Mercie .

TANYA:

Alright. Thank you so much, Angie, for coming in and talking about all of this. I know it's hard, but it's sometimes those hard conversations that just need to be had. So thank you. If everyone can say their thank you's in the chat. And if you want to insert emojis, do whatever you want, just to say thank you to Angie. Amazing. Angie, you are welcome to stay here if you'd like. Otherwise, you're welcome to go. Thank you again so much for all of your help today. To the next slide.

Alright, so we started talking about this last week and we're going to jump right back into it. Who is allowed to tell Indigenous stories next?

So we've talked about this already. Anyone is allowed to tell an Indigenous story as long as they follow Indigenous cultural protocol and ethical care. Earlier on... Yes. Thank you, Gabrielle, if you have any questions for Angie, you can email her at, email Gabrielle and we can talk to connect everyone together. Thanks, Gabrielle. Everyone's allowed to tell Indigenous stories as long as we follow Indigenous protocol. And Gabriel, actually, she did a really good job talking to us a little bit about that at the beginning of the class. So let's go to the next slide.

Last time we, I would only show a little bit of this video because it just drives me bananas. But this is from Annie Get Your Gun. Again. This was a, it was originally supposed to be a Judy Garland movie, but they ended up replacing her with Betty Hutton. Either way, you can find the full video on YouTube, but I'll just give you the gist. It's basically Betty Hutton dancing with a bunch of quote unquote Indigenous or quote Indigenous peoples, end quote. There's not really anything involved with that other than completely based on myths. Things that don't even necessarily make sense culturally and honestly, the biggest thing for me is Betty Hutton's treatment of the Indigenous peoples in that she is treating them as objects and not as human beings. Next slide, please.

So this is all about cultural appropriation because this happens a lot, and honestly I get questions about this all the time. What is cultural appropriation? What can I do? What can I do? What can't I do? And still be culturally appropriate and sensitive to other cultures that aren't necessarily your own. So cultural appropriation, again, this is when somebody adapts and aspect of a culture that is not their own. So what's really important in this definition is that it's

representative of a power dynamic. The person that's doing the taking is typically from a dominant culture. A culture in power taking from another culture that is systemically oppressed and honestly systematically, but also like oppressed generally. It's not just the systems that are oppressing the under-represented groups here, right? So cultural appropriation is representative of a power dynamic where there is a dominant culture pulling aspects from another culture that is systematically oppressed. Next slide.

Alright, so this all gets convoluted because there are things like cultural exchange and there are things like assimilation that get entered into the pot to make things a little bit more confusing, right? So what about cultural exchange? Absolutely 100% cultural exchange happens as Angie was saying earlier, our families are actually from neighbouring communities, right? So our families know each other. She's from Poplar Point and our families from St. Ambroise. So there's honestly a lot of cultural exchange even between Métis groups. So Métis groups, even between Manitoba and Alberta, I've had lots of cultural exchange there too. And what this is, is there's no power dynamic there. It's where two cultures, or honestly even within the same culture, can share mutually within each other. So for example, if one Indigenous group like the Cree wanted to share with the Blackfoot, which I mean they're in very neighbouring territories, then that would be considered cultural exchange instead, right? Now then there's assimilation, which is pretty much all encompassing of Angie's presentation. Like that's a huge theme in her presentation is that assimilation happens when the marginalized group or the, I'm going to say the underrepresented group, adopts the elements of the dominant culture. Sorry. There you go. So assimilation is when the marginalized or underrepresented group adapts culture, adapts elements of the dominant culture in order to survive, right? So there are no options here. You don't have an option to exchange. That's not even, that's not even a point to pull out. Basically, these groups, they don't have the power to decide what customs to follow and assimilation, I mean, within Canada, there's tons of different examples of that. The biggest one is Indian residential schools. We all know and have heard stories about that. The primary goal of residential schools is to assimilate and to get rid of the quote, "the Indian in the child." So assimilation happens when we adopt ourselves in order to survive. So, for example, within my own culture, I grew up actually speaking Michif, and I grew up with a thicker accent than I have now. But assimilation is, it's happened because of code-switching. Code-switching is, we jump back and forth in between cultures a lot. So the reason we have code-switching is because of these policies and these assimilation policies. Next slide, please.

Cultural protocols. This is the difference between putting yourself forward and doing things in a good way, let's say. Cultural protocols, Maggie, Margaret Kovach. She has a quote here and she says "a means to ensure that activities play out in a manner that reflects the community teachings and are done in a good way." So I have actually pasted the Elder Protocol and Guidelines. There should be a link there. So once you get the slides, these are the protocol guidelines for the University of Alberta. And really it talks about how to give protocol, how to accept protocol. What types of protocol are appropriate for Elders within this territory. Here we typically give tobacco, sometimes we'll give prayer for example, and an honorarium.

Honorariums vary depending on what institution you're from. At the U of A here we do \$300. And that is \$300 for either 1 hour of lecturing or the entire day. So you can definitely check those out. But just remember that each protocol is going to be different according to the community that you're from. So I know that we're all over. We're expanding it from across Turtle Island here, everyone. So the best thing to do is to connect with your local communities. If you are coming from an institution and have no connections. The best way to do that is to go to the Indigenous peoples services and then go from there and make relationships there. Next slide, please.

There we go. So here's some protocol examples. Again, I always want to emphasize, always consult the community because there's no single rule that fits all of us. So some protocol examples have to do with storytelling. So some stories are only allowed to be told in the wintertime. And the reason for that is because winter is where storytelling season is, right? So storytelling season is always in the winter because that tends to be the time where we're all brought inside and we're all cuddling up around the fire because it's effing cold out. So that's usually when a lot of visiting and storytelling happens. Does storytelling happen in the summer? Yes, it can. It really depends. However, be careful because there are some stories like Wesakechak stories and even Wesakechak the name can't be told unless there's snow on the ground. Right here where I'm at, there is lots of snow here, so I'm allowed to say Wesakechak, but things get confused. Not confusing, but complicated and complex when I'm trying to teach it in the summer months, right? But that just means for me as an instructor, I get to be creative, right? So another example of respecting protocol is within our podcast. When we do storytelling and we have traditional stories being told, what we do is we add noises that are really representative of the wintertime, like the crunching of the snow underneath footprints. So we'll simulate the winter so that we are transforming the space into a winter space. That's just one example. There's lots of different things that people, other people have done. Another example of protocol could be even going into the berry bush. You know, there's a lot of rules when you are picking berries. Wild berries, especially, and a lot of those have to do with ensuring that there are bushes for everyone. And that's not just us as humans, it's also the bears. I've heard so many stories about berry picking and the black bears just waiting on the edges, waiting for their turn. Everyone's happier near the berry bush, right? So you don't want to over pick. That's another protocol, right? So we have these rules and I like to think of them as cultural red tape. There are red tape rules. Yes, I can get you a link to the podcast. I think it's bookwomenpodcast.ca There we go. So protocol is really, really important. Next slide, please.

This is where we get into representation and reclamation. So we're in a really cool time right now. And honestly, Indigenous peoples have been reclaiming and asserting themselves since 1492. So this is nothing new. However, I think this video is really cool because it talks about cultural appropriation from a satiric side. It's a satire. It's something just to make fun of the whole thing. So this is a group that is the 1491s. What they've done is they've taken that Annie Get Your Gun song that's called "I'm an Indian too." And they've transformed it into something completely different so that it is a critique now on cultural appropriation. So 1491s is an all

Indigenous group. So this is going to blow your mind. But this gentleman here in this image, he's actually, I think he's an Anishnaabe man. Everyone here is Indigenous. So it's all Indigenous perspective, Indigenous made, so let's take a listen. I love this song. So we're going to listen to the whole thing just for fun.

[🎵 "[I'M AN INDIAN TOO](#)" BY THE 1941s PLAYS 🎵]

TANYA:

Alright, that's your first introduction to the 1491s, this comedy group is great. They have tons of different sketches. And honestly, I love using this video to teach to it because it lightens the mood up, especially with all the heavier topics that we were talking about today. Just music. It's good to change that mindset, so love it. Check them out. What I want you to consider though, is be careful, be careful. So cultural appropriation is really important. And there's a lot of minefields in order to jump through everything and jump through the hoops. So I really like this quote that was actually from the book and it says, "this may be harder work than simply adding an Indigenous text, speaker, or activity into a course, but it's the responsibility of all educators to engage in this work." So this is a really nice reminder for us to stay humble and to do the work that is necessary. It's not something that we can do just by looking through Wikipedia. It's something that's going to take relationship development that could take a long, long time. Which is okay. Can I get the next slide, please?

There we go. So incorporating local land knowledge and language. Next slide. So when you are wanting to do this kind of stuff, when you are incorporating this stuff into your curriculums, the only thing I can really tell you is to be cautious and to know your stuff. So knowledge is very empowering in these types of scenarios. So read your Indigenous authors, read, listen to your podcasts. Do all of the things that you feel like you need to do to be comfortable with this stuff. Be cautious. Know your stuff because, next slide, please.

Things can go wrong and things can go wrong. So cultural representations are a really interesting thing, I put the evolution in quotation marks. I just get weird about that word because we're not evolving. It's just the pattern that we see. So really as Angie was talking about, there is a linear timeline here that we're working with, which doesn't even work within Indigenous worldviews. But let's think linearly for a minute. So if we're thinking that way at the beginning, we were getting cultural representations in film and media and everywhere else from a different perspective. So from that colonial lens, right? So first representations of Indigenous peoples are from the colonial lens. And not the first, I'm excluding time immemorial stuff here. Starting from colonization, right? And then we shifted and you'll see a lot of, Indigenous authors shift into speaking for themselves. However, in that shift, it's really important that to note that a lot of times this colonization has been internalized, right? So while it is from an Indigenous perspective, technically, a lot of times, some of us have internalized those colonial ways of knowing and colonial Western mindset. So oftentimes you'll see Indigenous representations that replicate the colonial lens. So that is also something that

happens. More recently, I'm not going to say it's a renaissance or anything, but at least for me, I've seen a lot more publications from Indigenous people, by Indigenous people, published from Indigenous perspectives. Everything, all Indigenous owned so that you can tell a really big difference, right? But just knowing, knowing this is important because it shows that we, as Indigenous peoples, we make mistakes too. Because a lot of this is really subtle and ingrained into our mindset. Next slide, please.

Alright, so things can go wrong. So these are some controversial people, just to name a few. And I do want to point these people out because you might be coming into, like you might interact with them at one point or time, right? This is where I'm saying it's important to know your stuff because Joseph Boyden is a very famous, famous, famous writer. Lots and tons and tons of awards. But within the Indigenous perspective, he's seen as a controversial character. In fact, all of these people that are listed here are seen as controversial characters, but really well-known within Indigenous studies, within Indigenous literatures. All of these types of things. I'm not going to go through every single example here. But what I will talk about is, since I'm talking about Joseph Boyden, let's talk about him. So the reason why he's considered cultural or controversial is because of the treatment of stories that he's had. The way that Indigenous... yes, Taiaiake Alfred too, that one's a big name actually for those in B.C. So this is actually a big stand that... I'm going to talk about him. I just keep getting distracted by everyone's chat. So Joseph Boyden and the reason why he's seen as controversial is because of an Indigenous world, if you are considered a part of the community. If the community claims you back. If the community hasn't claimed you, then you are not considered a part of that community, right. So Joseph Boyden is not claimed by any community that I know of. And in fact, he actually stole stories from a community and used them in his classes, in his writing. In fact, it was a student, an Indigenous student learning from Joseph Boyden's work and realizing, Oh man, This sounds really familiar. And then it just exploded that controversy. And that was, I think it's about five years ago now. But he's still seen as a really controversial person.

Taiaiake Alfred, he's one of the granddaddies, I would say, of Indigenous studies. But he's also seen as a controversial character because of his treatment towards women. And that is a couple of people on this. So, of course, this is based on your own opinions. But for me, I refuse to read his work because of that. Because I am an Indigenous woman who has experienced violence. So things like that are really important for you to know because we're developing a discipline right now. So we have a lot of responsibility and pressure on our shoulders. And we don't want to uplift people who are, I guess, harming a significant portion of community, which is Indigenous women, right? So that's a really important aspect to think about. And of course it's going to be up to you whether you want to include these people or not, but it's important to know the conversation behind them.

Now, Shannon Web-Campbell, briefly, I want to talk about her because she's really important. She released a book of poetry and it was called *Who Our Stolen Sisters* or *Who Stole My Sister* or something along those lines. And it was a poetry collection about the missing and murdered

Indigenous women and girls. Now, the reason why this book is seen as controversial is because she didn't ask permission from the families to use the name or to use the stories of these missing women and the missing girls, right. So that was really controversial. So the families fought back and fought the publishing industry, a publishing company about this. And the publishing company actually removed all of those books from all of the shelves. So it no longer, you can't access it, of course, right now anymore because it's been removed. But these are things just to expose you to some of these conversations and controversies that are happening. Because I know in Indigenous studies, a lot of times there's this misconception that we're all very much like loving and peaceful and spiritual and stuff like that, which is not always the case. There's a lot of times we don't get along either, right? These are some of these examples, right? So this will be important to you when you're working with Elders, because sometimes Elders don't want to work with each other and that's normal because we're still humans, right? Next slide, please.

Okay, so these are some tips to avoid some cultural appropriation. Number one is involve your local Indigenous community. Build connections with Indigenous communities and Indigenous peoples. Even just making one friendship at a time, just thinking about it as making new friends. Integrate Indigenous pedagogical approaches. Explain cultural and spiritual significance, and follow the proper protocols and values. So cultural significance is like, I'm explaining the word neechie to you and skoden. So those are really important terms that have evolved and changed and are now words to resist or to resist and resurge all of our cultural information. Next slide, please.

So this is going to give you an introduction on how to spot terrible resources. A lot of times though this is going to happen to end up on you and your own spidy senses, right? And your own tingling senses. So number one, I suggest you to check for illustrations. This is really important if you're working with children's books, because oftentimes there's stereotypes, tokenisms. Check to see who the active doers are. I always like to tell my students to look at the main character. What is the main character doing? Are they Indigenous, are they non-Indigenous? What do they look like? Do they follow that typical look that Angie was talking about earlier today? Check for the storyline. Look for standards of success. Who's successful in this story? Is it women, is it men, is it both? Is it non-binary folks? Look at the lifestyles. Oftentimes in literature, we are told that the nuclear family is the one right? Think of Berenstain Bears, right? That's the father, the child, and the two children. So an Indigenous families, we work very differently. So for us, a grandma is a grandma to all, and an aunty is an aunty to all and sometimes your aunts aren't blood-related to you and that's okay. Our families are seen as very expansive, so we have the nuclear family and, I think it's called the expanded family, or the extended family. We are very involved with our extended family. I often laugh and say that my mom and my dad are also my co-parents because they're so involved with my children. And the reason why they're involved with my children is because I want my kids to know our stories. And to carry that on in the generation. So that's really

important. So note the heroes as well. See how the relationships are depicted. Again, like I said, families for us are a lot different. Next slide, please.

Consider the self-image. What are these characters inspiring to be? What are they aspiring to do? A lot of times we see books nowadays that have a project or a trajectory of an Indigenous person goes from savagery to now they're a professor at a university, you know, that's a weird storyline and that's a weird way of defining success through prestige. We don't often define success the same ways. Check the author's perspective. So 1980s, 1980s around, that's when ethics first came around into academia. So you can imagine a lot of things that are before 1980s. You're going to see some really unethical stuff. Look at the copyright date. Again, 1980s. Think about that anytime earlier, it's going to be questionable. So you want to use your spider senses and then consider historical and cultural perspectives. So one example would be the Red River Rebellion, right? We've learned it as a rebellion in elementary school, but for us it's a resistance. So it's really knowing these nuances and it's hard to know, and it's something that your spider sense is, yes. It's hard to know this stuff until you've actually immersed yourself into the culture and started reading Twitter feeds by Indigenous peoples, those types of things. And it takes years and years to develop this stuff. So start, just start out, try your best. That's all I can suggest. So I'm going to stop actually right here because I know we're running out of time. I know we have a couple of slides left, but I want to save those until next time. So the following slides is more how to choose items for your collection or for your presentation or whatever it is that you're using. So, the LinkedIn work. Okay. Paula's got the link right there for us. So I'm going to stop here and let you all get on with your day. We will pick up where we left off. Next week we're going to read developing awareness of one's own role and in Indigenization and reconciliation. So a lot of this stuff really fits into this week. So I'm going to let you all go and I will see you all next week. Have a great day. Thanks everyone.
