

WHAT WE DO, WHAT WE ARE: RESPONSIBLE, ETHICAL, AND INDIGENOUS-CENTERED LITERARY CRITICISMS OF INDIGENOUS LITERATURES

INTRODUCTION TO THE SPECIAL ISSUE ON NATIVE LITERATURES

Niigonwedom James Sinclair, Co-Editor

University of British Columbia
niigon@interchange.ubc.ca

Renate Eigenbrod, Co-Editor

University of Manitoba
eigenbro@cc.umanitoba.ca

In 1985 *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies (CJNS)* published its first “Special Issue on Native Literature” (#5.2), compiled and edited by the late Lorelei Cederstrom and overseen by then-Head Editor, the late Samuel W. Corrigan (whom this issue honors). Now, nearly twenty-five years later, you hold in your hands *CJNS*’s second edition. Needless to say, we are extremely pleased and honored to be asked to compile and work on such an important volume. For reasons we discuss in a moment, this collection addresses and examines the important intersections between theory-making, responsibility, and ethics when it comes to the study of Indigenous literatures as well as proposes critical lenses that inhabit this space. Considering such a large historical and ideological distance between these two special issues of *CJNS*, however, we thought it an important moment to reflect upon the field of Native literature and literary criticism as it was, and as it is, represented in these two issues.

For this volume we chose the theme of “Responsible, Ethical, and Indigenous-Centered Literary Criticisms of Indigenous Literatures” under the somewhat naïve assumption that this would be an altogether new ideological move for *CJNS*. The 1985 edition (at first glance) seemed to reflect an altogether different intellectual time—and dissimilar interests—in the study of Native writing and writers, and only handfuls of articles on literary productions had been published since. As the journal undergoes its current overhaul (with a new Head Editor, Art Editor, and Editorial Board), it is our hope to take this opportunity to draw the focus

of *CJNS* more specifically to Indigenous literatures and literary productions as primary and critical sites of Native Studies.

Why? Simply look around. Oral and written stories, songs, speeches, and other literary acts constitute a large part of the fabric of Native cultures. In Native Studies departments in the United States and increasingly in Canada, countless novelists, poets, and literary critics occupy professorships, departmental chairs, and visiting lecturer positions. Simon Ortiz, Maria Campbell, Drew Hayden Taylor, Thomas King, and Richard Van Camp headline Indigenous academic events. Jeannette Armstrong, Lee Maracle, and Tomson Highway have obtained honorary doctorate degrees from major Canadian universities while Emma Larocque and Basil Johnston have received National Aboriginal Achievement Awards. University of Illinois professor Robert Warrior—a literary critic—is currently President of the newly-formed Native American and Indigenous Studies Association. In the Indigenous/Native Studies section of any university or mainstream bookstore, the majority of texts are literary in scope. Simply put, it is our position that it is virtually impossible nowadays to work in Native Studies without some knowledge of literature and literary criticism.

During the past twenty-five years, the field of Indigenous literatures, as in Native Studies, has moved a great deal. What we expected to find in the 1985 special issue of *CJNS* was somewhat dated scholarship, distantly related to current veins of criticism. After all, during the mid-1980s most English departments were still firmly ensconced in classical and established notions of literary merit and modernist aesthetics (although postmodernity was also taking hold). Many Native Studies departments in Canada were just in the process of being formed (emerging in or from a burgeoning Cultural Studies movement). Although there were many excellent Indigenous writers and activists publishing widely, few Canadian scholars took notice and worked on theorizing these literatures, and indeed none had published a widely-known study. What we found while reading through the 1985 issue though, were the crucial, initial seeds—both necessary and needed—for the 2009 version to materialize.

Before we could make a case in 2009 (and indeed, convince *CJNS* to devote an entire issue around the notion) that Indigenous theories of Indigenous Literatures are a rich and worthy field of study, the literatures themselves had to be fought for. In Cederstrom's very first words in her 1985 introduction, she writes:

It is with mixed feelings that I introduce this special edition....
I am saddened by the fact that Native literature remains only
a peripheral area of Native Studies. Over the last few years,

courses and scholarly interest in the field have increased several hundredfold all over North America. Yet, in comparison to the growth of studies in other ethnic areas, or even in comparison to the development of other Native Studies programs, the growth is minimal. I believe that the special attention of an important journal like this will strengthen the support for Native Literature and develop an appreciation for the contributions which Native Literature can make to several academic disciplines. (145)

Cederstrom continues: “Native Literature consists of Native authors articulating their cultural values in their own idioms, [so therefore] Native authors deserve to be heard whenever issues of culture are raised” (145). It’s not that long ago, we should remember, that literary productions—and particularly novels, short stories, and poems in English—were questionable as “authentic” expressions of Indigenous peoples and cultures. To academic culture brokers of the day, particularly in Native Studies (but also arguably in anthropology, archaeology, history, and literary studies), this was likely a radical argument. In some circles, it probably still is.

In this vein, the 1985 *CJNS* special issue attempted two tasks. The first was to define the field of Native literature and to argue for its academic relevance. The most significant choice was to choose works that focused specifically on Native authors, and privileged (rather than widely accepted non-Native gazes at Indians).¹ The second focus of the edition was to devise a respectful, meaningful critical language through which to discuss the ways Native writers were articulating their own critical realities and experiences, and using creative means to do so.² As Cederstrom explains, critics “need to focus upon Native culture as Natives themselves perceive that culture and to develop a vocabulary with which to assess the contributions of Native authors” (145). Considering some of the forces these moves were up against, these were lofty goals. Still, the collection is evidence of a tremendously provocative and interesting intellectual moment in the field of Native literatures.

The essays are authored by eight American and Canadian scholars, all non-Native. They reflect for the most part introductory forays into Indigenous literatures, but also stimulating examples of the ways critics engage Indigenous literatures politically and draw conclusions that directly challenge and/or rely upon the existing academic status quo.³ In all cases though, scholars sincerely engage Indigenous expressions to the best of their critical abilities. And, in every essay, an attempt is made to situate Native storytellers and artists as creators and thinkers, not tragic, victimized, lost souls. In most of the essays, though, and per-

haps due to some inherent and long-standing problems in their approaches, it is quite evident that particular values and ideologies of these non-Native critics are privileged and the interests of the non-Native reader is central.⁴ Most notably absent are extensive and meaningful critical dialogues with those intellectuals who actually were devising a critical “vocabulary” in studying Native literatures at the time (Paula Gunn Allen, Maria Campbell, Emma LaRocque, Lee Maracle, Basil Johnston, to mention just a few). This is not to say that these essays are not without great merit, just that the precise “vocabulary with which to assess the contributions of Native authors” Cederstom hoped for is lacking.

At the same time, however, there *are* Indigenous critical theories available in the issue. Embedded throughout the essays are four poems, written by Native (likely Oji-Cree) students enrolled in the Garden Hill Band school at Island Lake, Manitoba.⁵ Only introduced by their names—Felix Beardy, Sharon Little, Billy Monias, and Zack Flett (with no further biographical information)—these emerging voices are critical vessels. Their important ideas are diverse and complex, astute and political, sharp and resilient. Although young, these contributions are the roots to our 2009 issue, with rich theories and possibilities worth considering.

Within each poem from the 1985 issue are striking images and rhetoric, as in Sharon Little’s “The Winter.” As she writes,

Soft snow glowing in the sun
Still the winter runs
Every quarter of the year
And I have no fear
From the strong blizzards
There stands the wizard
Who keeps me warm all along
In my home where I belong. (192)

Many questions could be asked, all of which could lead to theories embedded in the work. What is the relation between snow and “wizardry?” How does the rhyming, cadence, and rhythm affect the piece and the reader? Who/what might be the narrator and how does the wizard relate to his/her home? How do the cycles in/of the seasons relate to times of threat and safety? What role, if any, do the history and experiences found at Garden Hill First Nation have in the work? And, where are Little’s subjectivities in all of this?

How might one understand the ideas in these poems if they were juxtaposed? The fact that all of the works come from young people in the same community, perhaps written at the same time and under similar circumstances, is too tempting to ignore. Let’s line up parts of Felix Beardy’s poem, “The Snake,” to see if anything emerges:

You may have seen him – did you not
The color of the moon glowing in the dark
A world of wonderful colors, yet isn't safe,
There on the branch of a tree was a snake,
Glowing the eyes of evil unto me,

After seeing “this same snake” on a visit to the zoo, the narrator concludes,

I heard a strange voice saying “death” it was
my imagination.
I thought the snake had said it.
I never went to the zoo.
I forgot about everything. (150)

Both works are about living in beautiful, but ultimately unsafe, worlds. Both are about overcoming mental trickery and “death,” albeit in different ways. Both are additionally about engagements with forces outside humanity—nature and animals—which seem to be up to no good (in relation to the narrators, anyway). The potential relationship of both pieces to Christianity is arguable in image and theme (and particularly when the long historical context of the church and education at Garden Hill First Nation is considered). There are also intriguing differences, like the sanctity of “home” in Little’s poem and the ambiguity of loss in Beardy’s work. Little’s rhyming adds a touch of oral tradition while Beardy’s narrative prose is sharp and sudden.

In the final two poems, by Billy Monias and Zack Flett, direct references to history, and specifically Native-centered events in history, are found. Monias’ poem “High Steel” describes the August 29, 1907 death of “36”⁶ Mohawks from Kahnawake “...trapped under the steel” when the Québec Bridge they were working on collapsed (240). Flett’s “The Beaver” is an homage to the loss of the animal (likely due to the exploitative fur trade), but also a reference to the disappearance of Native peoples at the same time. As he writes,

The beaver are gone.
And those who saw the beaver are gone.
Those who saw the beaver by hundreds
and how they live with the water
their great head down
Those who saw the beaver are gone
And the beaver are gone. (240)

Though sprinkled in tragedy, both poems are interesting moves tying acts of writing with history in order to make powerful political and social condemnations on the loss of Native lives. Both works also show how strong the influence of western industrialization and aesthetics has been

on Native communities (see how Flett's poem rings of Carl Sandberg's "Buffalo Dusk" – found in Tasha Hubbard's essay in this volume). They are frank, political statements on Native representation and presence in North American history.

It's somewhat disappointing that more attention is not paid to these poems in the 1985 issue because, in all of them, individual or collective theories could be forged about nature, technology, rural life, urban experience, animals, imagination, "reality," traditional spiritualities, Christianity, orality, "writing," and a host of other possibilities. This is not to say that some of the ideas therein might not be unsettling or worth critiquing – no artist or work doesn't deserve honest examination. Surely the fact that these writers are young, studying in an institution with a particular colonial history, and that three of them are boys has to enter into these considerations as well. But, if during the study of one or more of these pieces, certain Indigenous-specific subjectivities, histories, and politics are privileged, along with particularized contexts and aesthetics, a Native-centered theory would emerge. Probably several would. And, when disseminated, a small part of the rich cultural knowledge, experience, and history from Garden Hill First Nation, demonstrated by some of its citizens, would be available. We read this as strong evidence of a theory central to our current issue – that within Native literatures lie the experiences and theories of Indigenous peoples, as well as the precise infinite possibilities of Indigenous existence. Indeed, these are rich perspectives worth giving critical time and space to.

So, in many ways, this 2009 special issue of *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* is a fulfillment of the second part of that original 1985 version: developing an appropriate and critical "vocabulary with which to assess the contributions of Native authors." Today we are taking up similar struggles as these 1985 intellectuals took up. The seeds they planted are blooming now. And, although growing perhaps in different directions, we appreciate and acknowledge these offerings as a part of our intellectual history. Their work enables this special issue to be here today.

The pursuit of Indigenous-centered criticisms of Indigenous literatures takes place in a multitude of forums and arenas all across North America, and this special issue of *CJNS* is intended to join in this critical movement. Speaking on behalf of the twelve Native critics from the United States and Canada who contributed to the 2008 collaboratively-written text *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*, Creek critic Craig S. Womack declares, "We believe theory, in fact, can emerge from novels, poems, plays, and many other forms, including life itself. We even claim these as prominent emergence points,

important creation stories for theory...stories are the birthplace of theory” (“A Single Decade” 7). Armand Garnet Ruffo, using Womack’s essay as a springboard, also makes parallel points in this volume. We agree, and used similar means in selecting and editing these critical and creative pieces.

A critical ongoing discussion, and a reason why *CJNS* is such an important place for this work, is in the disciplinary context for the field of “Native lit” as an academic study. In other words: do Indigenous orature, novels, short stories, plays and poems belong in English or Native Studies? Much interesting debate exists over the fascinating possibilities in each discipline.⁷ In our discussions, Renate admitted that she, together with the majority of literary scholars in Canada, used to see Native literatures “naturally” housed in English departments. *It’s literature, isn’t it?* was the title of a collaborative panel presentation (shared with some of her Native students) at Lakehead University in 1994. Following the 2000 Congress at the University Alberta (when Samuel Corrigan offered to publish a book from the proceedings of the first roundtable on Native Literatures) and a turn in her own career, she now finds herself intrigued at the potential offered in examining literature in the Native Studies. As one reads the essays in this volume, the question of disciplinary context is interrogated time and time again.

On the other hand, this introduction and special issue of *CJNS* as a whole is not about Native Studies versus English. In fact, it is not about constructing boundaries and defending our academic “turfs” but about encouraging intellectually expansive and thought-provoking dialogue and debate regarding the contributions of Native authors. Thus, by its very nature, our work has interdisciplinary interests and ends. Considering this, our choice of Marvin Francis’ art work as cover image for this issue may in fact be interpreted symbolically as our declaration that studying Native literature *is* Native Studies. Marvin Francis himself cannot be described within any one category; he was a poet and an artist, a creator and a critic, as comfortable on the streets of downtown Winnipeg as in academia. His complex piece, aptly untitled, provokes precisely the kind of critical and creative engagements Native authors and artists take up in the ongoing struggle to experience and endure life as an Indigenous person, community member, and human being.

But the issue of what an appropriate and interdisciplinary critical lens is, and the parameters and possibilities in such an approach, is not an easy one to address. Some of the problematic history surrounding the appropriation of voices, denial of Indigenous subjectivities, and the exploitative politics surrounding the treatments of Native literatures by the academy has already been mentioned. Both Native and non-Native

writers, critics and allies have decried these actions, calling for critical lenses that are both Indigenous-centered and invested in ethics and responsibility to Native peoples. This movement reached an apex in Anishinaabe critic Kimberly Blaeser's seminal 1993 essay "Native Literature: Seeking a Critical Center," where she laments a history of reckless and misdirected approaches to Native literatures, describing the field as perpetuating a dangerous and damaging paradigm in which the "implied movement" is "that of colonization: authority emanating from the mainstream critical center to the marginalized Native texts" (56). Inspired by these words and this history, and often helped along by certain strands of post-colonial and feminist criticism, important questions around the ethics of reading and responsible use of Indigenous expressions and knowledges now exist.⁸ A few, among many, are: Who constitutes "the mainstream critical center" today, and how does one go about arguing "from" the Indigenous text in question instead of imposing "colonizing" theories on it? What defines theoretical marginalization of Native texts and, in turn, centering? What constitutes an "ethical" and "responsible" approach? What are some of the obstacles, paradigms, and possibilities available in theorizing Indigenous literatures through such lenses? These questions are a few we asked in our call for papers.

While answering some of these questions may be difficult, not to mention demanding much sensitivity and careful thought, the large response we received from scholars is a testament to the state of the field. The collection of essays and creative pieces in this volume speaks to a process that is ongoing; these works ask questions that provoke further thinking; they suggest but do not prescribe theoretical approaches, but they all have in common an appreciation for the tremendous richness and significance of Aboriginal literatures in Canada (and beyond). If in 1985, Native literature was "only a peripheral area of Native Studies," as Cederstrom pointed out (and, for that matter, even more so in English Studies), we had many to choose from (and therefore had to reject some good scholarly writing). Further, this issue shows that not only do we have a new generation of Aboriginal creative writers in Canada but also a new generation of scholars in this field; in fact, most of the contributors are from the younger generation. This in itself may explain the excitement of the co-editors for this edition – a great change from "the mixed feelings" and sadness expressed in Cederstrom's introduction in 1985 (145).

Besides the boundary of disciplines, there is another division even more discussed in the last twenty-five years: the question of a scholar's ancestry. As Kristina Fagan emphasizes at the end of her article in this

volume, non-Native scholars do come from a different experience than Native scholars; there is no denying of that. However, the co-editors decided (different from the decision made in a co-edited book also published in the fall of 2009)⁹ that this difference should not become exclusionary. A non-Native critic may perform responsible, ethical and Indigenous-centered criticism if he or she is able “to work through” (in the sense of LaCapra’s trauma theory) that difference as constituting not only cultural illiteracy but also complicity in the history of colonialism. That difference means that they are aware of assumptions around cultural productions that are embedded in colonial ideologies and Eurowestern epistemologies and are expected to work on their gaps of knowledge of Indigenous frameworks. As Fagan asserts, “[w]hile we cannot completely ‘know’ the experience of the other, it is surely part of our human gifts to seek to know and to try to understand.”

It’s also important to point out the inclusion of international scholars in this volume. While perhaps the inclusion of American scholars in the 1985 edition may have largely been due to the fact that Native American literature was academically recognized in the U.S. much earlier than Native literature in Canada (and they therefore complemented the small number of Canadian academics), for us the reason was to strengthen an only recently emerging dialogue among American, Canadian, and other international scholars from which all parties benefit.

It should also be added that the movement of “American Indian Literary Nationalism” (which several articles take up and engage in several ways in this volume) greatly inspired our impetus and initial visions of the issue. In fact, the title for this journal was inspired by one of the proponents of that movement, Cherokee scholar Daniel Heath Justice, who teaches at the University of Toronto. In his 2006 study *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*, he reminds us that the creation of criticism is a social endeavour with real-life implications, as he sees the role of the “literary scholar” in “the telling, preservation, interpretation, and creation of stories. Stories are what we *do*, as much as what we *are*” (206, original emphasis). Reflecting back on Womack’s earlier words, this means that as much as we are storytellers, we are producers and innovators of theories when we engage Native literatures. This makes the awareness of ethics and responsibility all that more important.

While many of us would like to have grand hopes that theory-making will “change the world,” we are not so arrogant to think it will do so on its own. But, as Justice, Womack, and the contributors to this volume point out, it is *a part* of that change. Theorizing about the universe, telling stories about it and the ways others view it, is engagement. It is listening,

perceiving, and creating things out of relationships forged from experience. Hopefully these are useful, respectful, and positive – and if they are not, we try again. Theories therefore are seeds that, with help and care, become trees – and then perhaps a forest, helping and participating in the sustenance of life.

The crucial move of *considering* ethics and responsibilities as a tenet of criticisms of Native literatures, collaboratively formulating them, and then embedding them in critical frameworks (as each essay you will find within does), is one part of this action. Intellectual seeds of ethics and responsibilities between peoples and communities are *the* aspects, in fact, most often missing from discussions and debates around Indigenous treaty rights, governance, and sovereignty, particularly as it relates to relationships with the governments of the United States and Canada. In fact it is also something crucial to remember between human beings and creation. The fact remains that we—Natives, Canadians, immigrants, and everyone all and in-between—have to find a way of co-existing peacefully, respectfully, and empathetically. Listening and letting Indigenous authors speak about their (and often their relations’) theories, ideas, and perspectives about the universe is one step in this process.

This collection is intended to tell some stories that demonstrate political and social ethics and responsibilities in criticism while remaining Indigenous-centered in interest. We hope you enjoy the work within it, build from it, and help along those scholars coming tomorrow.

Notes

1. This choice flew in the face of a well-established Canadian literary tradition and popular mainstream tastes (not to mention a long history of cultural appropriation and racism). As Cederstrom declares:
 The strength of this particular issue of *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* is that each of the articles contained herein discusses works by Native authors. A recent conference on “Native Literature” at a western Canadian university focussed on works by White Canadian authors writing about Natives. While the contributions by Rudy Wiebe, Robert Kroetsch, W.P. Kinsella and W.O. Mitchell are worth consideration for their interpretation of Native/White relations, their writings are *not* Native literature. (145, original emphasis)
 In this way, the 1985 issue was groundbreaking, against what had become the Canadian academic establishment.

2. Instead of critics focusing on how a non-Native author uses Natives as “a reflection of his own fears or his own cultural values,” Cederstrom explains that it is necessary to “assess Native culture in its own right. We desperately need to focus upon Native culture as Natives themselves perceive that culture and to develop a vocabulary with which to assess the contributions of Native authors” (145).
3. They include: two primary text surveys (Janette K. Murray’s “What is Native Literature” and Cederstrom’s “Developing a Curriculum for Native Literature”), a “judgement” of the historical accuracy found in two Native writers (Dennis Hoilman’s “The Ethnic Imagination: A Case History”), a study regarding the misuse and appropriation of Native stories by non-Natives (Jon Stott’s “Spirits in the Snowhouse: The Inuit Angakok (Shaman) in Children’s Literature”) and two ethnographical studies that use orality and comparative strategies to pinpoint Native cultural expressions (Rota Lister’s “The Importance of Native Oratory” and Georgina Louck’s “The Girl and the Bear Facts: a Cross-Cultural Comparison”). A somewhat unusual contribution to the collection is a first-person account by anthropologist Robin Ridington (entitled “The Old Wagon Road: Taking Field Notes from Ethnographic Work in a Northern Native Community”) of his experiences spent amongst the ‘Dunne-za’ (Danezaa, or ‘Beaver’ as called by Europeans) nation of British Columbia. The entire issue can be downloaded for free at the *CJNS* website at: www.brandonu.ca/Library/cjns/.
4. For instance, cultural binaries are relied upon, with non-Native cultures painted as inherently deficient and unworthy and Native expressions romanticized as eternally holistic and supernatural. The most engaging work can be found in those critics ambiguous in their conclusions, like Janette K. Murray, who ends her survey of the field by stating that Native writers of the day are now “achiev[ing] a mastery of non-Indian techniques and literary forms and, at the same time, maintain [their] Native voice and vision” (164).
5. According to Cederstrom, the poems were first collected by Ted Wilson, edited by John Blaikie, and published in a text entitled *Island Lake Anthology ’82* (149).
6. Most accounts of the disaster, albeit unofficial, count the Mohawk deaths at thirty-three. For more see William D. Middleton’s *The Bridge at Québec* (Bloomington: Indiana U P, 2001).
7. Emma LaRocque addresses the disciplinary question in her article “Teaching Aboriginal Literature: The discourse of margins and main-streams.” *Creating Community: A Roundtable on Canadian Aboriginal Literature*. Eds. Renate Eigenbrod and Jo-Ann Episkenew. Bran-

- don and Penticton: Bearpaw and Theytus, 2002.
8. Both of us have recent articles on these topics. For more, see Renate Eigenbrod's chapter "An Ethics of Reading" in *Travelling Knowledges: Positioning the Im/Migrant Reader of Aboriginal Literatures in Canada* (Winnipeg: U of Manitoba P, 2005) and Niigonwedom James Sinclair's essay "Trickster Reflections, Part I" in Linda M. Morra and Deanna Reder's edited collection *Troubling Tricksters: Revisioning Critical Conversations* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier U P, 2009).
 9. See: Paul DePasquale, Renate Eigenbrod and Emma LaRocque, eds. *Across Cultures/Across Borders: Canadian Aboriginal and Native American Literatures* (Peterborough: Broadview, 2009).

References

- Beardy, Felix
1985 "Snake." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 5.2: 150.
- Blaeser, Kimberly
1993 "Native Literature: Seeking A Critical Centre." *Looking At The Words of Our People: First Nations Analysis of Literature*. Ed. Jeannette Armstrong. Penticton: Theytus. 51-62.
- Cederstrom, Lorelei
1985 "Introduction to the Special Issue on Native Literature." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 5.2: 145-49.
- Flett, Zack
1985 "The Beaver." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 5.2: 240.
- Justice, Daniel Heath
2006 *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- LaCapra, Dominick
1998 *History and Memory after Auschwitz*. Ithaca and London: Cornell U P.
- Little, Sharon
1985 "The Winter." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 5.2: 192.
- Monias, Billy
1985 "High Steel." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 5.2: 240.

Murray, Janette K.

1985 "What is Native American Literature?" *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 5.2: 151-66.

Womack, Craig S.

2008 "A Single Decade: Book-length Native Literary Criticism between 1986 and 1997." *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*. Eds. Craig S. Womack, Daniel Heath Justice, and Christopher B. Teuton. Norman: U of Oklahoma P. 3-104.

Acknowledgements

The co-editors would like to thank the following individuals and entities for making this special issue happen. They are: Head Editor Lorraine Mayer, Art Editor Catherine Mattes and everyone else at *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, Kim Wilde and the University of Manitoba Native Studies Department, Lorena Fontaine and the University of Winnipeg Aboriginal Governance Program, Colleen Simard and *Urban NDN*, Linc Kesler and the University of British Columbia First Nations Studies Program, Sian Echard and the University of British Columbia Department of English, Kateri Akiwenzie-Damm and Kegedonce Press, Great Plains Publications (and particularly those at Enfield & Wizenty), KC Adams and everyone at The Urban Shaman Gallery, Scott Stephens, Louise Soga, Daniel Heath Justice, Margery Fee, Mary Chapman, Cindy Singer, Kimberly Blaeser, Richard Van Camp, Jeanette Warren, Don Borgfjord, Doris Young, Vanda Fleury, Murray Sinclair and Katherine Morrisseau-Sinclair.