

**Spiral Reading Strategies: Re/citing Māori and Aboriginal Stories
in Relation to the Nation**

Linda Michelle Rodenburg

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

At the University of Otago, Dunedin,
New Zealand.

February, 2011

ABSTRACT

Stories, as discourses, act on the world by creating systems of representation. Along with other discourses, they sanction and limit what can be conceived as reality. The stories of Thomas King and Patricia Grace are a good example of this dynamic because they both relate, and relate to, the (neo)colonial stories of ‘Canada’ and ‘New Zealand’ respectively. Using Grace and King’s works, this thesis traces the interrelationships among indigenous and colonial stories, the perspectives they advocate and the political/cultural locations they sanction. Drawing on both indigenous and postcolonial theories, I work with these stories to further expose Eurocentric conceptualizations of Aboriginal and Māori cultures.

Colonial and neocolonial stories place the ‘Aboriginal’ in Canada and ‘Māori’ in Aotearoa New Zealand from Eurocentric points of view. Both Canada and New Zealand are what Michel de Certeau calls ‘recited societies,’ discursive formations limiting the conceptualization of culture. I argued that these discursive formations share similar archives that give form to a utopian-progressive paradigm reflected in discourses of cartography, geography, neocolonial tourism, and multiculturalism and biculturalism. This thesis unpacks these key discourses of assimilation and integration that are central to the construction and reconstruction of the idea(l) of the colony and the Nation.

(Neo)colonial discourses that ‘recite’ Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand as colonies and as nations devalue indigenous peoples’ conceptualizations of their own cultures. In counterpoint to these discourses, King and Grace envision cultures as relational and in process. They each create new discursive systems through their texts. Critics must respond to these new systems and adopt spiral reading strategies in order to move beyond the limitations of colonial and neocolonial ways of thinking.

Spiral reading strategies embrace postcolonial and indigenous theories, and colonial and indigenous literatures in relation to one another. Read together, these discourses challenge colonial and neocolonial worldviews and activate a shifting and relational order as the basis for new ways of imagining the Nation. Grace and King promote cultural empowerment using what Rob Wilson calls ‘inside-out perspectives’ and writing from relational worldviews. They resist Eurocentric discourses of assimilation and integration in various ways and enact alternative models of culture. Drawing on selected colonial, postcolonial and indigenous discourses, including excerpts from the work of King and Grace, this thesis shows how spiral reading strategies put pressure on colonial and neocolonial conceptions of cultures as either static or progressive.

In this thesis I both explain and enact spiral reading strategies, bringing together colonial and neocolonial discourses, indigenous and postcolonial theories, in relation to one another and through the contrapuntal lens of King and Grace. This dissertation does not presume to cover the entire range of these discourses, but to explore a new approach to reading that opens up a relational-processual paradigm already located within these Aboriginal and Maori stories. Spiral reading strategies break down traditional dichotomies that oppose history and stories, theory and literature. These strategies take as a given that both theory and history are changing sets of stories, and that stories are both historical and theoretical.

Acknowledgements

It is impossible to properly thank the multitude of people who have saved me from myself as I worked through this thesis and, finally, enabled me to complete this project.

However, I need to thank the Commonwealth Scholarship Program of New Zealand, and the people at the University of Otago in the School of Language, Literature and Performing Arts. At different times I worked with Dr. Christine Prentice and Dr. Vijay Devadas.

Thanks to Dr. Charles Tustin. My utmost respect goes out to my exceptional – and patient – colleagues and friends at Lakehead University-Orillia campus and in Orillia. Thanks, most of all, to Dr. Daphne Bonar, my end-game coach and editor, and incredible friend.

My thesis is a culmination, to date, of my own lifelong learning process. For this reason, I want to acknowledge some of my key teachers over the past number of years: at College Ave., Joan DiNardo and Heather Walkom; at Lakehead University, Joan Dolphin, Dr. Kim Feddersen, Dr. Hope Fennell, Dr. Judith Leggatt, and Dr. Gillian Siddall; at the University of Guelph, my supervisor and friend, Dr. Ajay Heble and Dr. Tom King himself. I once received a card reading, “to teach is to touch lives forever.” How true.

I would never have had the confidence to finish without the love of my family and friends. First, and always, thanks Mom, Dad, Peter, Georgina, Brian, Jaclyn, and Oma. You were always ‘there’ for me, even when ‘there’ and ‘here’ were far apart. Karen and Jenn, no one quite extends family into friendship the way you have. Thank you.

In the ‘stock, thanks, Gazers. Thanks to Jenn, Sheila, Lee and the LULAS girls, who made three degrees in four years seem not only possible, but fun. Thanks also to Ben, Claire, Gord, Kate, Jenn, Elska, and Maija for all the good times in Guelph.

The University of Otago is *the* furthest university from Woodstock, Ontario and many people in Dunedin helped make it a second ‘home.’ Thanks to my colleagues who became fabulous friends: Eleanor, Fiona, Ian, Joan, Margaret, Mary, Richard, Sandra, and my Canadian compatriot Colleen. Particular thanks to Ann, Lizzie, Martina, and Robyn: I could never have made it without your critical eyes, listening ears, unique lunches, and patience for insanity. Thanks also to my Kiwi ‘family,’ including Andrew, the Andersons, Ants and Al, Christine and Josh, Donald, Emma, George, and the Kerrs. Thanks for putting out the welcome mat and leaving it there.

And thank you, Chris. You are incredible and I can’t imagine my life without you. And I certainly can’t imagine finishing this particular project.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my good friend Kim Johnson, who – through her battles with Cystic Fibrosis – has taught me that, no matter what challenges life throws one’s way, in order to really ‘Breathe Easy’ all one needs is a kind heart, a positive attitude, and a dream. Thanks, Kim, for being brave.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | page |
|--|------|
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Table of Contents | iv |
| | |
| Introduction – Spiral Reading Strategies: Reading Indigenous Cultures and the Nation | 1 |
| | |
| Chapter One – Re/creating Cultures: Beginning with Inside-out Perspectives and Spiral Reading Strategies | 57 |
| | |
| Chapter Two – (Re)Mapping Colonial Places: Opening up Spaces and ‘Novel’ Negotiations | 110 |
| | |
| Chapter Three – (Re)routing Progress: Assimilationist Discourses, Colonial Governmentality, and Spaces of Knowledge | 160 |
| | |
| Chapter Four – Performing the Pedagogical: Neocolonial Tourism and Discourses of Integration | 210 |
| | |
| Chapter Five – Integrating Cultures Within: Multiculturalism, Biculturalism, and the Possibilities of National Places | 264 |
| | |
| Conclusion – Spiral Reading Strategies: Reading Indigenous Cultures and the Nation | 311 |
| | |
| Works Cited | 327 |

INTRODUCTION

Spiral Reading Strategies:

Reading Indigenous Cultures and the Nation

We wish to look at things our way, from the inside out, not from the outside in.... [T]here are transformations happening which, guided by tikanga Māori, push the work beyond post-colonial or post-modern models to a new form that is an amalgam of centre and margin. This is the flowering. A new beginning. (Witi Ihimaera, D. S. Long, Irihapeti Ramsden, and Haare Williams in “Kaupapa,” *Te Ao Marama*, Vol 3).¹

First Nations literature, as a facet of cultural practise, contains symbolic significance and relevance that is an integral part of the deconstruction-construction of colonialism and the reconstruction of a new order of culturalism and relationship beyond colonial thought and practice. (Jeannette Armstrong in “Editor’s Note,” *Looking at the Words of our People*).

In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Michel de Certeau asserts that a “recited society” is “defined by stories . . . by citations of stories, and by the interminable recitation of stories” (186). Stories, as discourses, act on the world by creating systems of representation. Along with other discourses, they sanction and limit what can be conceived as reality. The stories of Thomas King and Patricia Grace are a good example of this dynamic because they both relate, and relate to, the neocolonial stories of ‘Canada’ and ‘New Zealand’ respectively. Using Grace and King’s works, this thesis traces the interrelationships among indigenous and colonial stories, the perspectives they advocate and the political/cultural locations they sanction. Drawing

¹ Tikanga Māori is the system of integral truths associated with Māori ways of life. From ‘tika,’ meaning ‘true.’ (Reed).

on both indigenous and postcolonial theories, I work with these stories to further expose Eurocentric conceptualizations of Aboriginal and Māori² cultures. Neocolonial discourses that ‘recite’ these locations as colonies and as nations devalue indigenous peoples’ conceptualizations of their own cultures. These discourses reflect and support pluralist systems that focus on integration, placing indigenous cultures in the past and indigenous peoples in the contemporary moment as often failing in attempts to assimilate into the progressive location of the nation. In counterpoint to these discourses, King and Grace envision cultures as relational and in process. Indeed, they participate in creating the ‘new order’ and ‘new form’ – the relational ‘amalgam of centre and margin’ – advocated by both Armstrong and Ihimaera, Long, Ramsden, and Williams (see epigraphs).³

If, as Armstrong states, literature is a ‘facet of social practice’, so too is literary criticism. Therefore, critics must respond to the call to move beyond both ‘colonial thought and practice’ and ‘postcolonial and postmodern models’ (see epigraphs). Spiral reading strategies embrace postcolonial and indigenous theories, and colonial and indigenous literatures in relation to one another. Read together, these discourses challenge colonial and neocolonial worldviews and activate a shifting and relational order as the basis for new ways of imagining the Nation.

² Māori is defined as “native New Zealander; ordinary; native; belonging to New Zealand; clear” (Reed 27). I acknowledge that Cook Island Māori also self-identify as Māori. Within this project this term refers to Māori in relation to the Aotearoa New Zealand context. This term is not meant to create a monolith. Rather, it should be recognized that Māori represents a differentiated amalgam of people who affiliate with various tribes in various ways. So, too, Aboriginal resists monolithic representation in this thesis. Please also note that I will identify each Māori word, in its first instance, with a definition from A. W. Reed’s *Concise Māori Dictionary*. I have chosen not to draw attention to these words with italics. This decision follows typical practice of critics in Aotearoa New Zealand, and gives Māori language equal status to English within critical discourse.

³ See epigraphs for this introduction.

Grace and King promote cultural empowerment using inside-out perspectives⁴ and writing from relational worldviews. They resist Eurocentric discourses of assimilation and integration in various ways and enact alternative models of culture. Drawing on selected colonial, postcolonial and indigenous discourses, including excerpts from the work of King and Grace, I will show how spiral reading strategies put pressure on colonial and neocolonial conceptions of cultures as either static or progressive.

In this thesis I both explain and enact spiral reading strategies, bringing together colonial and neocolonial discourses, indigenous and postcolonial theories, in relation to one another and through the contrapuntal lens of King and Grace. I do not presume to cover the entire range of these discourses, but to explore a new approach to reading that opens up a relational-processual paradigm already located within these Aboriginal and Maori stories. Spiral reading strategies break down traditional dichotomies that oppose history and stories, theory and literature. These strategies take as a given that both theory and history are changing sets of stories, and that stories are both historical and theoretical.

Thomas King and Patricia Grace

Thomas King was born in 1943 to a Cherokee father and a mother of Greek and German descent. He grew up in the United States, and completed his PhD in English and American Studies⁵ at the University of Utah after an earlier career as a

⁴ Many indigenous critics argue for inside-out perspectives. Here, I focus on the definitions articulated by Rob Wilson, below. For other interpretations of this term, see the work of Objibway writer and critic Armand Garnet Ruffo in articles such as “Inside Looking Out: Reading ‘Tracks’ from a Native Perspective” and Witi Ihimaera in “The Singing Word.”

⁵ King completed his dissertation, “Inventing the Indian: White Images, Native Oral Literature, and Contemporary Native Writers,” in 1986. He then coordinated the American Indian Studies program at the University of Utah.

photojournalist.⁶ King moved to Canada as an adult to work as a professor at the University of Lethbridge, and is now a dual citizen of Canada and the United States. He originally published short stories⁷ and poems—as well as critical articles—in various journals and anthologies, before writing his first published novel, *Medicine River* (1989)⁸, which was the runner-up for the Commonwealth Writers' Prize. He has since also published children's stories⁹, as well as two further novels: *Green Grass, Running Water* (1993), which was shortlisted for the Governor General's Award and won the Canadian Authors' Association Award for Fiction, and *Truth and Bright Water* (1999). He has also published fourth and fifth novels under a nom de plume, Hartley GoodWeather, called *DreadfulWater Shows Up* (2002) and *The Red Power Murders: A DreadfulWater Mystery* (2006).

King's contributions to the field of Aboriginal literature in Canada extend beyond fiction writing. He also has edited numerous anthologies, including a collection of critical articles entitled *The Native in Literature* (1987), *An Anthology of Short Fiction by Native Writers in Canada* (1988), and *All My Relations: An Anthology of Contemporary Canadian Native Fiction* (1990). He wrote and was part of the ensemble cast for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's radio show, *The Dead Dog Café Comedy Hour* from 1995 until 2000. In 2003, he gave the Massey Lecture Series, *The Truth About Stories: A Native Narrative*, now available in book

⁶ It is interesting to note here, given the comparative nature of my project, that King spent time in New Zealand while he was working in this field.

⁷ In addition to being collected in numerous anthologies, these stories are also represented in collections of King's works entitled *One Good Story, That One* (1993) and *A Short History of Indians in Canada* (2005). For the latter he was awarded the McNally Robinson Aboriginal Book of the Year award in 2006.

⁸ This novel became a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation movie in 1993.

⁹ *A Coyote Columbus Story*, illustrated by William Kent Monkman (1992), was nominated for the Governor General's Award. King also authored *Coyote Sings to the Moon* (1998) and *Coyote's New Suit* (2004), both illustrated by Johnny Wales, in addition to *A Coyote Solstice Tale* (2009), illustrated by Gary Clement.

form (2004).¹⁰ Currently, King is a professor in the School of English and Theatre Studies at the University of Guelph. He also ran as a candidate in the 2008 federal election for the New Democratic Party of Canada, but chose not to run again in 2011.¹¹

Any reading of Thomas King as Aboriginal and Canadian requires some unpacking. As Arnold Davidson, Priscilla Walton, and Jennifer Andrews point out, “[p]art-White and part-Native, King is neither simply one nor the other, and thus his perspective is both inside and outside of the borders under examination” (4). When Hartmut Lutz asks the author to self-identify in an interview, King, while acknowledging that he was not born in Canada and that the Cherokee are not a Canadian tribe, indicates: “I think of myself as a Native writer and a Canadian writer” (107). Davidson, Walton, and Andrews put further pressure on King’s self-identification, pointing out that “he can be read as a Canadian writer and as a Native writer, but he cannot be a Canadian Native writer because the Cherokees are not ‘native’ to Canada” (13). King himself responds to this concern directly: “I guess I’m supposed to say I believe in the line that exists between the US and Canada, but for me it’s an imaginary line. It’s a line from somebody else’s imagination” (qtd 13).¹²

In a more recent interview with Margery Fee and Sneja Gunew, King goes further:

I don’t know which is tougher, to be a Cherokee in Canadian Aboriginal society, or to be an American in Canadian society. . . . I’m outside in the garden someplace and I can’t find a door to get in for the most part.

¹⁰ King is the first scholar of Aboriginal descent accorded this honour.

¹¹ The decision to run for political office represents a shift in King’s focus. In an interview in 1999, for example, he states, “I’m not involved in any degree in the political community. [...] I have little patience for that kind of work. And so all of my work is with writers” (qtd in Snowden and Todorova).

¹² King makes this comment in an interview with Constance Rooke in *World Literature Written in English*.

People talk to me from the kitchen window. It just depends on whom I talk to. I mean, that's the odd thing – that my subject position, as it were, changes not through my own efforts but through the efforts and the ideas of others. You know, people put me in different places. (qtd in Snowden and Todorova)

Rather than placing King in a limited, or limiting, subject position, this thesis accepts the multiple ways King places himself and engages with cultural identifications in his stories. Because King's identity politics involve the transgression of multiple borders in relation to others, his embodiment of inside-out perspectives¹³ facilitates his imagination of Aboriginal identity in relation to the multiple borders constructed around both the Nation and indigeneity through discourse. He embodies, in multiple ways, the 'new order of culturalism and relationship' noted by Armstrong (see epigraph).

Patricia Grace links her ability to re-imagine Māori identity to her own embodiment of two ancestries and her ability to cross borders as a result. She states: "I have always been aware of a double heritage and of knowing which foot I was on all the time... So, in some ways I have been able to see myself as a communicator between two groups of people," Māori and Pākehā (qtd in Calleja 114-5).¹⁴ She questions borders around 'Māori' in particular, arguing "all Māori people today have other ethnicity as part of their make-up. They are Māori nevertheless" (qtd in Della Valle 134). When asked about her own Māori self-identification, Grace states: "I was never allowed to be anything else. My Māori family claimed me and endorsed me as Māori and my [Pākehā] mother supported that.

¹³ Rob Wilson discusses "inside-out perspectives" extensively in his introduction to *Asia/Pacific as Space of Cultural Production* (1-14). I will refer to Wilson's work later in this introduction.

¹⁴ Pākehā is defined as "foreign; foreigner (usually applied to white person)" (Reed 37). In common New Zealand usage, it refers to a New Zealander of European descent.

Other people who were not Māori—teachers, friends, neighbours, parishioners—saw me as Māori too” (qtd in Della Valle 134). Thus, Grace puts ‘Māori’ at the centre of her inside-out perspective, acknowledging the interrelationships between self-identification and identifications by others as part of her own development of subjectivity.

Born in 1937, Grace is of Ngāti Toa, Ngāti Raukawa, and Te Atiawa descent, and she is affiliated with Ngāti Porou through marriage. She describes herself as “of mixed parentage, [her] father being Māori and a mixture of other, and [her] mother being Pākehā of an Irish, and other, background” (“Influences” 65). In addition to her dual heritage, Grace negotiates various authorial positions; she indicates that she does not “object to” being labeled by others as a “Māori writer” or a “New Zealand writer” (Calleja 112). She embodies the ‘amalgam’ of centre and margin advocated by Ihimaera, Long, Ramsden, and Williams (see epigraph). Grace was initially a short story writer, and also writes children’s stories¹⁵ and works of non-fiction in addition to novels. Her collection of short stories, *Waiariki* (1975), was the first such collection by a Māori woman writer, and it won the PEN/Hubert Church Award for Best First Book of Fiction.¹⁶ She published her first novel, *Mutuwhenua: The Moon Sleeps*, in 1978, and followed this with four further novels: *Potiki* (1986, winner of the New Zealand Book Award), *Cousins* (1992), *Baby No-Eyes* (1998), and *Dogside Story* (2001, co-winner of the Kiriya Pacific Rim Book Prize). *Tu: A Novel* (2004) won the Deutz Medal for Fiction at the 2005 Montana Book Awards. In 2008 she

¹⁵ *The Kuia and the Spider/ Te Kuia me te Pungawerewere* (1981), *Watercress Tuna and the Children of Champion Street/ Te Tuna Watakirihī me Nga Tamariki o te Tiriti o Toa* (1984), *The geranium* (1993), and *Maraea and the Albatrosses* (2008).

¹⁶ Grace went on to publish five additional collections: *The Dream Sleepers* (1980), *Electric City and Other Stories* (1987), *Selected Stories* (1991), *The Sky People* (1994), and *Small Holes in the Silence* (2006). She has also published a biography – *Ned and Katina* (2009), which was recognized at the Massey University Nga Kupu Ora book awards.

also won the Neustadt International Prize for Literature.¹⁷

Both Grace and King are important authors with complex subject positions, and both have also been recognized by the countries in which they live: Grace accepted the Prime Minister's Award for Literary Achievement in 2006 and became a Distinguished Companion of the Order of New Zealand Merit in 2007, while King became a member of the Order of Canada in 2004. Both Grace and King have accepted not only these prestigious awards, but, as will be discussed throughout this project, a need to negotiate the interrelationships between Nation and indigeneity within their respective countries. In their works, Grace and King foreground their complex indigenous subject positions in their use of inside-out perspectives. In doing so, they locate indigenous cultures in relation to their national locations. They tell stories from evolving perspectives to relocate Aboriginal and Māori cultural subjectivity in relation to Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. By officially recognizing their contributions to national cultures, Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand acknowledge inside-out perspectives and position indigenous subjectivity in relation to the Nation.

According to Grace, connections to the location of Aotearoa New Zealand empower Māori people. She contends that when Māori have “ancestry that connects them to a particular place,” they have “*turangawaewae* [...which] literally means ‘a place where one puts one’s feet, a place to stand’” (Grace qtd in Della Valle 132, original emphasis). Included in her list of rights associated with this cultural location are those associated with the “right to speak” (132)¹⁸, a right which, in many ways,

¹⁷ Grace is the first writer from New Zealand and the first of Māori descent accorded this honour.

¹⁸ Grace also includes the right to live and be buried on one's ancestral lands.

Grace enacts through her writing as she explores connections between indigenous cultures and various national discourses and contexts. Grace contends that negotiating such interrelationships and asserting the right to speak are both integral to her role as a Māori writer. She states:

I must say that I agree with Witi Ihimaera's definition of who is a Māori writer: they are people with Māori genealogy who identify as Māori and people who are accepted as Māori. His definition is culturally correct because it is part of our culture to be inclusive and it's part of our culture to say who we are. (qtd in Calleja 112)¹⁹

Māori writing, according to Grace, involves drawing on inside-out perspectives to demonstrate inclusive worldviews and define Māori cultural identities.

King is more hesitant in outlining what is central to the role of an Aboriginal writer. He argues that, although there is “a collection of literary works by individual authors who are Native by ancestry,” it is too early to move beyond a definition more specific than this: “Native literature is literature produced by Natives” (*All My Relations* xi). Rather, he hopes “that if we wait long enough, the sheer bulk of this collection [of Native writing], when it reaches some critical mass, will present us with a matrix within which a variety of patterns can be discerned” (xi). In the meantime, King and others seek to open up this space for this ‘critical mass’ to emerge through encouraging further writing and the critical reading of Aboriginal literatures.

Texts, then, are locations where subjectivity can be negotiated. In his introduction to *Learning to Listen: Native Writers and Canadian Writing*, W.H. New

¹⁹ Ihimaera himself articulates these ideas in an interview with Juniper Ellis, in which he ties Māori cultural awareness to inside-out perspectives. He states, “I have to say that Maori ancestry itself will not make your work Maori. Understanding about Maori culture will” (176).

discusses textual space in this way, referring to his collection of essays and poems as a “speaking-place” (4-8). Texts, and critical readings of them, offer metaphorical spaces where locations of culture are negotiated on the terms of indigenous writers; these spaces thus comprise ‘speaking places,’ turangawaewae.

Emergent Matrices: Relational spaces, inside-out perspectives, locations in process

In the same way as he resists defining Aboriginal literatures, King resists defining precisely how they might be critiqued. He believes that critics like me often go through a process whereby “every time I come up with a theoretical framework, what happens is: I see this animal out there called Native literature. And I say ‘Ah, if I make this net that looks like this, I can capture it. And if I make a net that looks like this, anything that I capture will be Native literature’” (qtd in Snowden and Todorova). Here, King addresses one of the questions at the heart of my project: how do I engage critically with Aboriginal and Māori literatures on their own terms, rather than merely capturing the things I am looking for from my outside-in perspective?²⁰ How do I answer Chippewa critic Kim Blaeser’s call to look “within the Native [and, I add, Māori] literature[s] or tradition[s] to discover appropriate tools to form an appropriate language of critical discourse” (56)?

I engage critically by employing spiral reading strategies. Through examining both indigenous and postcolonial theories in relation to the novels of King and Grace, this dissertation opens up concepts of culture and community in relation to the Nation.

²⁰ This term inverts Wilson’s ‘inside-out perspectives’. I recognize my own position outside of indigenous cultures and my desire to learn more about them, while also acknowledging my power position within the Canadian and New Zealand contexts. I will discuss my own subjectivity in greater depth below.

These concepts operate within the always-emerging matrices for cultural engagement that are set up by King and Grace in different ways within their texts. Thus, the spiral reading strategies I advocate resist ‘the net’ King identifies; they attempt to retain relational-processual notions of cultures, rather than capture cultures and render them static and containable. Through focusing on two established authors within a given time period, I also attempt to tease out matrices from these particular texts rather than trying to myself denote a critical mass from which I, as a critic, define Aboriginal or Māori literatures or critical fields from my outside-in perspective.

Terms like ‘outside’ and ‘inside’ might, at first, seem to set up a dichotomy that is at odds with the postcolonial notions on hybridity discussed here. However, the relational construction of the terms used throughout this dissertation – ‘outside-in,’ and ‘inside-out’ rather than ‘inside’ or ‘outside’, for example – acknowledges not only the prior critical use of these terms by Ihimaera, Ruffo, Wilson, and others, but also the ways in which relations between cultures are imbedded within this particular terminology itself. King and Grace write books for a reading public including people like me and, thus, they invite me into their stories in various ways. From the ‘inside-out,’ they create worlds with which critics can engage from the ‘outside-in’, and this necessary act of engagement itself requires an interrelationship between writer and reader through which meaning is ultimately created. This meaning, within this dissertation, represents a hybrid negotiation of culture and results in complex relationships between readers, writers, and texts brought together through spiral reading strategies.

As King points out, “writers themselves are constantly in the process of

changing the critical ground that you stand on. . . . Some of the very best critics are the writers that we have” (qtd in Snowden and Todorova).²¹ I look to King and Grace as writers *and critics* working within complex paradigms to negotiate cultural subjectivity. Although I outline many of the differences in their stories throughout this project, I begin here with a commonality that I see as central to the shifting critical grounds they create for cultural negotiation through stories: the concept of Aboriginal and Māori cultures as both relational and in process.

Okanagan writer and critic Jeannette Armstrong claims that, from indigenous perspectives, “everything is part of something else. Everything is part of a continuum of things, a whole” (qtd in Acoose 32). This relational-processual paradigm is evident in both King’s and Grace’s work and reflects both the Māori concept of ‘whakapapa’ and the Aboriginal idea of ‘relations.’ Interrelationships, according to Grace, are the predominant theme of Māori writing, whether these comprise “the interrelations between family and family members” or cultural groups (qtd in Calleja 112). Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Ngāti Awa/Ngāti Porou) points out that “a number of Māori have identified *whakapapa* as the most fundamental aspect of the way in which [Māori] think about and come to know the world” (234). According to Smith, whakapapa can be defined as

A way of thinking, a way of learning, a way of storing knowledge, a way of debating knowledge. It is inscribed in virtually every aspect of our worldview. . . . It is through whakapapa that Māori people trace [them]selves and [their] access to the land, to a *marae*, and to a

²¹ King is speaking directly to Fee and Gunew in the interview here. However, his ‘you’ implies both me and critics generally, so I choose not to change it here.

turangawaewae. Whakapapa also positions [Māori] in historical relationships with other *iwi*, with [their] landscape, and within the universe.” (234-5, emphasis in original)²²

Thus, the dictionary translation of this term as “genealogical table” (Reed 73) must be extended to encompass Māori culture as process, product, and way of life.

King makes similar statements about indigenous worldviews in his introduction to *All My Relations: An Anthology of Contemporary Canadian Native Fiction*. Here, he states,

‘All My Relations’ is at first a reminder of who we are and of our relationship with both our family and our relatives. It also reminds us of the extended relationship we share with all human beings. But the relationships that Native people see go further, the web of kinship extending to the animals, to the birds, to the fish, to the plants, to all the animate and inanimate forms that can be seen or imagined. More than that, ‘All My Relations’ is an encouragement for us to accept the responsibilities we have within this universal family by living our lives in a harmonious and moral manner. (ix)

The ideological systems that these author-critics advocate illustrate that both Māori and Aboriginal worldviews envision culture as a site from which to negotiate one’s own identity, based on the relationship between self and world within a universe premised on relation rather than on binary divisions. The location of culture, then, is

²² A marae is “an enclosed ground used as a meeting place” (Reed 27). Generally it refers to the open meeting area situated in front of the communal meeting house. *Iwi*, here, carries a similar meaning to tribe in the North American context; it is defined as “bone; nation; strength” (Reed 13).

a central aspect of indigenous systems of knowledge.²³

Within Māori and Aboriginal cultures, this relational paradigm includes relationships between past, present and future. The responsibilities King refers to extend beyond the contemporary moment. As Grace also points out, interrelationships in Māori culture include “ancestors and people who are not yet born” (qtd in Calleja 112). According to Nakota scholar Vine Deloria, Aboriginal cultures “hold their lands—places—as having the highest possible meaning, and all their statements are made with this reference point in mind (64). To look at time as a process integrally linked into negotiations of space, then, reflects King’s and Grace’s shared concern with “the philosophical problem of space,” a concern Deloria links to indigenous cultures more generally (65).

As with any comparative project, this one risks conflating Aboriginal and Māori worldviews in relation to colonial ones. There is also the risk of collapsing differences between various tribes and iwi under the umbrellas of ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Māori’ in particular or ‘indigenous culture’ generally. However, the concept of relation in both whakapapa and All My Relations guards against essentializing indigenous cultures. It engages with a potentially productive commonality among indigenous worldviews without undermining the complexity and uniqueness of different iwi, tribes, and individuals.²⁴

²³ ‘Location of culture’ immediately brings to mind Homi Bhabha’s postcolonial theory text by that name (1994). To reflect the centrality of this concept to King’s and Grace’s work apart from the postcolonial context, I do not cite Bhabha directly. I will address Bhabha’s work below.

²⁴ Politically motivated pan-Māori and pan-Aboriginal responses will be discussed further in this project in relation to colonial discourses. As Andrew Sharp writes, the emergence of pan-Māori identity has been an important part of political and legal initiatives in relation to colonizers. “Each of the 40-odd tribes (iwi) and many of the subtribes (hapu) had their own history. But now there was a pan-tribal story told. The story was that the Māori had been subjected to wrongs and injustices at the hands of the new colonizers.” (Sharp Justice).

Both King and Grace recognize uniqueness within their own contexts. However, because they are also reluctant to limit other writers' engagements within their own subject positions, Grace and King acknowledge that looking for commonalities can be productive. Building on King and Grace, spiral reading strategies also attempt to open spaces for multiple voices within a contextual framework that advocates that culture be defined within a shared relational-processual paradigm.

For King, in particular, "pan-Indian self-positioning becomes a powerful tool, which acknowledges post-contact interaction with non-Natives, yet focuses on the experience of contemporary Natives" (Davidson, Walton, and Andrews 9). These authors go on to cite King himself:

I think a lot of people think pan-Indianness as a diminution of 'Indian,' but I think of it as simply a reality of contemporary life. Native culture has never been static even though Western literature would like to picture it that way. . . . There are Indians upon Indians in novels who go off the reservations into the city and are destroyed, who come back to the reservations and can't make it. I think that's bullshit myself. In reality there are lots of Indians who go off the reserve, who come back to the reserve, who work, who go off the reserve again, who keep going back and forth and they manage. (orig qtd in Weaver 150)

Thus, for King, pan-Aboriginal reality can translate into an ability to move and define one's cultural location in relation to various places.²⁵

6). See Sharp's text for more on these matters: *Justice and the Maori: The philosophy and practice of Maori claims in New Zealand since the 1970s*.

²⁵ As will be discussed further in Chapter One of this project, Yi-Fu Tuan links this spatial negotiation with the power to construct and maintain subjectivity and agency. Tuan discusses these issues extensively in *Space and Place: the Perspective of Experience* (1977).

King himself not only discusses “an affinity with other aboriginal people” but also one with “the Maori in New Zealand.” He recognizes a similar “experience with colonization.” He states, “we seem to be concerned about the same things . . . I’ve just finished Grace’s *Potiki* which is about a Māori community. It touches on some of the same things that I like to write about, and many of the storytelling techniques, the characters, and the voices are familiar” (qtd in Rooke 68). My project discusses many of these similarities, but it will also outline many differences. The relational-processual paradigm enacted by King and Grace through their stories may make these texts seem ‘familiar’ to those that read several of them, but the complexity of the spiral – the recognition, first, of texts as individual works, and the inclusion of indigenous and postcolonial theories in critical relation– promotes a complex set of reading strategies that highlight the relational- processual nature of King’s and Grace’s negotiations of culture within the Nation.

In a speech to the Saskatchewan Writer’s Guild, Armstrong urges Aboriginal writers to challenge the systems of domination still present in the Nation through a “discourse and dialogue flowing outward from” their cultures (“Disempowerment” 241). The texts of both King and Grace constitute such discourses, as they centre All My Relations and whakapapa in their representations of Aboriginal and Māori cultures. King’s *Medicine River*, *Green Grass*, *Running Water*, *Truth and Bright Water*, and *The Truth about Stories*, and Grace’s *Potiki*, *Cousins*, *Baby No-Eyes*, and *Dogside Story* not only challenge the neocolonial discursive formations of Canada and New Zealand, they also promote Aboriginal and Māori perspectives and access to cultural subjectivity. How, then, do they form and transform discourse to promote the

‘new forms’ and ‘new orders of culturalism’ centred by indigenous critics today?

The stories of King and Grace envision cultures from the inside out. They privilege a link between indigeneity and place while refusing to limit indigeneity to its placement as Other in Eurocentric discourse. These authors demonstrate that “*critical negation* (shedding a mentality bred under conditions of colonialism) and *imaginative affirmation* (redefining ‘cultural identities’)” are, as Rob Wilson argues, central to inside-out perspectives (3-4).²⁶ This ‘creative dialectic,’ as Wilson calls it, undermines voices associated with Eurocentric discourses and asserts the authority of Aboriginal and Māori perspectives. Negotiating subjectivity essentially involves asserting one’s ability to see the world from one’s own point of view. Stuart Hall argues that cultural identities help individuals assert their perspectives, so that cultural identities become “the points of identification, the unstable points of identification or suture, which are made within the discourses of history and culture” (“Cultural” 395). Cultures, then, enable subjectivity, in that they allow for individuals to assert points of view in given moments. Cultures promote subject positions based on “[n]ot an essence but a *positioning*” (Hall “Cultural” 395). The ability to articulate stories is linked, then, to cultural perspectives and the positions one takes in relation to one’s locations. Māori and Aboriginal cultures, read in this way, position individuals to productively negotiate subjectivity in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada as *turangawaewae*, or places to stand.

Stories are inherently associated with spaces, and, perhaps more importantly here, places are often central to stories. As will be discussed in Chapter One, colonial

²⁶ Wilson expands the conceptualization of ‘inside out’ introduced by the editors of *Te Ao Marama*, Vol 3 in the epigraph to this introduction in his own introductory piece.

stories tend to foreground places that limit indigenous cultural subjectivity and reject the relational-processual paradigms discussed here. They represent indigenous cultures as static and containable within discursive formations central to the colonies and nations under discussion. For this reason, King and Grace not only ‘imaginatively affirm’ indigenous locations, but also critically negate relationships between Aboriginal and Māori cultures and the space of the Nation.

In order to locate indigenous place within the Nation beyond colonial and neocolonial discursive formations, indigenous cultures negotiate what Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak calls the “deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial.” Postcolonial subjectivity is precluded because indigenous peoples cannot construct a sense of place in relation to a nation that disavows them. The colonized must reclaim catachreses²⁷ “from a space that one cannot not want to inhabit and yet must criticize,” a place constituted by the histories of the colony and the nation (“Marginality” 64). Both “Aboriginal Canadian” and “Māori New Zealander” are catachreses because neither ‘Aboriginal’ nor ‘Māori’ constitute positions from which one can define the national contexts. These nations continue to be defined in neocolonial terms that preclude indigenous access to subjectivity. Within dominant discourses associated with these colonies and nations, Aboriginal and Māori can ‘perform’ in their cultural subject positions in certain situations, but they must continually strive to ‘become’ Canadians or New Zealanders, fitting into Eurocentric paradigms. Inside-out perspectives must be validated to ensure that Aboriginal and Māori cultural locations are included in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand

²⁷ In *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, Spivak defines a catachresis as a “metaphor without an adequate referent” (4). It might also be read as meaning a signifier that is ‘out of place’ because there is no context in which it has meaning, or can construct that meaning.

respectively.

King and Grace reclaim catachreses in different ways through their novels, critically inhabiting the discursive formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Throughout this project, I read their works as already contrapuntally engaged with dominant historical and contemporary colonial and neocolonial discourses, and I place these novels in further contrapuntal relationships with indigenous and postcolonial theories. Spiral strategies foreground the place of indigenous culture and expand on Edward Said's conceptualization of counterpoint to enact the spatial and temporal relational paradigms central to both the Aboriginal belief in "All My Relations" and the Māori focus on whakapapa. As a result, worldviews and theories promote stories that advocate particular critiques. The matrices for critical engagement that emerge as a result of spiral strategies privilege inside-out perspectives and relational paradigms and recognize the process of locating cultures.

In this thesis I interrogate the ways that King and Grace enact this process. They negotiate the interrelationships between indigenous cultures and settler-invader narratives and they renew "the past, refiguring it as a contingent 'in-between' space, that innovates and interrupts the performance of the present" (Bhabha *Location* 7). According to Homi Bhabha, the aim of cultural difference is to perpetuate "political and discursive strategies where adding-*to* does not add up, but serves to disturb the calculation of power and knowledge, producing other spaces of subaltern signification" (*DissemiNation* 312). My postcolonial reading of the colonial and neocolonial discourses highlighted in the novels of King and Grace shows that adding 'Aboriginal' *to* 'Canadian' and 'Māori' *to* 'New Zealander' in colonial and

neocolonial discourses does not add up to a concept of culture that encompasses relational worldviews. For this reason, we must unsettle the ways in which culture is defined within Eurocentric discourses and recite it within relational- processual paradigms. We must continue revisit the stories that define society.

Re-visioning Culture: Critical negations, imaginative affirmations

Reading within a relational-processual paradigm requires reconceptualising the term ‘culture’. James Sa’kej Youngblood Henderson (Chickasaw) rejects the term ‘culture’ in favour of ‘worldview,’ arguing that “to use ‘culture’ is to fragment Aboriginal worldviews into artificial concepts” (“*Ayukpachi*” 261). This is true; historically and more recently, Eurocentric conceptualizations of culture have enabled outside-in perspectives to create ‘nets’ limiting Aboriginal and Māori agency. The concept of culture must be re-visioned to see if it can function within a relational-processual paradigm to promote inside-out perspectives.²⁸

Raymond Williams’ definitions of culture identify the historical uses of ‘culture,’ as well as some of the critical underpinnings of my own use of the term. In *Keywords*, Williams recognizes that “in all its early uses [culture] was a noun of process” associated with “the tending of something” (77). In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, culture evolved to refer to “an independent noun, an abstract process or the product of such a process” (77) until it came to commonly denote three broad categories: “a general process of intellectual, spiritual, and

²⁸ I use the term ‘re-vision’ purposefully here. Coined by feminist scholar Adrienne Rich, re-vision refers to “the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new critical direction,” an act she links with cultural survival. It is important to know how culture has been written about in the past, so that we can “know it differently than we have every known it; not to pass on a tradition, but to break its hold over us.” (18).

aesthetic development,” “a particular way of life,” and “the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity” (80). My own use of ‘culture’ draws on all three categories identified by Williams, but attempts to reconfigure them with relational-processual paradigms in mind.

Eurocentric conceptualizations of culture align different elements of this definition with different societal groups to perpetuate the binary social relations that other indigenous cultures in relation to European cultures in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Colonial discourses that try to assimilate indigenous peoples into the dominant place of the colony ensure that indigenous ‘culture’ is located within ‘acculturation’: it is a ‘process of development’ toward assimilating into dominant culture.²⁹ Alternately, in neocolonial tourism³⁰ and contemporary discourses of multiculturalism and biculturalism³¹, indigenous culture denotes a ‘way of life’ locked in the past. These discourses deny that the worldviews associated with that way of life evolve in contemporary times and have an impact on either the contemporary dominant worldviews of the Nation and the daily life of many of its citizens. Here, culture is located in a site one can visit, a product available for purchase, or a tradition one can draw on to perpetuate Eurocentric visions of indigenous traditions.

In each of these cases the perspectives from which culture is defined is Eurocentric and perpetuates neocolonialism. Eurocentric culture remains the privileged site of ‘intellectual activity,’ and the measure of what counts as ‘artistic

²⁹ I will discuss discourses associated with colonial assimilation of land and peoples in Chapters Two and Three respectively.

³⁰ This is the focus of Chapter Four.

³¹ I address national discourses of multiculturalism in Canada and biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand in Chapter Five.

excellence.’ Outside-in perspectives of indigenous cultures maintain the supposition that indigenous peoples should perform indigenous culture as historical; they can also reinforce what Bhabha recognizes as the “spatial dimension of ‘distance’—*the perspectival distance from which the spectacle is seen*—that installs a cultural homogeneity” (*Location* 243). All elements of Williams’ definition of culture maintain this distance and perpetuate homogeneity. Envisioned from the neocolonial ‘outside’, Indigenous cultures are meant to evolve from pre-colonial times into the present not to self-actualize as contemporary cultures but to support neocolonial discursive formations.³²

Terry Eagleton argues that Williams’ exploration of the term ‘culture’ does not go far enough in explicating the *relationship* among the three broad categories of culture Williams identifies in *Keywords*. According to Eagleton, this leads to a ‘crisis of culture.’ However, Eagleton’s critique is problematic. It relies on a conceptualization of culture that necessarily locates an Enlightenment narrative of progress that is neocolonial in a dual sense. First, culture, as a Eurocentric construct, promotes the idea that minority indigenous cultures must be defined in relation to dominant cultures. This can be traced back to imperialist discourses: as Eagleton notes, the “anthropological meaning of culture as a unique way of life” emerged in the context of nineteenth-century colonialism. Culture is envisioned from the outside-in. Secondly, utopian culture is envisioned as an amalgam of the “most exquisitely conscious products of human history.” This second conceptualization, Eagleton points out, is oppositional to the first (28).

³² Discourses’ and ‘discursive formations’ will be interrogated further, in light of Foucault’s engagement with these terms, in Chapter One.

Eagleton asks a question Williams does not: “[w]hat is it that connects culture as utopian critique, culture as way of life, and culture as artistic creation” (20)?

According to Eagleton, the answer is “a negative one: all three are in different ways reactions to the failure of culture as actual civilization—as the grand narrative of human self-development” that is modernity (20). Eagleton’s perception of the resulting ‘crisis of culture’ as negative emerges from following each of these three definitions through to what he sees as their logical, yet unattainable ‘ends’: culture must reference either a utopian past or future, a concrete limited experience accessible to the dominant, or an enlightened work of art (20-22).

Eurocentric discourses recite ‘culture’ within a paradigm that is antithetical to the relational-processual one advocated by King and Grace. The contemporary progressive culture of the Nation has no space within it for traditional worldviews and seeks to contain historical cultures. The result is a binary of progressive European/unchanging Other. Within Eurocentric definitions of culture, ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Māori’ are traditional, static ways of life, while the locations of ‘Canada’ and ‘New Zealand’ promote cultural experiences that relate to ‘progress.’

In the introduction to de Certeau’s *Culture in the Plural*, Luce Giard provides an alternative conception of culture as both relational and processual. Giard brings together de Certeau’s words to state:

If culture is really going to exist, it is not enough to be the author of social practices; these social practices need to have meaning for those who effectuate them; [for culture] consists not in receiving, but in positing the act by which each individual *marks* what others furnish for

the needs of living and thinking . . . [It is the appropriation that constitutes] the staging of culture. (xi)

Cultural subjectivity, then, involves envisioning culture from one's own speaking place or *turangawaewae*, asserting one's voice to 'stage' culture on one's own terms.

Inside-out subjectivity provides new answers to Eagleton's question about what "connects culture as utopian critique, culture as way of life, and culture as artistic creation" (20). Shifting to a perspective promoting subjectivity enables Māori and Aboriginal writers to create culture on their own terms. For Māori guided by 'tikanga Māori,' this has the potential to lead to the 'flowering' noted by Ihimaera, Long, Ramsden, and Williams (see epigraph). 'Māori,' 'Aboriginal,' and 'culture' themselves must all be read in relation to one another, and new perspectives must always be able to participate in the (re)construction of meaning. Only then will culture cease to denote a static meaning and give way to 'culturalism' existing 'beyond colonial thought and practice' (Armstrong, epigraph).

In the eight texts I select from, King and Grace engage specifically with Eurocentric discourses of imperialism, tourism, and pluralism. I, in turn, use those engagements to unpack the ways in which these three discourses denote culture, and how it might be revisioned from the inside-out. Because the selected works by King and Grace were published between 1986 and 2001, I take them to represent in particular discursive formations located in – and locating – Canada and New Zealand at the close of the 20th century.³³ Neocolonial assimilation and integration into the

³³ I do not include Grace's *Mutuwhenua: As the Moon Sleeps* (1978). This novel is the story of Ripeka and her marriage to a Pākehā man named Graeme, and although it is an interesting examination of intercultural relationships, it does not focus as much as her other texts on relations as they are imagined by larger

neocolonial discursive formations of Canada and New Zealand are processes that depend on imperialism and do not exist in isolation from it. For this reason, postcolonial theories are important. The spiral I trace encompasses imperialist discourses associated with the colonial era as they relate to neocolonial discursive formations in contemporary times.

Originally, as a postcolonial theorist, I was drawn to the critical negation of these Eurocentric discourses, and to explaining how these stories participate in what Spivak calls the ‘worlding of a world.’ Spivak traces this concept back to

the imperialist project, which was to assume that the earth that is territorialized was in fact previously uninscribed. So then a world, on a simple level of cartography, inscribed what was thought to be uninscribed. Now this worlding actually is also a texting, textualising, a making into an art, a making into an object to be understood. (*Critique* 1)

This is how Eurocentric discourses attempt to place indigenous cultures in relation to settler-invader cultures. Imperialist discourses start from utopian assumptions—that space is empty and ready for settlement—and move to more e/utopia³⁴ ones linking ‘progress’ to assimilation and integration. The chapters in my thesis trace this path.

However, as I have continued to work in this area, I realized that focussing

communities. I also do not include *Tu*, Grace’s latest novel, which is the story of three brothers who join the Māori Battalion in World War II: Pita, Rangi, and Te Hokowhitu-a-Tu. The youngest, Tu is the only brother to survive his time in Italy, and he shares his brothers’ stories with his niece and nephew from his point of view. Although this novel does address the Eurocentric discourses on which I concentrate, it focuses on the time period during and around the Second World War and the implications of this event. This work will be important to further research.

³⁴ This term connotes the relationship between eutopia (good-place) and utopia (no-place) captured by Thomas More and discussed further in Chapter One. Colonial discourses represented the space of the colony as simultaneously ‘good’ due to the efforts of civilization and ‘empty’ and available for colonization.

almost exclusively on the ways in which both King and Grace ‘critically negate’ Eurocentric, often national, discourses at the expense of the ways in which their stories ‘imaginatively affirm’ Aboriginal and Māori discourses is problematic.³⁵ A focus on negation not only excludes imaginative affirmation – or, in particular, indigenous stories that do not critically negate – it also keeps separate the two catachrestic elements I seek to illuminate *in relation* to one another. King and Grace inhabit the inside-out space of the Aboriginal Canadian and the Māori New Zealander through their own cultural backgrounds and negotiate these liminal spaces in their creative work. For this reason, I argue that neither author should be placed solely within either the ‘indigenous’ or the ‘national’ literary categories. Rather, both novelists should be read through spiral reading strategies which reposition indigeneity in relation to the discursive formation of the Nation and encompass the historical processes of positioning and repositioning. These reading strategies expose how both King and Grace enact the inside-out perspective in their writing. Each highlights both the critical negation of Eurocentrism *and* the simultaneous imaginative affirmation of indigenous cultural locations. They negotiate *both* national and indigenous stories, and the emergent spaces between the two.

Through their novels, King and Grace ‘world’ alternative worlds, and they ensure that ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Māori’ are understood not as static, containable concepts, but as processual and relational cultures. Aboriginal and Māori are dynamic subject positions located in relation to the evolving sites of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. In this way, King and Grace enact Spivak’s strategic ‘postcoloniality,’ in which one “take[s] positions in terms not of the discovery of

³⁵ This terminology draws heavily on Rob Wilson’s articulation of ‘inside-out perspectives’ as discussed above.

historical or philosophical grounds, but in terms of reversing, displacing, and seizing the apparatus of value-coding” (“Marginality” 63). In addition to this critical negation, King and Grace also resist the binary imposed here by Spivak, as they re(disc)over, and recite, the philosophical grounds associated with historical and contemporary Aboriginal and Māori experiences. Here, they affirm subjectivity in relation to national locations and indigeneity. In other words, King and Grace draw on indigenous worldviews to illuminate cultural places, from the inside-out, which challenge dominant cultural paradigms and recite always-emergent stories of Aboriginal Canada and Māori New Zealand.

Spiral Reading: Novels, postcolonial theories, indigenous theories, stories

The spiral reading strategies I set up in this thesis reject colonial and neocolonial conceptions of cultures as necessarily either static or progressive. The spiral opens up spaces within national discourses which are locations of indigenous cultural empowerment. The spiral spatializes interrelationships among multiple sets of stories: Grace’s novels are read in counterpoint with King’s texts. King and Grace are themselves postcolonial indigenous critics who set up contrapuntal engagements with colonial and neocolonial discourses of mapping, acculturation, tourism, and bi- and multi- culturalism, all of which have evolved in relation to imperialist discourses and on which I expand on as a critical reader.³⁶ In addition, both indigenous theories and postcolonial theories are brought into relation with these discourses and with one another. Remaining at the centre of the spiral are indigenous worldviews: culture itself is necessarily viewed as relational and in process within the location of the

³⁶ These are focused on in Chapters Two through Five respectively.

contemporary Nation. Because of the breadth of discourses and disciplinary fields bridged in this dissertation, I must acknowledge that there is selective sampling of the literary texts for evidence of theories' insights, and vice versa. The spiral of stories moves through several highly contested literary and theoretical terrains, but the trajectory I follow most closely highlights the critical lenses applied by King and Grace through their creative works.

The spiral itself begins with the works of King and Grace. I read these literary texts as not only open to postcolonial and indigenous critiques, but theoretical in their own rights. Thus, my spiral reading strategies acknowledge the “Maori Research Methods and Practices” outlined by Kathie Irwin (Ngāti Porou/Ngāti Kahungunu). The strategies start “from te ao Maori and extend outwards to te ao Pakeha, rather than the other way around” (28).³⁷ They “seeks a critical voice and method which moves from the culturally-centered text outward” (Blaeser 53). Spiral reading strategies centre literary texts, and resist the singular empowerment of “an external critical voice and method which seeks to penetrate, appropriate, colonize or conquer the cultural center” (Blaeser 53).

The spiral—or Māori koru³⁸—trope is important in both Aboriginal and Māori cultures and, in choosing this symbol as a guide for my own work, I again respond to Blaeser's call to look within cultures for tools of engagement. By plotting Grace's and King's novels in spiral relation to one another, to Eurocentric discourses, and to indigenous theories, I attempt to circumvent the criticism often levelled at

³⁷ Although ‘ao’ can be defined as “bright; cloud; dawn; day; day-time; world” (Reed 3), here ‘te ao’ reflects common usage of the term as ‘world.’

³⁸ Folded; shrub (Reed 21). The spiral shape of this native plant, *Pratia physaloides*, is replicated in Māori art, and is particularly predominant in carvings.

postcolonial and other theoretical discourses: that the act of interpretation represents a new form of colonization through reading indigenous texts within dominant theoretical paradigms.³⁹

The spiral is not meant to promote a mapping of theoretical engagements that will contain texts within it or restrict emergent meanings. On the contrary, the spiral brings texts in relation to one another, opening up a space in which the resultant readings are always in process. A spiral's "sequences relate to the integrity of the circle, not the directional determination of the line. It encompasses, it does not point" (Deloria qtd. in Blaeser 57). This reflects not only a spatial paradigm that centres relation, but also a temporal paradigm that privileges non-linear time. Paula Gunn Allen (Laguna/Sioux) sees both as contributing to the relational "achronicity" of Aboriginal stories, which represent

a meandering, there are little circles, but the circles aren't going in a nice perfect little spiral. Instead, they circle here, and circle there, then they go over there and they circle, and they go somewhere else and they circle, and the circles get bigger – until, finally, the whole thing is wrapped up, in some sense. Its an ever expanding, eccentric, erratic, meandering spiral. (qtd in Ballinger 22)

Interviewer Laura Coltelli points out the centrality of the spiral trope to Laguna writer and critic Leslie Marmon Silko, stating that the structure of Silko's novel, *Almanac of the Dead* (1991), "is like a spiral in which every story or single character is somehow connected to another" (121). Silko acknowledges that, although she did not realize

³⁹ See the work of Brydon for excellent recent engagements with the debate about the nature and relevance of postcolonial theory in relation to indigenous discourses. Of particular note is "Canada and Postcolonialism: Questions, Inventories, and Futures."

this structure's presence when writing the novel, it does not surprise her that others find it there: the "spiral is very important down here with the Tohono O'odham tribal people" (122). Fellow writer Joy Harjo (Creek) contends that writers might not always be aware of relational-processual structures like the spiral at work. Her Creek heritage "provides the underlying psychic structure, within which is a wealth of memory," she states; this "memory is not just associated with past history, past events, past stories, but is non linear, as in future and ongoing history, events and stories. And it changes" (61). Harjo acknowledges the centrality of the spiral trope in her own work in the title of a collection of interviews about her own writing and other artistic endeavours: *Spiral of Memory* (1996).⁴⁰ Naming the reading strategies in this project for the spiral promotes recognition of the importance of not only the spiral as a symbol, but the ways in which space and time are structured relationally by the indigenous critics central to this dissertation.

In her critical work entitled *The Circle and the Spiral: A Study of Australian Aboriginal and New Zealand Māori Literature*, Eva Rask Knudsen links the spiral to a "revolving" idea of the future that denotes 'a world that moves forward to the place it came from'" (24). She asserts that "in Māori visual art the two movements are integrated in the *koru* (the spiral), its most significant icon" (24). Knudsen connects the spiral to a "Māori noetic," in that it negotiates "sets of opposites [that] are ultimately different from the dichotomies (such as centre-margin, self-Other or superior-inferior) deciphered in postcolonial theory, because Māori cosmogony

⁴⁰ In her introduction to Harjo's book, Laura Coltelli articulates the relationship between the spiral and the concept of memory located within this text: "What affords the most successful figurative description of the proceeding of memory is the spinning vortex, which spirals back while simultaneously expanding towards the future" (9). This temporal representation of memory as moving through the past into the future mirrors similar ideas in Māori stories.

emphasizes an interrelatedness – a system of spiralling relations – rather than the contrariety of opposites” (4).⁴¹ As Allan Hanson notes, ‘the spiral’s uniqueness is that the duality it creates is not one of adjacent spaces but rather a dual division which intertwines and grows within the same space as the two arms of the spiral revolve outward from . . . a common centre point” (qtd in Knudsen 216).

I read this ‘common centre point’ not as a new, singular centre, but as a relational site constructed of stories within the ideological places of the Nation. Aboriginal and Māori cultures are distinct. The spiral spatializes their shared concerns with the negotiation of cultural subjectivities and interrelationships with dominant cultures. Ultimately, the “koru [spiral] design . . . reflects a perspective on space [in which] the world inhabited— and the artistic vision of it—embraces not one centre but a multitude of centres” (Knudsen 24). The stories emerging in relation to one another within this thesis include the texts of Grace and King, the colonial and neocolonial discourses they discuss, and the indigenous and postcolonial theories which interrogate both Māori and Aboriginal stories and those colonial and neocolonial discourses. These are my spiral reading strategies in action and they expand on the work of Knudsen, not just by adding the Aboriginal context, but by focusing on the relationships between indigenous subjectivities and national locations of culture as they are explicitly engaged not only by Grace, but also by King, *and* by indigenous and postcolonial theorists. Rather than critiquing postcolonial theories in my introduction, as Rask Knudsen does, before moving “back to the text with the intention of locating the ‘inside-out’ perspective within it” (17), this dissertation does the reverse. I take the inside-out perspectives as a starting point in Chapter One and

⁴¹ Knudsen goes on to relate this noetic to creation stories, something I will address in Chapter One.

spiral out to include outside- in perspectives as part of the process of critique.

These four elements – Aboriginal texts, Māori novels, indigenous theories, and postcolonial theories – intertwine in many ways, and attempts to pull them apart go against the reading process I advocate. I agree with King when he states that “criticism and writing sort of have this chase on between the two. . . . And criticism is always looking for new ways to interpolate that material by sort of chasing and trying to hold it in place at the same time for a moment” (qtd in Snowden and Todorova). This dissertation participates in the ‘chase’ but unsettles the rules of the game. Writers’ roles and critics’ roles become largely interchangeable as stories are read as theory and theories are unpacked as story. Ultimately, this project works against ‘holding indigenous writing in place.’ It seeks instead to make indigenous writers and critics a central part of the ongoing dialogue concerning the construction of cultures.

As Grace notes, “analysing and breaking things up into compartments is really not a Māori activity, it doesn’t fit a Māori worldview”; however, when asked if she appreciates criticism, she indicates, “I’ve always said that I want my work to be read and discussed, and to quote myself ‘chopped in the marketplace along with everyone else’s.’ . . . It’s all part of the discussion” (qtd in Calleja 113). What matters to King are the terms of that discussion. He argues that critical terminology should not “establish a chronological order” centering colonialism nor should it “open and close literary frontiers” as a result of that focus (King “Godzilla” 248).⁴² King and Grace both choose to enter dialogue with critics when they allow their novels to be published, but they challenge critics who try to engage with their work as part of

⁴² In this article, “Godzilla vs. the Post-colonial,” King takes issue with postcolonial critical discourse specifically, outlining different terms of engagement. These will be discussed below.

larger genres, including ‘Aboriginal,’ ‘Māori,’ ‘indigenous,’ ‘postcolonial,’ or categories associated with literary discourse types.

Both Grace and King move to writing *novels*—a primary Nation-building genre⁴³— after times of upheaval in, and increased recognition of, indigenous politics in New Zealand and Canada.⁴⁴ That King and Grace both address cultural placement primarily through novels from the mid- to late-1980s onwards encourages a comparative reading of these two authors with one another, as well as within the larger discursive formations in which they locate themselves. That these works have sold well, were nationally and internationally recognized through awards, and continue to be widely read in English literature courses around the world is also important, as this provides tangible evidence that these particular novels actively participate in the ‘imagination’ of these countries.

In *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Benedict Anderson conceives of the Nation as an ‘imagined community’ and links its capacity to imagine communities beyond face-to-face contact as arising from ‘print capitalism’ and, in particular, the genre of the novel. He associates the place constructed by the novel with the emergent possibility “for rapidly growing numbers of peoples to think about themselves, and to relate to others, in profoundly new ways” (36). Along with maps and censuses, novels mirror the place of the Nation in its ability to embody “homogeneous, empty time” (25). They enable people to think of themselves as members of a larger community, sharing perspectives despite differences in their daily lives. Drawing on Anderson, Timothy Brennan

⁴³ See Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*. See also Brennan’s “The National Longing for Form.”

⁴⁴ Significant similarities in the political situations of these two countries—historically and in more contemporary times—are outlined below.

suggests that it “was the novel that historically supported the rise of nations by objectifying the ‘one, yet many’ of national life, and by mimicking the structure of the nation” in this way (“National” 49). The novel thus represents and enables integration of the Nation.

At the same time, the novel is structurally unique, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, in that it is “the sole genre that continues to develop, that is as yet uncompleted” (“Epic” 69). It reflects, then, relational-processual paradigms as a genre. In the discursive tradition of Eurocentric novels, ‘development’ involves the assimilation of difference on neocolonial terms. The structures of novels can, however, also accommodate changing worldviews by providing spaces in which inside-out perspectives can critically negate dominant cultural norms and imaginatively affirm alternatives. King and Grace reject the evolving dominant and dominating tradition of the novel itself and use this genre to open up spaces that unsettle the placement of Aboriginal and Māori cultures within not only literature, but also the discourses of cartography, tourism, and pluralist nationalism.

Members of both Māori and Aboriginal cultures recognize the power inherent in stories. As Objibway writer and critic Armand Garnet Ruffo states, “[b]eginning in the oral tradition, words and stories have always meant power in Native culture, and it is through this sacred power that Native people have always expressed their sense of identity and place on the land” (174). It is through stories, particularly, that Ihimaera chooses “to present a specifically Maori view of the world and of New Zealand history” and, according to Mark Williams, he did so because he knew it “challenged the established narratives of colonisers”. Judith Leggatt discusses how “Native

writers advance [cultural] theories through story” (121).

Drawing on the work of Lee Maracle and Thomas King, Leggatt argues that “the interpretations of First Nations creative writing by academics become an act of translation from an indigenous mode of expression to a Western one” (121). Spiral reading strategies propose that, in order for this translation to take place on the terms of Aboriginal and Māori writers, their stories must be told from inside-out perspectives. In addition to this, individual stories are also read in counterpoint with one another to ensure that they do not totalize cultural subjectivity based on singular experience. Multiple stories, read in relation, create and affirm cultural locations as always in process.

Spiralling Forward: Reconceptualizing ‘postcolonial’ themes in praxis

Said’s “contrapuntal reading” strategy, requires readers to “think through and interpret together experiences that are discrepant, each with its particular agenda and pace of development” (*Culture and Imperialism* 32). This process requires that readers understand the points of view from which writers choose to write, as well as the presence of alternative points of view beyond those represented in individual texts. In reading colonial and neocolonial discourses, then, “contrapuntal reading must take account of both processes, that of imperialism and that of resistance to it, which can be done by extending our reading of the texts to include what was once forcibly excluded,” namely stories resisting the colonial and neocolonial discursive formations of the colony and nation (Said *Culture* 79). In reading King and Grace in counterpoint with one another *and* with the discourses they themselves address, I

enact two levels of contrapuntal reading.

Said argues that contrapuntal reading encourages readers to envision the past and present beyond dominant representations, revealing culture as hybrid. He ties this hybridity to imperialism itself, stating, “partly because of Empire, all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated and unmonolithic” (*Culture* xxix). Reading in counterpoint, Said posits, necessitates reciting not only specific discourses, but also alternative discourses in relation to ensure that culture itself is read as relational.

As we look back at the cultural archive, we begin to reread it not univocally, but *contrapuntally*, with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts. (*Culture* 51)

This thesis recites colonial and neocolonial constructions of culture in relation to the Nation from alternative perspectives, opening up liminal spaces in which new stories promoting indigenous subjectivities emerge.

Reading multiple texts in counterpoint is central to my spiral reading strategies because they promote these indigenous subjectivities, but Said’s notion of contrapuntal reading needs to be broadened. The writing of narratives open to this process, he argues, enables writers to “assert their own identity and the existence of their own history” (*Culture* xiii). Although Said maintains that hybrid cultures can be ‘extraordinarily differentiated,’ his contrapuntal reading strategy focuses solely on the level of individual stories read in relation, or on reading discourses in counterpoint to

expose the monolithic nature of Eurocentric paradigms.

Said's reading strategy recognizes differences between discourses; he reads indigenous discourses as having different agendas than dominant discourses, but shared agendas with one another. Thus, writers like King and Grace, self-identifying as hybrid, must still function within binary relationships in order to enable outside-in recognition of their impact on the dominant discursive formations. Said's counterpoint, then, relies on the recognition of specific, identifiable indigenous agendas giving rise to specific points of view. In other words, Māori writers must write about Māori issues, or write *as* Māori, and Aboriginal writers must do the same.

As a result, contrapuntal reading can perpetuate what Bhabha calls "cultural diversity," in that it relies on "the recognition of pre-given cultural 'contents' and customs, held in a time-frame of relativism" ("Cultural" 206). As a result, Said's reading strategy can limit cultures, because it represents "a radical rhetoric of the separation of totalized cultures . . . safe in the Utopianism of a mythic memory of a unique collective destiny" (Bhabha "Cultural" 206).⁴⁵ As a reading strategy, Said's contrapuntal reading, on its own, could be used to support neocolonial ideas of culture, as it requires indigenous peoples to advance indigenous perspectives on indigenous agendas that can be recognized as such in binary relation to dominant discourses. How, then, can the notion of 'contrapuntal reading' be opened up to promote not only critical negations of colonial and neocolonial discourses, but also affirmation of indigenous stories and/as theoretical engagements? How can this reading strategy be extended to ensure cultures are recited from the inside-out without having to conform to perspectives acknowledged as indigenous?

⁴⁵ Bhabha here is not discussing Said's work, but the dangers associated with collective cultural definition.

In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha advances the theorization of cultures as necessarily hybrid, stating that “it is in the emergence of the interstices—the overlap and displacement of domains of difference—that the intersubjective and collective experiences of *nationness*, community interest, or cultural value are negotiated” (2). Reading Bhabha’s work in relation to Said’s addresses potential limitations because Bhabha’s definition of hybridity facilitates the recognition of “interstitial perspective[s]” (*Location* 3). Unlike the binarism inherent in counterpoint, liminal perspectives recognize the complexity of the catachrestic locations of contemporary indigenous authors, and cultures, I discuss.

The critical trajectory of my spiral reading strategies traces a path through the chapters in this dissertation that is set out initially by King and Grace themselves in their literary texts. It then addresses in further depth the colonial and neocolonial discourses they point to. I read the literary texts and colonial and neocolonial discourses through two critical lenses: postcolonial and indigenous. In this way I plot the novels of King and Grace in counterpoint with Eurocentric discourses—as related ‘narratives of the nation’—and theoretical perspectives on a spiral. These strategies, conceived spatially as a spiral rather than two points in opposition, create a space for critical negations of outside-in perspectives associated with colonial and neocolonial discourses since contact, and for imaginative affirmations of indigenous cultural locations.

Critically negating colonial discourses shows that what began as an imperial demand for indigenous cultures to assimilate evolved into the demand for them to integrate. As part of this process, the discursive formations of Canada and New

Zealand – their stories – evolved to support and maintain those neocolonial demands. Assimilation promotes the absorption of indigenous places into the Eurocentric map, as well as the acceptance of Eurocentric worldviews by indigenous peoples.

Integrationist models appear to create places for difference within the larger place of the Nation while simultaneously including and excluding indigenous cultures on the terms of the dominant.⁴⁶ In both stories, indigenous cultures are viewed by the dominant culture as ‘almost the same but not quite,’ and what Bhabha stresses as “*almost the same but not white*” (*Location* 89). Postcolonial theories’ recognition of this always-ambivalent status of indigenous cultures within the discursive formations of both colonies and nations opens up spaces for critical negation. Thus, these inside-out perspectives, validated in turn by a postcolonial theoretical perspective operating, in some ways, from the outside-in, responds to the “synchronic panoptical vision of domination—the demand for identity, stasis—and the counter-pressure of the diachrony of history—change, difference” in colonial discourses (Bhabha *Location* 86).

By critically negating colonial and neocolonial stories, writers and critics can begin to challenge “the effect of power [that has] been built into the notions of race, progress, evolution, modernity and development as hierarchies extending in time and space” (Pieterse and Parekh 1). However, this is only part of the story and, at times, the critical discourses that examine colonial and neocolonial realities do not speak to all authors who write of these issues. As Grace notes:

[s]ometimes when I look at what people have written I know that I

⁴⁶ One can be, then, Aboriginal and (Eurocentric) Canadian separately, but one’s Aboriginal culture should not affect, in any meaningful way, definitions of contemporary national culture or lived experience.

would rather people were talking about ideas, language, or themes instead of thinking ‘now I have to find out what’s postcolonial in there.’ Because ‘postcolonial’ does not mean anything to me really... I don’t write postcolonial literature according to *me*. I am just writing what I know about and bringing creativity to bear on that. Nevertheless, I am often astounded by the scholarship and analysis. (qtd in Calleja 111)

The scholarship and analysis here often relies on postcolonial theories. However, one of the issues Grace draws attention to is the use of the term ‘postcolonial,’ a term she does not find meaningful. She also points out that postcolonial theorists, at times, fail to read her stories closely and carefully, but read for potentially ‘postcolonial’ content, inevitably finding what they are looking for rather than what the story, or Grace, seeks to offer.

King, too, argues that postcolonial theories can promote certain engagements at the expense of others. In “Godzilla vs. Post-Colonial” he contends the problem is that “colonialism” continues to be the “pivot around which we move” within the field (242). King is especially critical of the term ‘postcolonial.’ He argues that

[w]hile post-colonialism purports to be a method by which we can begin to look at those literatures which are formed out of the struggle of the oppressed against the oppressor, the colonized and the colonizer, the term itself assumes that the starting point for that discussion is the advent of Europeans in North America. At the same time, the term organizes the literature progressively, suggesting that there is both progress and improvement. (242-3)

King proposes four new terms to describe Aboriginal literature: tribal, interfusional, polemical, and associational (243).⁴⁷ According to his new terminology, the novels discussed in this project could be labelled as ‘polemical,’ in that they concern themselves “primarily with the clash of Native and non-Native cultures” (244). They could also be defined as ‘associational’ because they concentrate on “the daily activities and intricacies of Native life . . . [they] organiz[e] the elements of plot along a rather flat narrative line . . . creating a fiction that de-values heroes and villains in favour of the members of a community, a fiction that eschews judgements and conclusions” (245-6). Here, King critically negates the term post-colonial, imaginatively affirming other terminology to better represent Aboriginal stories.

King is not the only indigenous writer to critically engage postcolonial as a term; Maori critics also resist this category. In “Ko Taranaki Te Maunga: Challenging Post- colonial Disturbances and Post-modern Fragmentation,” for example, Leonie Pihama (Te Ātiawa/Nga Māhanga ā Tairi/Ngāti Māhanga) contends that few Māori people use ‘post- colonial’ and that, although “[n]umerous writers have sought to justify the use of the term . . . those justifications are unconvincing for many indigenous peoples who live day to day experiencing colonial oppression” (8). In a similar spirit, Lee Maracle (Salish/Cree) states, “[u]nless I was asleep during the revolution, we have not had a change in our condition, at least not the Indigenous people of this land” (205). Tuhiwai Smith echoes this opinion in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand: “Post-colonial can only mean one thing: the colonizers have left.

⁴⁷ For a discussion of King’s work in relation to these categories specifically, see Marta Dvorak’s article, “The Discursive Strategies of Native Literature: Thomas King’s shift from adversarial to interfusional” (2002).

There is rather compelling evidence that this has not occurred” (24). In her recent PhD dissertation, Alice Te Punga Somerville (Te Ātiawa) arrives at this conclusion: “possibilities of bringing the Postcolonial frame into relationship with Maori writing in English seem to rest in the *anti*-colonial struggle with which many Maori writers identify. Whether scholars working in the field of Postcolonial Studies are comfortable with the substitution of the prefix ‘anti-’ for ‘post-’, in order to fix a starting point for conversation, remains to be seen” (287).⁴⁸

Spiral reading strategies *can* withstand the substitution Te Punga Somerville encourages postcolonial theorists to make, and, in fact, necessitates it, in that it focuses on the ways in which postcolonial theories open up anti-colonial possibilities. I situate my dissertation as part of the “future work towards which [her] dissertation gestures.” It demonstrates “the attention paid to texts” and discovers that “there are indeed affinities between ‘Maori’ and ‘Postcolonial’” (270). However, I acknowledge here that much of the foundational work of postcolonial studies, including that of Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin in *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) and *The Postcolonial Studies Reader* (1995), tends to focus on the binary relationships between the imperial centre and the colonial margin, between European and (white) settlers. Within early critical conceptualizations of the field, as Te Punga Somerville asserts, “[t]he way in which Postcolonial Studies talks about Oceania is that it (generally) doesn’t” (278).

In the Canadian context, Julia Emberley points to a similar lack critical

⁴⁸ Te Punga Somerville here echoes the earlier claim of Merata Mita, who states “I have dismantled the frame of reference further, and in my construct – post-colonialism, which denotes passivity has become anti- colonialism, which is a truer description of what influences the arts and politic of the Māori world” (37).

engagement with Aboriginal cultures within postcolonial discourses. She states:

postcolonialism in Canadian literary studies has tended to keep Euro-Canadian or ‘settler’ literature at the centre of its critical inquiry – as if the contradictions of the colonial encounter inhere primarily between English or French Canada and Britain, France, or other European nations – it must be continually pointed out that colonization and imperialism had its greatest and most detrimental impact on indigenous societies . . . The tensions between settler cultures and indigenous nations must also be written; otherwise, the notion of a ‘postcolonial’ nation that has exceeded its colonial history becomes nothing more than an extraordinary fiction. (*Defamiliarizing the Aboriginal* xiv)

Spiral reading strategies acknowledge these tensions within colonial and neocolonial discourses, bringing these into relation with the “factors (sovereignty traditions, community, process, and so on)” that Robert Allen Warrior (Osage) argues must also be held “in tension while attempting to understand the role of critics in an American Indian future” (118).⁴⁹ By refusing a linear trajectory and insisting on careful, relational reading, spiral reading strategies plot multiple texts as sites of tension in which cultural conflicts that must be worked through. King and Grace begin this process by critically engaging these tensions in their work, unpacking many ways in which Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand continue to perpetuate (neo)colonial (hi)stories.

⁴⁹ Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee) heralds Warrior’s *Tribal Secrets* as the first text of in an emergent body of work that critically engages with the ways in which Native peoples “intellectually engage with their own texts, but also their right to do so *on their own terms*” (210, original emphasis).

In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin posit that “indigenous peoples of ‘settled’ colonies, or ‘First Nations,’ have in many ways become the *cause célèbre* of post-colonialism. No other group seems so completely to earn the position of colonized group, so unequivocally to demonstrate the processes of imperialism at work” (214). Te Punga Somerville disagrees with this distinction in relation to Maori in particular; however, she also stresses that this statement “fails to recognize that Indigenous people are not interested in competing for ‘worst oppressed’ and have never mobilized along those lines” (274). Indeed, a reading of several key indigenous theorists locating themselves in Aboriginal and Maori contexts reveals that, while oppression remains a central theme in many ways, the shared focus is on what Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee) identifies as the “liberating potential of our Indigenous histories and experiences, not a blanket rejection of Eurowestern ideas and traditions” (8). Indigenous histories and theories play a central role in the critical engagements associated with the works of King and Grace throughout this project; Aboriginal and Māori critical engagements will be highlighted within the chapters of this project. What is important to note at the outset, however, is that indigenous theorists are not, generally, averse to their theories being read in relation to other theoretical paradigms, provided these readings centre a relational-processual paradigm.

For example, Justice’s theoretical engagements with Cherokee literary history represent a “Cherokee-centred intellectual and ethical challenge” to stories that have silenced Cherokee voices. However, he argues that “to say ‘Indian first’ is not to say ‘Indian only.’ Indigenous nationhood is distinguished from Eurowestern nationalism

by its concern for respectful, relational connection; so, too, is the best of Indigenous scholarship” (152). Te Punga Somerville contends, conversely, that “an *engagement* with comparative work need not be understood as a *dis-engagement* from a Maori critical methodology” (5). In her dissertation, Te Punga Somerville argues that her critical engagements are “Maori-centric [in that] the project *itself* is conducted from a Maori location” (5). This does not preclude her excellent discussion of comparative critical frames. As Justice also notes, privileging indigenous perspectives does not exclude other voices:

To privilege Indian perspectives in discourses by and about Indians isn’t to claim that those perspectives exist in a vacuum, or that they’re disconnected from historical and cultural influences beyond one’s own nation(s); it is, however, to insist on the ethical repositioning of Indian voices from the margins of that discourse firmly to the center” (Justice 212).

The focus in this dissertation on inside-out perspectives, including those represented by Grace, King, and multiple indigenous theorists, centres indigenous voices in relation to indigenous subjectivities.

In an important recent work entitled *The Third Space of Sovereignty*, Kevin Bruyneel argues that many attempts to negotiate indigenous subjectivities in relation to the Nation – and here he is speaking in particular about the United States context – lack “an analytical entry point around which different approaches could converge to speak across disciplinary boundaries” (xiii). In order to establish this point of entry, Bruyneel focuses on “boundaries” within “relationships”: “specifically, these are the

spatial boundaries around territory and legal and political institutions and the temporal boundaries around the narratives of economic and political development, cultural progress, and modernity” (xiii). He acknowledges the actions of “indigenous political actors [who] work across ... spatial and temporal boundaries” to create and maintain what he calls a

‘third space of sovereignty’ that resides neither simply inside nor outside the American political system but rather exists on these very boundaries, exposing both the practices and contingencies of American colonial rule. This is a supplemental space, inassimilable to the institutions and discourse of the modern liberal democratic settler-state and nation. (xvii)

Bruyneel acknowledges his indebtedness to postcolonial theories in general, and Bhabha in particular, arguing that this field of criticism is “very helpful, and uniquely so, in the effort to uncover and theorize the active cultural and political life occurring in the interstitial, in-between, neither-nor locations that we commonly refer to as boundaries” (xviii). I appreciate that Bruyneel takes the time to articulate that boundaries are “co-constitutive” sites in which “competing notions of political time, political space, and political identity shape the U.S. – indigenous relationship” (xix). His recognition of hybridity and the ways in which Bhabha’s concept of the Third space works in relation to indigenous sovereignty within the American context represents an important contribution to the intersecting fields of indigenous and postcolonial studies.

As should be reiterated here, my spiral reading strategies also promote the

intersection of indigenous studies with postcolonial critical discourses, as I include the work of key postcolonial critics, including Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, and Gayatri Spivak. I read their work in relation to both indigenous literatures and what Marie Battiste, a Mi'kmaq educator from Potlo'tek First Nations, calls "postcolonial Indigenous thought . . . based on our pain and our experiences." Although Battiste "rejects the use of any Eurocentric theory or its categories" (xix), spiral reading strategies create 'co-constitutive' sites that include indigenous thought on its own terms, and reads various discourses in relation to one another. With Brydon, I classify "postcolonialism not as a Eurocentric theory but as a hybrid and emergent discourse struggling with the legacies of Eurocentrism" ("Canada" 57). As a result, my spiral reading of the 'postcolonial' fits in with Battiste's 'indigenous thinking' of the term: it "describe[s] a symbolic strategy for shaping a desirable future, not an existing reality" (xix).

Katja Sarkowsky articulates a compelling way out of the endless debates about "whether or how postcolonial theories provide an appropriate framework for a literary analysis of Native Literature in Canada . . . [she] would like to pose the question the other way around: what do the specific situations of First Nations writing and the strategies employed in contemporary Native texts mean for the formulation of theories that explicitly refer to a postcolonial national literature like Canada's?" The answer, she states, "means examining the challenge that First Nations writing poses to postcolonial literary theories and addressing the need to reformulate the central concepts in postcolonial theorizing" (87). Spiral reading strategies include the challenges Aboriginal and Maori writers/critics formulate in relation to both

neocolonial and postcolonial discourses. In his seminal work on 4th world literatures and politics in New Zealand and the United States, *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*, Chadwick Allen asserts that “it is time for indigenous peoples themselves to define the terms of the discourses used to describe them as individuals and communities, as well as the terms of the discourses used to circumscribe their efforts to assert themselves as distinct social, economic, and political entities” (216).⁵⁰ Spiral reading strategies cast postcolonialism itself within a relational and processual paradigm recognizing these indigenous terms.

Placing Myself on the Spiral: An autobiographical note

As Thomas King points out numerous times in *The Truth about Stories*, “the truth about stories is that’s all we are.” I agree that it is important to place oneself carefully in relation to one’s work.

Stories have always been important to me, and I have always been aware of their power. I am a first generation Canadian whose Dutch family, on both sides, immigrated to Canada because of their shared ‘stories’ of this nation. This was the country that provided a safe haven for the Dutch Royal family during World War II, the country that liberated Holland from occupation at the close of that same war. My Oma still talks about the brave, selfless Canadian men throwing chocolate bars as they rode into her little village in armored vehicles, bringing the end of the war with them. And then there were so many untold stories, gaps created when my childhood

⁵⁰ For an excellent engagement with comparative (America) Aboriginal and Māori identity politics, see Allen’s *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts* (2002). Here, Allen engages with the interrelated concepts of blood, land and memory.

questions were either answered flippantly or dismissed.

These stories of the war figured prominently in my family stories. Some made me aware of the power of stories of resistance: my great-Opa was hanged in a Nazi death camp for publishing a resistance newspaper in his barn. Others showed me the power of stories of shared humanity. For example, my Opa was also sent to a death camp, but he managed to escape. Although he seldom spoke about his experiences in the camp, the story of the German family who hid him from the Nazi soldiers is a key part of my family history – in fact, my father went to visit the children of this family recently, pointing out that he, born after the war, would not have children of his own if he did not have this story to tell.

I have sought to fill in some of the gaps of my family story over time, and part of that process has included looking hard at the larger story of Canada, the place I have always called home. In teaching Canadian Literature, I focus on the stories of our nation, pointing out that the concept of the nation itself is one built on stories; as I state in the opening lines of this thesis, Canada is a ‘recited society.’ Since I was a child, official discourses about Canada have focussed on multiculturalism and inclusion, which line up with the stories I was told of my home as a child. It was only in university that I began to question these stories, and recognize that not all members of our society have the same story of this Canadian home. A move to Aotearoa New Zealand as a Commonwealth Scholar confirmed that the ‘common wealth’ of our shared colonial (hi)stories ensured some shared issues of disempowerment.

This recited society has enabled me, as a white Canadian woman, to have, for the most part, easy access to deciding how to define my own cultural subjectivity in

relation to earlier places and to my current location in Orillia, Ontario, Canada. I teach at Lakehead University – Orillia campus in an interdisciplinary program that promotes inquiry-based learning. Here, I often find myself reminding students that, as King notes, “[s]tories are wondrous things. And they are dangerous... So you have to be careful with the stories you tell. And you have to watch out for the stories that you are told” (*Truth about Stories* 22). I do not take for granted my role as a teacher-storyteller, and as a learner-listener. In many ways, this dissertation represents one of my attempts to negotiate the interrelationships between the two.

This negotiation involves placing my own critical voice in relation to those of Thomas King, Patricia Grace, and indigenous and postcolonial theorists. In this complex contrapuntal reading, I recognize, as Said notes, that I, as a critical reader, “must connect the structures of a narrative to the ideas, concepts, and experiences from which it draws support” (*Culture* 67). Justice states emphatically: “no Native scholar I know has ever said that non-Natives don’t have a place in the study of Indian people, but most of us have insisted that such a place be earned through respect, not presumed through the unreflective exercise of privilege” (217). I do not deny that my position represents one of privilege within Canada, and as a PhD student and Commonwealth scholar in Aotearoa New Zealand. This dissertation represents, in many ways, an extensive reflective exercise respectfully structured to enable, first and foremost, critical engagements with the voices of two key indigenous authors who draw support from their cultural subject positions to set up and maintain the terms on which their stories should be read.

Following the Spiral: Histories unfold

This thesis moves through discourses associated with creation stories and the creation of stories more generally, imperialism, neocolonial tourism, and pluralism in spiral fashion. All five chapters deal with one of two interrelated themes central to Eurocentric stories and their definitions of indigenous cultures within the colony and Nation: assimilation and integration. These concepts are interrelated, as they both pertain to placing indigenous cultures within the culture of the nation in various ways. Eurocentric notions of assimilation and integration begin with the premise that indigenous cultures should be located in relation to the nation on the terms of dominant, white culture. King and Grace respond to these different ways of locating indigenous cultures in various ways.

In Chapter One, I explore how King and Grace ‘world’ cultural location through creation stories. They critically negate biblical and Eurocentric stories and imaginatively affirm the relational-processual paradigm to open up new textual spaces where relationships between cultures can be negotiated. After establishing this paradigm using their stories, I read Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) as a discourse strategically promoting early colonial worldviews that are at odds with those found in King’s and Grace’s stories. The worldviews set up in *Utopia* are at odds with those focused on in King’s and Grace’s texts, yet King and Grace feel compelled to engage with the coding and expectations set up by colonial discourse. More’s attention to detail – and a reading of his text in relation to the works of Grace and King – enables a critical unpacking of the systematic nature of Eurocentric constructions of hierarchical power and ‘colonizable’ peoples and places. If *Utopia* is read as a larger

metaphor for the monolithic nature of colonial governmentality, King and Grace – read in relation – challenge this monolith through elements of their stories. This first chapter, then, not only defines key terminology in relation to the thesis as a whole, but demonstrates the application of spiral reading strategies in relation to the individual stories they bring together.

In Chapters Two and Three, I move on to read King's and Grace's works in relation to larger discourses, (re)mapping colonial assimilationist space and the roots/routes of progress. Both of these chapters are concerned, primarily, with assimilation. The first focuses on colonial mapping, which leads to the assimilation of the spaces that would become Canada and New Zealand into the Empire. The second focuses on the ways in which indigenous peoples were expected to assimilate into the emergent place of the Nation. Both Grace and King deal directly and indirectly with these issues in their novels, and I begin with their work, reading it in relation to indigenous and postcolonial theoretical concepts.

In Chapter Four, I examine King's and Grace's engagements with neocolonial tourism as an expression of integration in which indigenous cultures perform indigeneity. This represents a shift from the focus on assimilation into national culture, as these sites are premised on separation of indigenous culture from others within the Nation. This sets up Chapter Five, where I address the integrationist paradigms of multiculturalism and biculturalism within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Both Grace and King address the site of the contemporary nation in different ways within their texts.

The novels discussed in this thesis respond to other (hi)stories emerging

between the mid-1980s and late 1990s, an important period in which to examine the discursive formations of both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Since the end of World War II, both Canadian and New Zealand government policy shifted toward ‘integration,’ which included the retention of ‘folkloric culture’ within dominant systems of power. Official government policies emerging in the late 1950s and early 1960s culminated in the Hunn Report in New Zealand (1960) and the White Paper in Canada (1969). These documents recast thinly-veiled assimilation as integration, as minority indigenous peoples were expected to integrate *into* majority national systems of law and government.

Indigenous peoples responded dynamically, and in Aotearoa New Zealand this historical moment is tied to ‘the Māori Renaissance’: “the remarkable flowering of Māori expression in the arts in the period since 1970,” to which Grace contributed through her writing (Williams “Māori” 2).⁵¹ Politically, it was a time of unrest, with the Māori Land March (1975) putting land issues firmly on the agenda, and the seventeen-month occupation of Bastion Point (1977-8) keeping them there. By the 1980s, failed negotiations of the ‘Māori New Zealander’ catachresis brought the nation to crisis. In 1981, “a bitterly contested tour of New Zealand by the South African rugby team forced the country to confront its own tolerance of racism and brought New Zealand closer to a mood of civil war than it had been since the Land Wars” (Lamb 96). Neocolonial discourses could no longer envision Māori cultures from the outside-in within the emergent political location Aotearoa New Zealand. Many Māori were actively negotiating their subjectivity in relation to the location of

⁵¹ According to Mark Williams, “One of the distinguishing features of the Māori Renaissance has been a readiness to colonise (or counter-colonise) existing European forms such as the novel and short story and turn them to non-European purposes.”

their Nation, legally and otherwise.

As articulated in Canada's White Paper (1969), the Canadian government planned to remove the legal concept of indigenous peoples and dissolve the custodial relationship between the government and Aboriginal Canadians in the early 1970s. Many viewed this policy as so overtly assimilationist that it was equated with "cultural genocide" (Fleras and Elliot 204).⁵² Another document—the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969)—raised questions about the place of minority rights and cultures in Canadian political discourse with its emphasis on a French-English bilingual framework. The National Indian Brotherhood—an inter-tribal organization for status Indians—and other minority groups were established to put pressure on the government to address minority rights and, in the case of Aboriginal groups, land issues. The federal government responded in the 1970s with discourses 'Celebrating Differences' through the 'folkloric' inclusion of culture in Canadian Multiculturalism.⁵³ Aboriginal writers responded with a cultural renaissance of their own.⁵⁴

In the mid-1980s to late 1990s, 'official' Canadian multiculturalism and New Zealand biculturalism became the dominant forms structuring cultural relations. In 1971, Canada became the first country in the world to adopt an official multiculturalism policy, and this policy became law through its inclusion in the

⁵² The "White Paper" (1969) "proposed abolishing reserves, removing the special status of Indians, and integrating them into Canadian society as individual citizens, thus threatening to enforce an assimilation always underpinning aboriginal policy" (Pearson 109). Dale Turner argues that the White Paper embodied and supported "White Paper liberalism" due to its reliance on Eurocentric political discourses promoting "the individual as the fundamental moral unit of a theory of justice" (13). For more on Turner's productive engagement with the White Paper and its affect on future political discourses in Canada, see *This is Not a Peace Pipe* (2006).

⁵³ For an excellent general overview of evolving discourses of Canadian Multiculturalism, see Fleras and Elliot's *Unequal Relations* (319-61)

⁵⁴ See Thomas King's "Native Literature in Canada" (358-64).

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) and the Constitution Act (1982). The latter passed without Aboriginal approval, however, and this would lead to further unrest into the 1990s. Meanwhile, in Aotearoa New Zealand in the 1980s, the government began “to incorporate bicultural values into Māori policy” (Pearson 120), and Māori themselves increased efforts to teach Māori language through Te Kohanga Reo, Māori language nests. The State-owned Enterprises Act (1986) finally enshrined the Treaty of Waitangi into law, making negotiation between Māori and Pākehā part of the legal framework of New Zealand.

Negotiation is not a given, however. Although multiculturalism and biculturalism appear to perpetuate partnerships between the many cultures in Canada and Māori and Pākehā cultures in New Zealand, as will be discussed at length in Chapter Five, they often conceive of indigenous folkloric culture from the outside-in. As a result, these pluralist discursive formations can regenerate the catachreses of ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘Māori New Zealander.’

In our contemporary historical moment, Brydon asserts that settler-invader societies must begin “rethinking the categories of citizenship” while recognizing that the “political will and imagination necessary to diagnose and remedy [many societal problems], as well as the obstacles preventing such action, [are] partly, if not largely, cultural in their formation” (“Canada” 53, 69). I focus on the novels of King and Grace to envision Aboriginal and Māori cultures as foundational to reconceptualizations of Canadian and New Zealand citizenship. By arguing for the rethinking of cultural subjectivity as necessarily negotiating relations with the *evolving* location of the Nation, I work toward a new concept of indigenous

citizenship that negotiates historical connections to the land in relation to contemporary placements in the Nation.

Grace's and King's works envision Māori and Aboriginal indigenous cultures as they relate to place by imaginatively affirming cultural subjectivity and critically negating Eurocentric discourses from the inside-out to re/cite the stories of Canada and New Zealand. My spiral reading strategies highlight the ways in which these novels challenge the discursive formations of the Nation, and create locations for Māori and Aboriginal cultures beyond those delineated in imperialist, tourist-oriented, and pluralist discourses.

As I will discuss further in the coming chapters, although their stories and approaches are at times quite different, both King and Grace create worlds premised on All My Relations and whakapapa from inside-out perspectives that affirm indigenous cultural location in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada. Their stories, read on the spiral, act contrapuntally as a critical lens, that focuses on relational-processual worldviews and on evolving, empowering stories of 'Canadian Aboriginal' and 'New Zealand Māori' citizenship.

CHAPTER ONE

Re/creating Cultures: Beginning with Inside-out

Perspectives and Spiral Reading Strategies

*This process of decolonization and reinvention of tradition, place, and polity [...is] the twofold process we are calling the 'creative dialectic' of decreation and recreation: critical negation (shedding a mentality bred under conditions of colonialism) and imaginative affirmation (redefining 'cultural identities') can be seen to work together, by polemical turns, in the same imaginative project. (Rob Wilson in "Introduction," *Inside Out: Literature Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*).*

*Memory is not just associated with past history, past events, past stories, but is non linear, as in future and ongoing history, events and stories. And it changes" (Joy Harjo in *The Spiral of Memories*).*

*For me, the post in postcolonial does not just mean after; it also means around, through, out of, alongside, and against. (Albert Wendt in "Introduction," *Nuanua: Pacific Writing in English Since 1980*).*

Space and place are central to indigenous stories, and any discussion of the location of Aboriginal and Māori stories must begin with or return to these key concepts. In *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre argues that societies produce place using certain sets of codes.¹ Generally, dominant cultures encode 'space' as 'place' (Tuan), and this thesis engages discourses that create colonial and neocolonial places. Such work often falls under the rubric of 'postcolonial theory', and although spiral reading strategies employed here do involve postcolonial critiques, this chapter does not begin with an extended focus on this theoretical perspective. Instead, it

¹ Reading Lefebvre reminds us of the complexity of the negotiation of space, as Lefebvre is concerned with unpacking specific coding system that enable this process to occur. I discuss the work of Lefebvre in relation to that of Yi-Fu Tuan, who offers a useful distinction between 'space' and 'place' in *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (1977). He argues that "space" is "abstract," whereas "place" is known to those who have power and control within it, those able to "endow it with value" on their own terms (6).

foregrounds the inside-out perspectives of both King and Grace, enacting Wilson's "creative dialectic" of decreation and recreation" in reverse order (see epigraph).

In this chapter, I will focus on two creation stories, one from Grace's *Potiki* and another from King's *Green Grass, Running Water*. These creation stories, read in counterpoint, show us alternative models of culture and relocate 'Māori' and 'Aboriginal' in relation to 'Aotearoa New Zealand' and 'Canada'. They both imaginatively affirm their relational-processual paradigms and critically negate colonial and neocolonial discursive formations. These creation stories create textual speaking places, or *turangawaewae*, from which their inside-out perspectives accommodate shifting Aboriginal and Māori codes and challenge Eurocentric discourses' denial of indigenous agency.

In his critical work, Lefebvre is searching for a different set of spatial codes from the dominant, Eurocentric one which forces things to be encoded separately and systematically. He posits that the "first thing that [an alternative] code would do is recapture the unity of dissociated elements" ("State" 64). Spiral reading strategies recognize that *All My Relations* and *whakapapa* recapture this unity by relocating cultures in complex, ambivalent spaces and amalgamated, hybrid places. Grace and King use inside-out perspectives in dual processes of imaginatively affirming Māori and Aboriginal cultures and critically negating colonialism and neocolonialism. After reading their stories contrapuntally and in relation with selected indigenous and postcolonial theories, I will turn to a sixteenth-century colonial work of fiction – Thomas More's *Utopia* – to demonstrate that the relational-processual paradigm set up by King and Grace offers new ways to engage texts critically. The spiral reading

strategies allow King's and Grace's work to be read not only as 'imaginatively affirming' indigenous locations within their texts, but also as critically negating relationships between Aboriginal and Māori cultures and the space of the Nation within *and beyond* their own novels. Their novels – read in relation to postcolonial and indigenous theories – offer important avenues through which to critically engage other texts.

This approach puts into practice spiral ready strategies, and answers Blaeser's call, identified in my introduction, to look "within the Native [and, I add, Māori] literature[s] or tradition[s] to discover appropriate tools to form an appropriate language of critical discourse" (56). Here, I turn to the creation stories of King and Grace for the tools and the language they use within their critical discourses. I recognize, as King does, that "writers themselves are constantly in the process of changing the critical ground that they stand on" and I should recognize them as critics (King qtd in Snowden and Todorova). What emerges from this particular reading of the worlds they create and the ways in which they create them is a focus on inside-out perspectives and the emergence of Aboriginal and Māori cultures as both relational and in process.

Eurocentric discourses attempt to contain indigenous cultures in a static past, but these creation stories remind us not only of the important relationship between space and stories, but also that "landscapes and times can never be 'out there': they are always subjective" (Bender 103). Places are created by the historically-situated stories that are told about them, whether they are political, economic, social, or cultural, and Eurocentric stories have, historically, relied on a paradigm at odds with the relational-

processual one.² The politicization of time and space in ways that can support emergent engagements with the stories of the Nation beyond Eurocentric constructions is essential. Bryuneel's definition of 'political time' as "the narratives of struggle, development, and transformation through which a people historically positions itself or is positioned by others as a form of coherent collective identity", and 'political space' as "the lived and envisioned territorial, institutional, and cultural location through which a people situates its past, present, and future as a political identity" enable his recognition of 'third space of sovereignty' (xix). This results in a postcolonial "vocabulary that both captures and helps to constitute a viable, increasingly sought-after location of indigenous postcolonial autonomy that refuses the choices set out by the settler-society" (218).

As Harjo points out, within the space of the Nation, contemporary memory has the power to join the past with 'ongoing history', which, in turn 'always changes' (see epigraph). How, then, do King and Grace enact subjectivity in relation to the changing locations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively? How do they negotiate the relationships between place and cultural agency? To answer these questions, I show how Grace's opening to *Potiki* sets up codes through which she creates a discourse that can be related to a larger discursive formation. I will then contrast Grace's codes with those adopted by King, demonstrating how each of their different discourses reinforce a shared relational-processual paradigm which challenges colonial and neocolonial epistemologies. This close contrapuntal reading of King's and

² I resist the urge here to outline the nature of that paradigm in great detail as, again, this will shift the focus to Eurocentric worldviews and colonial texts, whereas I seek to begin with the texts of King and Grace as they create the 'worlds' of their texts here. This initial focus is central to my spiral reading strategies, as it unsettles a postcolonial focus on Eurocentric discourse.

Grace's stories of creation is the core of the spiral. It forms the space and sets up the terms on which indigenous and postcolonial theories relate. I then extend the spiral, demonstrating how its strategies can be used to critically engage a colonial text, ultimately exposing and offering ways to negotiate catachrestic citizenship.

Patricia Grace begins *Potiki* with a story of creation that imaginatively affirms and “redefine[es] ‘cultural identities’” (Wilson 4) as they relate to Māori epistemologies.

From the centre
 From the nothing,
 Of not seen,
 Of not heard,
 There comes
 A shifting,
 A stirring,
 And a creeping forward,
 There comes a standing
 A springing
 To an outer circle,
 There comes an intake of breath –
 Tihei Mauriora (7)³

This breath gives life to *Potiki*, a novel consciously structured as a *whaikōrero*.⁴ These

³ These lines constitute the Prologue. “Tihei Mauriora’ translates as the “sneeze” of “life principle” (Reed 60, 29).

are the opening lines of the tauparapara—the words designed to draw the audience into the oration. In “Influences on Writing,” Grace explains that she used this “pattern of *whaikōrero* for the shape of *Potiki* . . . to give circular shape suitable to the storytelling content of the book and to reflect the way that talk moves in a circular fashion inside the meeting house” (72). The circular pattern mimics a spiral, which is why it forms the basis for my reading strategies. The reading spiral moves through the novel and challenges various discursive systems throughout. The novel’s opening, therefore, sets up dialogue on Grace’s terms.⁵ Spiral reading strategies recognize these terms as foundational to the tools and language of critical discourse.

Grace’s employment of this technique could be read as a move against Maori tradition, as *whaikōrero* are generally delivered by men. According to Poia Rewi (Ngāi Tūhoe/Ngāti Manawa/Te Arawa), New Zealand historian Cleve Barlow’s definition of *whaikōrero* as “formal speech-making . . . performed by male elders on the *marae* and at social gatherings” is only “useful as a starting point” and is inadequate in regards to the practice’s scope and importance within Maoridom. According to Rewi, the “boundaries of this belief system span from one horizon to the next, and its philosophies originate from the beginning of time with links to the present, and encompass Māori and non- Māori words and the evolution that continues to take place within, between and around them” (10). Rewi connects the origins of

⁴ A *whaikōrero* is a speech (Reed 70). According to Poia Rewi, “[i]t is often assumed that the word . . . is derived from a combination of ‘*whai*’, meaning ‘to follow’, and ‘*kōrero*’, meaning ‘to speak’. According to Te Wharehuia Milroy, the word ‘*whaikōrero*’ may also simply mean having something to say, that is ‘*whai*’ (meaning ‘to be in possession of something’) and ‘*kōrero*’ (meaning ‘to speak’)” (16).

⁵ According to Grace, “*Potiki* is set out like a *whaikōrero*, a piece of oratory, and a formal piece of oratory has a format to it. It will often have at its beginning a chat, tauparapara it’s called, something that brings the attention towards the speaker. And then we have the greetings. Then will come the body or main part of the speech and at the end there will often be ‘Ka Huri’ to turn over to another next speaker or to the next storyteller to tell his/her story” (114, interview with Paloma Fresno Calleja). ‘Māori’ here should not be read as essentializing, as every speech is affected by individual contexts.

whaikōrero to the Māori creation story, and indicates that this practice enables negotiations of the world. By incorporating this particular practice into her novel, Grace begins her story on specific terms associated with Māori culture.

Although the novel is a “quintessentially Western invention,” as Vijay Mishra and Bob Hodge point out in *Dark Side of the Dream*, Grace uses her inside-out perspective to make this genre her own, setting up the novel as a dialogic space reflecting oral storytelling traditions.⁶ Mark Williams contends that “the shape of the novel Grace makes is not purely traditional, it is something new. . . . That is to say, she has written a novel, a European- derived literary form, but in a way that expresses a sense of the world, the past, culture, community, and spirituality that is quite alien to that which we find in most European novels” (8). How, then, to read this opening to the novel, this whaikōrero?

In her introduction to *The Circle and the Spiral*, Knudsen offers a compelling dual reading of this text with which I largely agree. She argues that “the centre” in the opening line is “that of the first circle in the spiral of human cognition” and that the second line “alludes to a particular Māori interest in nothingness as the realm of potential waiting and pressing for its own fulfillment” (3). Knudsen goes on to unpack the text in relation to Māori epistemologies, much in the same way I read this opening section. She acknowledges the Māori belief in ‘Te Kore’⁷, the opening stage of the spiral of creation. The void represents potential. The secondary stage of

⁶For a recent comparative discussion on some of the key aspects of the oral traditions in both Canada and New Zealand see Elvira Pulitano’s article, “Writing in the Oral Tradition: Reflections on the Indigenous Literatures of Australia, New Zealand, and North America.”

⁷Literally translated, this mean ‘the’ ‘not’ (Reed 22, 58). Knudsen translates this as “The Void, an original nothingness of silence and invisibility in which nothing moved and nothing was seen or heard” (3).

creation is also reflected in Grace's text: Te Pō⁸, a chaotic darkness out of which the world slowly comes into existence. In recognizing the “shifting,” “stirring,” and “springing” as this slow progression, Knudsen insists on a “Maori noetic” and its “particular Maori interest in ‘nothingness’ as the realm of potential waiting and pressing for its own fulfillment” (3).

By beginning *Potiki* in this way, Grace imaginatively affirms Māori epistemologies, placing Māori ideas of Te Kore at the centre. However, this ‘centre’ does not contain or limit culture; rather, it is a space of potential from which to begin. This centre enables movement – it is an initial location enabling “A springing,/To an outer circle” – and this movement precipitates the “intake/Of breath” necessary for “Tihei Mauriora” (7). This reflects Māori stories of creation, as “‘Te Po’ gave birth to Papatuanuku (Mother Earth) and Ranginui (Father Sky), who fostered – in their serene, close, and dark embrace – an offspring of deities who separated their parents to let darkness fulfil its potential and become light. Thus emerged ‘Te Ao Marama’ (the World of Light)” (Knudsen 4).⁹

Grace sets up a series of codes concerning the creation and negotiation of space in this passage, and as a result she constructs a textual location that enables cultural agency. In effect, her coding turns what Tuan calls a ‘space’ into a ‘place.’ In *Space and Time*, Tuan’s distinction between space and place offers a useful way to engage Grace’s approaches to cultural location and placement. According to Tuan, “space” is “more abstract than ‘place’”. What begins as undifferentiated space

⁸ Although Knudsen does not accent ‘Te Po,’ I follow Reed here. Note also that this word has many interrelated meanings, including “night; chaos, darkness; place of the dead” (Reed 42).

⁹ Knudsen’s bracketed translation must be augmented with Reed’s interrelated definition of mārama: “natural light; understood: clear” (Reed 27). ‘Te ao’ maintains the focus on light, translating as the “bright; cloud; dawn; day-time” and “world” (Reed 3).

becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value” (6). The social systems differentiating space, as it becomes place, determine cultural agency, in that – although space does connote “freedom” – place self-validates (Tuan 6). Grace’s whaikōrero demonstrates the cultural agency of the Māori speaker, and the ways in which spaces – textual or otherwise – contain the potential of ‘Te Kore’. The location in this particular text is transformed into a place that can be understood and known by readers willing to engage with it on the terms Grace sets up. The relationships between ‘space’ and ‘place’, ‘Te Kore’ and ‘Te Po’, are dynamic and interactive. Grace’s ability to code ‘culture’ affects social systems, and enables her to negotiate spaces and create places on her own terms.

In the initial section discussed here and throughout the stories in *Potiki*, Grace affirms Māori cultures as both relational and processual. She uses the spiral, or koru, explicitly to symbolize the process of storytelling itself which, from her inside-out perspective, is not linear or chronological, but rather a “curving out from points on the spiral in ever-widening circles from which neither beginnings nor endings [can] be defined” (*Potiki* 41). The opening whaikōrero sets up this textual location, and the stories fit into the resulting spiral emerging from Te Kore:

Gradually the stories were built upon, or they changed. . . . And although the stories all had different voices, and came from different times and places and understandings, though some were shown, enacted, or written rather than told, each one was like a puzzle piece which tongued or grooved neatly to another. And this train of stories defined our lives.

(41)

Stories work together, demonstrating a negotiation of spaces that (re)creates Māori places. These changing stories define Māori cultures as dynamic and capable of creating multiple and various future stories defining ‘Māori’ in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand.¹⁰

This ability to enact agency – to negotiate spaces and recreate places – can be associated with what Bhabha calls “cultural difference.”¹¹ When cultural locations are empowering speaking places, cultural agents can act on the world in a way that is recognized as “knowledgeable, authoritative, adequate to the construction of systems of cultural identification” (*Location* 34). This requires the ability to present inside-out perspectives through stories. According to Hirini Melbourne (Ngāi Tuhoe/Ngāti Kahungunu), Māori writers must “decolonize the mind” and “reorient [it] so that the indigenous traditions and ways of thinking are central and no longer peripheral or denigrated” (132-3).¹² Melbourne contends that Māori writers must create place; they must “build a whare whakairo where [their] links to the past, as well as the future, can be made certain” (140).¹³ This textual place mirrors aspects of turangawaewae, as the whare whakairo is “a place where knowledge is stored and transmitted and where the links with one’s past are made tangible” (133). Expressions of cultural difference

¹⁰ Here the Māori conceptualizations of Te Kore are highlighted, and, unlike in *Green Grass, Running Water*, there are no direct references to the biblical creation story. This is not to undermine the importance of critical negation—biblical stories are challenged in this story through Toko’s parents, Mary and Joe-Billy, whose names allude to the Virgin Mary and Joseph, for example. However, negation is not the focus in Grace’s creation of textual place at the outset of this novel.

¹¹ Bhabha sets up “cultural difference” in direct opposition to “cultural diversity,” a term I introduced in the Introduction. “Cultural diversity” relies on “the recognition of pre-given cultural ‘contents’ and customs, held in a time-frame of relativism” (“Cultural” 206).

¹² Although Melbourne sets up alternatives in this article, his primary concern is for the empowerment of the Māori language. He argues that “only when Maori writers can rely upon there being a sizeable body of readers in the Maori language will Maori culture truly be able to assert its independence” (129). However, in the interim, he seeks to find solutions to encourage the recognition of Māori literary traditions through the image of the meeting house. I return to this discussion at the close of Chapter Four.

¹³ Whare is defined as a house (Reed 75). “Whakairo” is not defined by Reed, but Melbourne discusses it as a carved ceremonial house that is a “symbol of cultural unity, a place of shelter and peace” (133).

and creations of place, then, map whakapapa in order to establish fluid Māori locations. This set of codes affirms a relational-processual paradigm central to Grace's work.

With her beginning to *Potiki*, Grace locates Māori culture as relational and always in process. In fact, both Elizabeth Deloughrey and Bridget Orr posit that Grace constructs her novels using the wharenuī¹⁴ as a governing metaphor, and her opening whaikōrero supports their arguments.¹⁵ Through Roimata's narrative voice in *Potiki*, Grace articulates a metonymic connection between the wharenuī and the places produced by stories: "our main book was the wharenuī which itself is a story, a history, a gallery, a study, a design structure and a taonga. And we are part of that book along with family past and family yet to come" (104).¹⁶ In producing a place embodying whakapapa, the wharenuī gives form to Māori epistemologies; it produces a place premised on relation and reflecting spiral time.

Opening with a whaikōrero, a dialogue on Māori terms, does not promote a single story, but multiple stories to be read in relation to one another. Grace sees these stories as part of a 'train of stories' written by many people, linked to an ever-evolving network. Ihimaera also advocates multiple Māori points of view, asserting that there

are many histories. . . . Each iwi, each hapu has a different or, rather, tribal, approach to their histories which are more parallel observations having parallel facts and parallel perceptions on the same factual events.

¹⁴ Nui is defined as both "large [and] public" (Reed 33). The wharenuī is common terminology for the meeting house that is the focal point of the marae, "enclosed ground used as a meeting place" (Reed 27). This meeting place is traditionally carved with artistic representations of whakapapa.

¹⁵ I will discuss these articles in depth in Chapter 4.

¹⁶ Taonga include "possessions; valuables" (Reed 55).

These are further informed by the holistic frameworks of the unreal as well as the real. (“A Maori Perspective” 53-4)

Grace uses multiple inside-out perspectives to not only set up Māori discursive ‘places,’ but also to challenge the Eurocentric history that Ihimaera insists Māori should treat with suspicion. This history “to a certain extent, still determines the shape of [their] lives”; it is a view of Māori history that is “not that of the participant, but the observer, [told] from the outside, not the inside” (Ihimaera “A Maori Perspective” 53). However, as Harjo asserts, history also has the capacity to change (see epigraph). Through enacting cultural difference and creating textual places from inside-out perspectives, Grace imaginatively affirms various Māori (hi)stories and cultural locations using her own codes on her own terms.

Grace’s Discourses: Imaginative affirmations, relational-processual archives

Grace’s stories are discourses that imaginatively affirm Māori culture and reflect relational-processual paradigms. Foucauldian terminology is useful in articulating critical engagements with her stories as ‘discourses’. Within the theoretical paradigm set up by Foucault, discourses emerge from within what he calls the “archive,” which comprises the limits and forms organizing knowledge from a specific historical perspective (Foucault, “Politics” 14-15).¹⁷ As will be discussed below, a colonial archive supports Eurocentric discourses and singular notions of truth and masks the hybridity inherent in colonial spaces. An examination of the

¹⁷ Foucault cautions that it “is not possible for us to describe our own archive, since it is from within these rules that we speak, since it is that which gives to us what to say... its modes of appearance, its forms of existence and coexistence” (qtd in Dreyfus and Rabinow 86). The question becomes, then, how can we engage theoretically with contemporary archives? It is by reading discourses and examining what is said that I begin to trace the rules limiting and enabling enunciation.

underpinnings of the term “archive” highlights the ways in which it supports not only the rules forming truth, but the perpetuation of these rules in larger discursive systems. As the editors of *ReCalling Early Canada: Reading the Political in Literary and Cultural Production* point out, the term archive hails from the Greek words *arkhe*, which means “beginning,” and *arkheion*, which refers to the “ruler’s house or public office” (xlii). As the editors explain,

from its inception, the term archive drew upon both the idea of some kind of originary and comprehensive compilation and the notion of institutional orderings of knowledge. Here, in effect, is Foucault’s two-fold description of the archive restated: both the contents of knowledge and the institutionalization of that knowledge. (Blair, Coleman, Higginson, and York xlii)

Institutionalization of archives strengthens the ability of colonial ‘rules’ to deny subjugated perspectives in the creation of cultural locations.

The archive is the set of rules that determine what can be said through discourses. According to Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace, formation, transformation, and correlation constitute Foucauldian discourses as they relate to their archives:

The [archival] rules of formation are the conditions which make possible in the first place the objects and concepts of a discourse. The rules of transformation are the limits of its capacities to modify itself, the “threshold” from which it can bring new rules ‘into play’. The rules of correlation are the “ensemble of relations” which a discourse has with other discourses at any given time and with the “nondiscursive context”

in which it finds itself. (44)

What are the rules informing the stories concerning the formation of the Nation? How do these rules relate to the opening *whaikōrero*? Do they enable a certain kind of ‘beginning,’ in each case? How do these rules correlate with work perpetuating colonial or anti-colonial perspectives?

Grace’s opening to the novel sets up a dialogue between the speaker and the listener on the terms of the Māori speaker and from the inside-out perspective. The *whaikōrero* presents the relational-processual paradigm. The rules guiding the creation of discourse, for Grace, reflect her Māori focus on *whakapapa*. Other stories in *Potiki* reflect this same set of rules, imaginatively affirming inside-out perspectives and empowering relocations of indigenous cultures in relation to the Nation. These will be discussed in detail in the remaining chapters.

To read Grace’s *whaikōrero* as a discourse with a relational-processual archive encourages the indigenous theoretical engagements outlined above. However, this does not preclude, as Knudsen would argue, a more overtly postcolonial critique of this section as well. In contrast to my spiral reading strategies, Knudsen’s critique rejects a dual reading of Grace’s opening section. According to Knudsen,

the postcolonial critic would observe – while moving the appropriate jargon into position – that these lines are spoken by the *silenced* and *othered* Maori (neither ‘seen’ nor ‘heard’) who is encapsulated by the Centre, yet *marginalized* at its physical fringes. The colonized Other now revolts against the Imperial ‘I’ who has confined the indigenous person to a subordinate position (‘the nothing’) by means of an *imperial-*

colonial nexus of power. From this emptiness comes a ‘standing,’ an active appropriation of the language and the medium of the Centre (‘a shifting, a stirring’). These actions become the tools that open up a new sense of cultural autonomy, and the Maori ‘breath of life’ can be celebrated again: ‘Tihei Mauriora.’ In other words, any critic well-acquainted with postcolonial orthodoxy but unfamiliar with Maori mythology will agree that these words refer to the conscious dismantling of the European centre. (2-3)

I disagree that a postcolonial lens would highlight only colonial and neocolonial binaries, which would then “invariably dominate a postcolonial reading of Grace’s poetic lines” (17).¹⁸ Critical negations of the “imperial-colonial nexus of power” – *alongside* imaginative affirmations of Māori discourses – promote dynamic Māori coding and challenge Eurocentrism.

Knudsen is right that, “instead of merely ‘writing back to the centre’, Aboriginal and Māori writers redefine centrality and thus find new entries into and pathways through traditional legacies” (17)¹⁹. As will be discussed below, the resulting bringing together of centre and margin envisions culture in different, hybrid ways. She fails to acknowledge, however, that both critical negation and imaginative affirmation are crucial to the inside-out perspectives Rob Wilson discusses.²⁰ In rejecting the ‘postcolonial’ reading outright, Knudsen limits the central ‘nothingness,’

¹⁸ Knudsen initially reads the opening section through a postcolonial lens, positing that “a reader or critic who is an outsider to Māori culture would not hesitate to subject Grace’s creation chant to a postcolonial reading” (7), before moving on to her ‘indigenized’ engagement.

¹⁹ ‘Aboriginal’ in Knudsen’s text refers to the indigenous peoples of Australia.

²⁰ Knudsen herself draws on Wilson’s conceptualization of inside-out perspectives throughout the introduction to her book.

and the place from which Māoritanga²¹ must ‘spring,’ to a pre-historical time in which Maoridom is in the mythological stages of becoming. From Knudsen’s perspective, the space from which the novel begins is Te Kore, the Void out of which Maoridom emerges, and from which spiral ontology originates. In a later discussion of Keri Hulme’s *The Bone People*, Knudsen recognizes that “the ancient Māori hermeneutic of human existence symbolized in the spiral motif [entails] expansion [that] inevitably leads to contraction; in any extreme lies the seed of its own opposite” (117). However, in privileging a singular reading of *Potiki*’s opening as ‘mythological,’ she denies what she presents as its theoretical ‘opposite’: the postcolonial.

By reading both indigenous and postcolonial theoretical approaches in relation to one another, spiral reading breaks down this binary opposition between the mythological and the postcolonial. As a result, postcolonial theories, read in relation to indigenous theories and epistemologies, participate in opening up indigenous epistemologies in relation to various historical and contemporary contexts. Contemporary readings, then, follow spiral reading strategies. This spiral mirrors the complex trajectory outlined by Wendt in the epigraph for this chapter. Theoretical engagements should not focus on the “*post* in postcolonial” as denoting a contemporary moment ‘after colonialism’; rather, contemporary theoretical readings should take the reader “*around, through, out of, alongside, and against*” colonial and neocolonial contexts through acknowledging imaginative affirmations of indigenous cultures and critical negations of Eurocentrism as these function in relation to one another.

²¹ Māoritanga is defined as an “explanation” or “Māori culture” (Reed 27).

Knudsen recognizes that both indigenous-centred and postcolonial readings can be theoretically supported from different critical perspectives, but she refuses to hold these readings in relation to one another. Ultimately she rejects the former ‘postcolonial’ reading in favour of the latter “indigenized”²² one. She then argues that an outside-in perspective should begin with Māori mythology (3ff), and reject a “strong focus on relationships between centre and periphery, between the European (or Western) literary canon and the ‘marginalized’ literatures that attempt to overturn it through conscious appropriation of and subversion of its forms and content” (2). This dismisses the potential significance of a postcolonial critique which recognizes a long history of Māori responses to colonial domination in Aotearoa New Zealand . Grace’s Māori discourses, reflecting relational- processual archives, encode cultural locations that can be read both in relation to Māori mythology *and* postcolonial critiques. In the places created in her texts, Grace imaginatively affirms Māori codes, but also critically negates Eurocentrism. The spatial location for culture in-text premises the “now-time centred in the being,” promoting agency within the narrative present (*Potiki* 39).²³

This narrative present locates Māori characters within present-day Aotearoa New Zealand. ‘Now-time’ does not reject historical realities, but, as Mark Williams points out, “[t]here is nothing nostalgic or sentimental about this endeavour; Grace is too intent on the difficulties of relearning and reapplying old sources of knowledge to bother about romanticising the past. Nor does she suggest that modern Māori people

²² Knudsen defines an indigenized reading as “the outsider’s attempt to read with an understanding of the indigenous perspective” (3ff)

²³ The relational spatial and temporal concept of ‘now-time’ is articulated clearly in Granny Tamihana’s waiata, “linking the earth that [they] are, to the sky that [they] are, joining the past that [they] are to the now and beyond now that [they] are” (*Potiki* 130). A waiata is a “song” (Reed 68).

should ignore the present and retreat into an idealised version of the past” (8).

Grace’s discourses encode Māori culture as both linked to ‘old sources of knowledge’ and “rooted in current economical and political conditions” of Aotearoa New Zealand (Williams 8). In a dual process, imaginative affirmation of ‘old knowledge’ in the opening section of *Potiki* links with critical negation current political and social conditions in this and other other texts.

Reading this dual process in relation to Foucault’s theoretical terminology enables me to analyze the places through which knowledge and social relations are created and maintained. In response to dominant colonial and neocolonial systems, Grace’s stories emerge as local knowledges that would be subjugated in relation to the monolithic nature of Eurocentric discourse. Thus, imaginative affirmation is a key element in continually re- producing Māori culture. Much postcolonial criticism neglects this part of the duality in favour of focusing on the “critical negation” of colonial systems of power. This perpetuates colonial power relations and limits Māori agency.²⁴ Reading Foucault’s theories in spiral relation to the work of Grace and Tuan allows for imaginative affirmations of culture to be read effectively alongside critical negations unsettling dominant ‘places’. In Grace’s *whaikōrero*, this particularly enables ‘imaginative affirmation’ of indigenous cultures in relation to – and beyond – colonial and neocolonial discursive formations.

Reading Grace’s Māori codes as discourse points to the systematic nature of

²⁴ In “Maori as Postcolonial,” Chapter 5 of her PhD dissertation, Te Punga Somerville laments this focus. She argues that “postcolonial projects” fall under several categories – “refusing to talk about us, concentrating on the settler populations on our land, denying us the possibility of (prescribed) decolonisation, focussing on continents rather than an ocean-inclusive globe.” Because of the lack of inside-out perspectives within these discourses, Te Punga Somerville argues that each “marginalises Maori, and anything which results in invisibilisation ultimately perpetuates the colonial project” (288).

the ways in which social systems create place. In order to constitute Māori places, Grace sets up locations that imaginatively affirm Māori social systems in relation to colonial and neocolonial ones. She places Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand, engaging with what will be discussed below as ‘catachrestic citizenship.’ Grace sets up a different ‘grid’ that that associated with Eurocentric stories, answering Lefebvre’s call to use alternative codes to “recapture the unity of dissociated elements” (“State” 64). Her work sets up textual places reflecting whakapapa in which Māori characters have agency within Aotearoa New Zealand.

Postcolonial critics frequently analyze the ‘grid’ of colonial discourse. In *Orientalism*, Said draws on Foucault to systematically critique this ‘grid.’²⁵ Further, in *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha explores discourse-based ‘governmentality,’ which he argues marks out “a ‘subject nation,’ appropriates, directs, and dominates its various spheres of activity” (*Location* 70). Bhabha locates minority cultures in ambivalent relationships with dominant cultures within the Nation, a move which focuses on the critical negation of colonial discourse. As Spivak notes, this limits agency for those outside of the dominant subject position:

colonial discourse theory always stops short of [making the colony the source of knowledge] because it will always be saying how ambivalently the native is placed etc. etc. If it sees some form of resistance to Western thinking it will celebrate it, but it will never constitute that space as a space of knowledge as such. (Spivak “Neocolonialism” 237)

²⁵ Said refers specifically to Foucault’s *Archaeology of Knowledge* and *Discipline and Punish* (*Orientalism*

3). Said later came to critique the work of Foucault in many ways; however the importance of Foucault’s exploration of discourses in relation to systems of knowledge and power is undeniable.

Through *Potiki*, Grace does more than ‘resist Western thinking’; she creates a ‘space of knowledge’ that enables locations of Māori culture on her own terms. Below, I will use the rules of that place, its relational-processual archive, as a space of knowledge: I will critique colonial texts in counterpoint with the worlds created by Grace and King as they negotiate catachrestic citizenship.

First, by recognizing *Potiki* as a discourse, my critique moves beyond the limiting colonial discourse theory Spivak calls into question. This is important because, as Lefebvre writes, “the social relations of production have a social existence to the extent that they have a spatial existence; they project themselves into a space, becoming inscribed there, and in the process producing that space itself” (*Production* 129). In other words, Grace creates Māori ‘places’ through setting up alternative social relations. Grace adopts a series of discursive codes to imaginatively affirm cultural locations beyond those set up by colonial social systems, critically negating colonial control in the process. In her creation story and elsewhere, her focus is on the creation of discourses based on a relational- processual archive that accommodates shifting Māori codes while also challenging Eurocentrism.

King’s Discourses: Emergent discursive formations, relational-processual archives

Foucauldian terminology offers productive ‘ways in’ to King’s discourses as well. Although King, too, imaginatively affirms alternatives to colonial and neocolonial social systems, in *Green Grass, Running Water*’s creation stories he focuses on critically negating Eurocentric constructs present in the discourse of the Christian creation story. Here, I will outline the codes of his discourse, before linking

these to the colonial and neocolonial discursive formations he unsettles. It is important to note that although these authors focus on critical negation and imaginative affirmation respectively in these cases, their engagements share a common relational-processual archive.

In *Green Grass, Running Water*, King “brings together Western theory and Native theory in a way that creates a dialogue between the two” (Chester 45). GOD says of the narrator’s created world in that text, “[t]his is all wrong” and the narrator replies, “[l]isten up . . . I only want to do this once” (38). God is presented as judgmental and dismissive, but the indigenous narrator continues to want to bring Him into the conversation, albeit on the narrator’s own terms. As in Grace’s text, place is constructed through dialogue. This novel also resists the biblical concept that the creation story is complete. The narrator and GOD/dog continue to create and recreate the world throughout *Green Grass, Running Water* despite their shared desire to ‘get it right.’

In the first pages of *Green Grass, Running Water*, King introduces the dialogic relationship between his narrator and God. God is reduced to a “contrary”, “silly . . . Coyote dream”, whose status is only grudgingly improved through his tenacity and obnoxiousness:

I am god, says that Dog Dream.

“Isn’t that cute,” says Coyote. “That Dog Dream is a contrary. That Dog Dream has everything backward.”

But why am I a little god? shouts that god.

“Not so loud,” says Coyote. “You’re hurting my ears.”

I don't want to be a little god, says that god. I want to be a big god!

"What a noise," says Coyote. "This dog has no manners."

Big one!

"Okay, okay", says Coyote. "Just stop shouting."

There, says that GOD. That's better. (2-3)

By relegating the European, Christian God to the status of a disobedient dream, King challenges not only the existence of such a God and the authority of His outside-in perspective but also his power to create a systematic, completed world.

Later in the story, one of the Old Indians accidentally begins her story with a version of the Biblical creation story: "*In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth*" (14). Again, King appeals to a tradition recognized within Eurocentric paradigms, as it is quickly pointed out that "[t]hat's the wrong story, . . . [t]hat one comes later" (14). First, and more important among creation narratives, according to the Old Indians, is a story using Cherokee language that remains incomprehensible to most European readers. It begins with "Gha! . . . Higayv:lige:i" (15). Here, King encodes both the presence of multiple stories and the need to read them in relation to one another to establish their relevance in given contexts. He also questions whether all aspects of Cherokee culture should be immediately accessible to those looking in on the culture from the outside who do not have access to the Cherokee language.²⁶

The GOD figure in *Green Grass, Running Water* exhibits and supports a colonial worldview, as he feels he should have possessive control over his world, his place. Indeed, GOD states emphatically, "there is only one world" (38). He wants to

²⁶ For a reading of Patricia Grace's *Baby No-Eyes* in relation to similar issues, see Michelle Keown's "Maori or English? The Politics of Language in Patricia Grace's *Baby No-Eyes*."

seize control not only of places, but also of potentially unknown spaces, foreclosing the latter through dismissing worlds beyond his system. When the Aboriginal creation stories begin to fill the world with water, GOD angrily asks, “What happened to my void?” (38). GOD refuses to share the power to create places, insisting “this is my world and this is my garden. . . . All this stuff is mine” (68). Ultimately his power—and the ‘Biblical rules’ supporting it—is critically negated by First Woman’s refusal to be have “a grouchy GOD for a neighbour” (69). His unwillingness to negotiate with First Woman or to accept relations between stories excludes her relational worldview, but this exclusion is called into question.²⁷

In his engagements with the Biblical creation story in *Green Grass, Running Water*, King challenges Eurocentric ideas by demonstrating the tenuous authority of members of dominant cultures envisioning the world from the outside-in. He also works against the singular colonial archive by engaging multiple stories of creation in relation to one another. As Chester notes,

King creates a dialogue between different cultural stories. He shows us that the question of otherness is a question of perspective. What we think of as otherness or difference is always relational; multiple characters, stories, and theories contextualize each other in the real world in meaningful ways. (56)

Within King’s textual location, these stories exist simultaneously in relation to one another as part of the process of re/creating the world. This world emerges, as a

²⁷ Dorota Filipeczak provides comparative engagement drawing on King’s First Woman character in relation to how she is located in Canadian writer Joy Kogawa’s work. See “Paradise Revisited: Images of the First Woman in the Poetry of Joy Kogawa and the Fiction of Thomas King.

result, as both relational and processual, perpetuating inside-out perspectives.

This rewriting of the creation story represents a postcolonial counter-narrative, as King undermines the authority of the Biblical creation story and its singular authorial point of view. As Davidson et al point out,

Much of King's work relies on the comic premise of inversion and incorporates elements of paradox, irony, and parody to undermine some of the standard clichés about Native peoples. As the creator of his own 'trickster discourse', King invokes and alters Eurocentric narrative conventions in a deliberately provocative manner, which moves to dismantle the hierarchical relationship between Natives and non-Natives living in Canada. (35)

King focuses on critically negating outside-in perspectives through discourses that promote critical engagement with dominant discursive formations. For this reason, his work fits particularly well in the spiral of critical discourses moved through in a spiral reading.

Because of King's manifold critical negations of Biblical creation stories, it is important to address the Bible as part of a spiral reading of his text, unpacking the ways in which the Bible sets up discourses concerning spaces and places. In Genesis 1, for example, "the earth was without form, and void" (Gen. 1.2) and God, "hovering over the face of the waters" (Gen. 1.2), brings the world into being through His enunciation: "Let there be light" (Gen. 1.3). It is His validation of his creation as "good," His differentiation of light from darkness (Gen. 1.4), and His naming of the two (Gen. 1.5) that, together, encode the process of bringing the world into existence.

God has the power – and access to discourse – both to create the world and define its component parts in relation to one another. He dictates that “male and female . . . [should] ‘be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth’” (Gen. 1.27-28). Thus, God creates the place of the world in its entirety: on the seventh day, He looks out and sees that “the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them, were finished” (Gen. 2.1). The perfect world is created by God and confirmed by His ability to see it and proclaim its goodness.

The relationships among the discursive construction of places, codes, and larger discursive formations is made even more explicit in the New Testament rendition of the creation story. At the opening of John, it states “[i]n the beginning was the Word” (John 1:1). “Word” here comes from the Greek, *logos*, which is usually associated with logic and reasoning. Biblical creation stories use language to encode the Christian worldview as reasonable. In his 2003 Massey lecture series, *The Truth About Stories*, King critically negates these codes directly, positing that the Biblical creation story constructs a binary- based “universe governed by a series of hierarchies—God, man, animals, plants—that celebrate law, order, and good government” (23). The Biblical creation story produces place by creating a new world that is represented as, naturally, the only world, a singular world that is inherently ‘good.’ The resulting discursive formation expresses the forms and limits of its singular archive: the created world integrates every aspect of space into Christian place. This place is itself governed by a singular order creating an

integrated system of knowledge.²⁸

According to King, in Genesis, “all creative power is vested in a single deity who is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. The universe begins with his thought, and it is through his actions and only his actions that it comes into being” (King *Truth* 24). Humans cannot live with the Creator-God in his garden; they are evicted when they break one of God’s rules. King himself sets up a contrapuntal reading of Eurocentric and Aboriginal worldviews in presenting his audience with the following ‘choices’:

a world in which creation is a solitary, individual act, or a world in which creation is a shared activity; a world that begins in harmony and slides toward chaos or a world that begins in chaos and moves toward harmony; a world marked by competition or a world determined by co-operation. (*Truth* 24)

In presenting these as ‘choices’ and telling the stories contrapuntally, King recognizes the connection between values and stories, and exposes the differing agendas of these creation stories. According to Chester, “Native storytellers like . . . King theorize their world by telling stories. Their theory, therefore, is interactive and dialogic, rather than monologic” (Chester 45). As a result, King’s theories also move beyond critically negating Eurocentrism; they also imaginatively affirm a relational-processual archive reflecting his worldview, centring All My Relations.

King’s work, here, can be read in relation to that done by Bhabha in “Signs Taken for Wonders.” Bhabha, too, critically negates the Eurocentric system as it pertains to the

²⁸ For more on the critical relationship between recent Canadian Native literature and religious discourse, see Ken Derry’s 2009 PhD dissertation, “Uncomfortable mirrors: Religion and mimetic violence in contemporary Canadian literature.”

“English book,” and to the Bible in particular. Such discourses demonstrate the monolithic nature of colonial power through promoting “empiricism, idealism, mimeticism, monoculturalism (to use Edward Said’s term) that sustain a tradition of English ‘cultural rule’” (147). Within such discourses, however, Bhabha locates ambivalence in the moment of ‘discovery’ by the colonized:

The discovery of the English book establishes both a measure of mimesis and a mode of civil authority and order. If these scenes, as I have narrated them, suggest the triumph of the write of colonialist power, then it must be conceded that the wily letter of the law inscribes a much more ambivalent text of authority. For it is in between the edict of Englishness and the assault of the dark unruly spaces of the earth, through an act of repetition, that the colonial text emerges uncertainly...consequently, the colonial presence is always ambivalent, split between its appearance as original and authoritative and its articulation as repetition and difference. (149)

Bhabha’s critical negation, then, relies on recognizing the ambivalence within colonial signs and signifiers. He points to moments when “the effect of colonial power is seen to be the production of hybridization rather than the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native traditions,” and argues that such a moment “turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention” (154). However, Bhabha also recognizes that he remains an observer here; he looks at these historical moments from the outside-in. He critiques the moment of cultural engagement, but does not create that moment in the same way King does through his

creative work. As will be discussed below, using spiral reading strategies to bring together these postcolonial and indigenous writers enables an even more productive reading of the work of both parties.

The Relational-Processual Paradigm and Thirdspace: Alternative archives

The relational-processual paradigm set up by both Grace and King promote cultural agency for Aboriginal and Māori peoples through enabling inside-out perspectives. But do the discourses establish an alternative archive to colonial narratives concerned with concepts of place and cultural location? Foucault asserts that power relations preclude multiple systems of knowledge from existing apart from one another within the same location. In *Power/Knowledge*, he articulates the relationship between power and what can be recognized within a society as “Truth”: “Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it” (133). Spivak posits that this circular relation attempts to foreclose, or make impossible, the truths of disempowered cultures.²⁹ In Canada and New Zealand, this forecloses the spaces within colonial and neocolonial places and contains indigenous cultures as Other to dominant cultures.

Recognizing stories as ‘discourses’ foregrounds the ordered components of knowledge that together form systems of knowledge. Discourses are not always transparent representations; they must be read critically as stories that actively

²⁹ Spivak discusses at length the foreclosure of the Native informant in *The Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, arguing that dominant discourses make recognition of this informant impossible. As an alternative to foreclosure, Spivak proposes a “commitment not only to narrative and counternarrative, but also to the rendering (im)possible of (another) narrative” (6). My spiral reading strategies commit me to reading within this kind of process.

constitute knowledge systems perpetuating Truth within discursive formations. Truth imbues discourses with colonial knowledge so that discursive formations, made up of various discourses, systematically renew themselves, ensuring that their discourses continue to reflect and relate to a colonial archive.³⁰ As will be discussed throughout the remaining chapters, in colonial and neocolonial discursive formations, the archive privileges European Truth over indigenous cultural knowledges, constructing the colony and Nation as “free containers” ensuring equal citizenship within social relations.³¹ In this way, Eurocentric discourses emerging from within the colonial archive are utopian in two ways: they represent places related to the double meaning inherent in Thomas More’s coining of the term to encompass both ‘eutopia’ (good place) and ‘outopia’ (no place) by foreclosing spaces within places.³² The utopian places produced in Eurocentric discourses constitute discursive formations supporting colonialism and, in turn, the Nation. The archive of these texts is at odds with the relational-processual paradigm discussed above and continues to legitimate the disempowerment of Aboriginal and Māori peoples within Canada and New Zealand respectively.³³

³⁰ The ways in which this circular Truth is set up and maintained within texts will be discussed below, in an engagement with Thomas More’s *Utopia*.

³¹ In *Production of Space*, Lefebvre discusses this concept of a “free container” as part of the “illusion of transparency” propagated by nation-states in their effort to mask power relations (28).

³² From this point onward I will use ‘utopia’ rather than e/o-utopia, although the dual meaning continues to be implied.

³³ Any discussion of utopian stories in the New Zealand context must note Samuel Butler’s *Erewhon* (1872). Although this text is discussed briefly in relation to Lamb’s work in Chapter Three, a comparative analysis of this text and Thomas More’s *Utopia* utilizing spiral reading strategies provides an opportunity for further research. The concept of utopias in relation to New Zealand also reminds one of ‘the Māori Prophets’, including such diverse figures as Te Whiti, Te Kooti, and Rātana. These men hybridized Māori and Christian views and made them central to the utopian communities they sought to establish. Although an engagement with these figures goes beyond the scope of this current project, their discourses provide another exciting opportunity for further work in the area of linking utopian discourses and the discursive formation of Aotearoa New Zealand. For a helpful introduction to these historical figures, see Judith Binney’s

Because of the ongoing disempowerment of Aboriginal and Māori peoples within Canada and New Zealand, they are what Spivak would call ‘catachrestic citizens.’ They lack subjectivity in the stories of the contemporary Nation because colonial and neocolonial stories define Aboriginal and Māori cultures as historical; they provide prehistory for the Nation and can only be performed in the present through utopian representations of the past. In contrast, continuing socioeconomic issues demonstrating the disempowerment of Aboriginal and Māori peoples are held up as examples of a collective failure to integrate effectively into the progressive sites of Canada and New Zealand.

Neither Grace nor King’s novels exclude European colonial cultures in their centring of indigenous cultures, nor do they return to a pre-colonial construction of place. Their shared relational-processual paradigm does not simply reverse the binary power relations supporting Eurocentric discourse, nor does it centre tikanga Māori or Canadian Aboriginal worldviews through an appeal to closed places excluding neocolonial realities. Instead, their novels operate within the relational-processual paradigm outlined above. Postcolonial critics offer productive ways of theorizing how colonial discourses should be challenged through critical negation, but, too often subvert inside-out perspectives. What critical concepts does postcolonial theory offer that might be useful in empowering these perspectives rather than ignoring them or shutting them out? Bhabha theorizes a ‘Third Space of enunciation,’ a site exposing Eurocentric discursive containment of ambivalence, while also replacing monolithic truth with more complex truths. His theorization of a hybrid relational space between

“Ancestral Voices” (1990). For further reading in this area, see Bronwyn Elsmore’s *Mana from Heaven* (1989).

subjectivities can be linked to the act of reading, as discussed above, but it also provides an interesting answer to the problem of catachrestic citizenship.

In an interview with Jonathan Rutherford, Bhabha explains the necessary link between his interpretation of hybridity and the Third Space: “For me, the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the ‘Third Space’ which enables other positions to emerge” (qtd in Meredith 3). This Third Space enables new beginnings, stories emerging at specific historical moments out of the power relationships emplacing and constructing cultures. It is a site in which “the disruptive temporality of enunciation displaces the narrative of the Western nation” (Bhabha “Cultural” 208). Later in this chapter, when I analyze Thomas More’s work, I will demonstrate how this narrative is an extension of historical colonial texts located in utopian space and progressive time.

Bhabha’s Third Space shares some attributes with Harjo’s ‘spiral of memories’, for it is premised on productive nature of relational stories. Focussing on the oral tradition, Harjo recognizes that both history and memory change through present stories (see epigraph). This challenges the dichotomy set up between indigenous and postcolonial theorists. Bhabha contends that the Third Space “constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized, and read anew” (*Location* 55). Harjo discusses the ways in which cultural memory “changes” through stories. Both of these postcolonial and indigenous theories, then, challenge the concept of a singular,

monolithic archive and the Truth of the discourses emerging from that archive.

According to Bhabha, the Third space creates the “precondition for the articulation of cultural difference,” which ensures that disempowered peoples can create culture on their own terms (Location 38). These terms, themselves, are shifting; Bhabha’s ‘difference,’ as John Fielder notes, “disallows . . . any utopian oppositionality in which some form of cultural or racial purity allows a transcendental position of truth or justification outside of the messiness of specific social and historical struggles” (118). In the same vein, King and Grace do not fight for indigenous rights based on an idea of racial or cultural purity, but on a complex politicization of indigenous cultural identities emerging not only from imaginative affirmations of indigenous discourses, but also from critical negations of colonial ones.

In his extension of Bhabha’s work, Bruyneel argues that the ‘third space of sovereignty’ opens up a space in which “indigenous political identity, agency, and autonomy reside in postcolonial time and space, and always are across the temporal and spatial boundaries marked out by the settler-state and colonialist political culture” (221). As a result of their location, these identities address catachrestic citizenship, operating to not only affirm ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Māori’ and, at times, negate ‘Canada’ and ‘New Zealand’, but also to negotiate the space between indigenous subjectivity and the place of the Nation.

In the remaining chapters, I will address critical negations of Eurocentric discursive formations of imperialism, neocolonial tourism, and pluralism that locate power within a neocolonial archive. James Sa’kej Youngblood Henderson

(Chickasaw) recognizes that neocolonial rules can set up a limited worldview; he argues that “Eurocentrism is, quite simply, the colonizer’s model of the world” (Henderson “Postcolonial” 60). ‘Model,’ here, can be read two ways: Eurocentrism defines the system through which discourses envision the world, while it is also conceived as defining the perfect end, the form social relations can take when cultures are properly placed in systems of power. Such Eurocentric discourses require a colonial archive in order to support and maintain utopian places, as the forms and limits available to discourses rule out alternative worldviews while supporting the conversion of space into colonial place. Challenging the model means challenging both its systematic nature and its appropriateness within historical and contemporary contexts. I now turn to Thomas More’s *Utopia* to demonstrate the ways in which the relational- processual paradigm set up by King and Grace, supported by Harjo and Bhabha, offers new ways to enact this challenge and engage this colonial text critically. I will then return to the catachrestic citizenship that results.³⁴

Relational-processual Engagements: Challenging E/utopian progress

How does a Eurocentric model operate within a fictional text to support colonialism as an acceptable story? In an article examining the uses of utopia, Denise Albanese argues that More’s *Utopia* “operates by invoking specific historical conditions in order to resolve the cultural anxieties attendant upon those conditions”

³⁴ Reading *Utopia* in conjunction with postcolonial and indigenous theories may seem disjunctive. However, in “Who’s that in the Mirror?” Herman argues that, “in many ways More’s *Utopia* anticipates – deliberately – what we now call post-colonialist criticism” (110) This is because More seems aware of the ways that “the processes of reporting on the New World . . . [as] a narrative of the unknown segues into a confirmation of the already known” (126). As outlined in my Introduction, Indigenous critics are similarly concerned with epistemologies of knowledge.

(504). In other words, at the dawn of the imperial era, More's text produces a fictional place in which anxieties about imperialism are solved through the cultural placement of indigenous peoples as inferior and the rejection of cultures as relational. Utopia is a fictional locale depicting a 'good place' where the indigenous inhabitants logically adhere to a system of rules set up by a colonising monarch. An interrogation of this place with the relational-processual paradigm of Grace and King in mind reveals a worldview at odds with Bhabha's Third Space and Harjo's Spiral of Memories. It reveals, instead, the foreclosure of spaces within places and the attempt of these discourses to mask the structural ambivalence that emerges when a system is represented as 'always already perfect', yet also progressing toward that perfection.

By critically engaging specifically with More's *Utopia*, I expose how this early colonial text acts as a discourse premised on Eurocentric codes and a monolithic archive. With its focus on hierarchical power structures and the systematic nature of colonialism, this story presents settlement as simultaneously utopian and progressive; Utopia emerges as a metaphor for the way in which monolithic systems set up relationships between the colonizers and colonized within space over time. Utopian settlement ideologies were mapped onto 'real world' colonial encounters as they unfolded to the point that, after assessing Aotearoa New Zealand's key 'foundational histories', Klaus Neuman, Nicholas Thomas, and Hilary Ericksen can assert that "settlement has been conceived as utopia, a realization of civil society in its consummate form, an order freed from conflict and history" (240). A similar statement can be made about Canada. Beginning with European 'discovery,' both

sites were imagined as utopian places which would naturally progress from largely empty and undefined spaces to colonies and, later, into nation-states.³⁵

Written before large-scale exploration of the areas in question, *Utopia* demonstrates the nature of Eurocentric vision and the “charm of progressivism that in the end is placeless and timeless” (P. Carter 68). Reading these discourses critically with King’s and Grace’s shared relational-processual paradigm in mind exposes the monolithic nature of the colonial archive and how utopian- progressive settings enable both integration and assimilation of land and cultures. Although neither Grace nor King deal with More’s text directly, they do challenge many of the expectations of colonization and citizenship set up by this text. In doing so, they negotiate Spivak’s ‘deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial,’ challenging the monolithic nature of Eurocentric discourse. For that reason, utilizing spiral reading strategies that include their novels alongside *Utopia* recognizes the importance of both colonial and anti-colonial texts to any engagement with issues of citizenship and subjectivity within the space of the Nation.

As Phillip Wegner points out, utopias are ‘real’ “in that they have material, pedagogical, and ultimately political effects, shaping the ways people understand and, as a consequence, act in their worlds” (xvi). According to Leonard Harris, a utopia is “either considered the realizable outcome of prevailing historical, natural, or evolutionary forces inclined to realize a submerged essence, or it is an impossible world which nonetheless represents what realization would be like” (42). As a result, these stories offer what

³⁵ Pordzick discusses how “the history of colonization and white settlement is cut to a heavenly pattern of political justice and material wealth” (55). In *Imaginary Communities*, Wegner links early utopian narratives both to the romance genre and to Imperialism and the Nation.

Graham Huggan calls “conceptual maps” of the ideal colony; they serve as “maps which are perceived to operate as exemplars of, and therefore to provide a framework for the critique of, colonial discourse” and its archive (“Decolonizing” 125). This critique is central to undermining colonial ideology frequently presented as Truth.

More’s *Utopia* represents an ordered, peaceful society, uniform in language and government. Raphael, a traveler who has visited the site, relates in detail the social systems of this ideal commonwealth in which all citizens—other than King Utopus himself—are equal. It is a world in which people are connected to the land, working in agriculture for six hours per day and spending the rest of their time in intellectual pursuits. On the surface, perfection has been achieved in Utopia, and systems of knowledge and government are set up to maintain this perfection. In his book entitled *Imaginary Communities: Utopia, the Nation, and the Spatial Histories of Modernity*, Wegner argues that “utopia’s imaginary community is . . . not only a way of imagining subjectivity, but also a way of imagining space” as place (xvii). The imagination of place as unchanging requires the integration of indigenous cultures into the governmental system of the dominant power. More perpetuates the idea of homogeneous community by representing the indigenous population as logically assuming their roles as colonized citizens, thus foreclosing potential indigenous spaces within the colonial place of Utopia and imagining it as an integrated location.

In the discursive formations represented by this text, the reflected and created Eurocentric knowledge structures—and their institutions—locate citizens’ engagements with the world in a way that fits in with the Christian belief system. In

Utopia, scientific knowledge emerges as inherently unitary and reasonable, while fitting into Christian paradigms. For example, although “principles of religion are conveyed down among [the Utopians] by tradition, they think that even reason itself determines a man to believe and acknowledge them” (56). Virtue, defined as “living according to nature,” hinges on a belief in the Christian God defined by the priests: “the first dictate of reason is the kindling... of a love and reverence for the Divine Majesty” (57). Education, in the hands of these priests, involves the use of “all possible methods to infuse very early into the tender and flexible minds of children such opinions as are both good in themselves and useful in their country” (90).

Although the Utopians are presented as “unwearied pursuer[s] of knowledge” (65) who “do not in all things agree among themselves” (55), the notions “imbibed, partly from their [childhood] education... and partly from their [continuing] learning and studies” (54) support a highly specific set of reductive outcomes. Reasonable and useful knowledge moves from the priests down into the population in a manner unquestioned by the people of Utopia. Here, the marriage of reason and tradition—through ‘imbibing’ and ‘infusing’ ideology from a young age and ensuring its continued absorption through the encouragement of culturally-specific reading and hearing of lectures into adulthood—ensures that large-scale changes in systems of knowledge are limited. The utopian- progressive archive remains ontologically stable and supported by those in power.

In the early days of Utopia, Utopus conquered the “rude and uncivilized inhabitants” and brought them “into such good government” (34) that there was no need for further improvement in the function of society. The singular and objective

‘ways of thinking’ advocated by the structures of government perpetuate a utopian-progressive archive: citizens progressively become more aware of, and logically buy into, shared ways of seeing and imagining their roles as citizens within Utopia. These citizens, then, constitute an ‘imagined community,’ as they envision themselves as part of a larger group due to shared reading codes. I argue that *Utopia* exhibits the Nation’s ability to embody “homogeneous, empty time” both structurally and thematically (Anderson 25). Anderson argues that shared reading codes ensure integrated knowledge systems. I will now turn to a second factor in the imagination of communities in these utopian narratives: the structural containment of place.

In More’s *Utopia*, the indigenous citizens thrive within the perfect commonwealth imposed by King Utopus. Indeed, the Utopians’ colonization allows them to begin “living according to nature” (57). Thus, colonization is naturalized through the maintenance of universal tenets introduced by King Utopus, who comes from ‘outside’ to colonize the Utopians. King Utopus further guarantees homogeneity by policing borders and limiting engagements with differences beyond his commonwealth.

Once empowered, King Utopus limits engagement with the world beyond Utopia by asserting that “if a man goes out of the city to which he belongs, without leave, and is found rambling without a passport, he is severely treated . . . and sent home disgracefully” (49). Although the Utopians are prepared to move if the state calls on them to do so, travel is not desired nor envisioned as a necessity. According to Tuan, “each pause in movement makes it possible for location to be transformed

into place” (6).³⁶ Movement beyond colonized places, then, enables the negotiation of difference in spaces beyond the ‘known.’ By preventing citizens’ access to spaces beyond place, colonizing monarchs preclude travel beyond established borders. This protects the unitary archive, ensuring continual proper placement through the containment of culture within established systems of power. King Utopus not only restricts movement beyond his commonwealth’s borders for members of the community, but also advocates control of who enters the commonwealth from the outside. The king “designed [Utopia] to separate [the Utopians] from the continent... [and] he ordered a deep channel to be dug fifteen miles long” (More 35). King Utopus thus controls the Utopians, ensuring stable power relations within his realm.

Utopian perfection is achieved through the integration of culture into a foreign system of knowledge that represents indigenous peoples as desiring only validation by colonial authority figures, rather than as citizens acting in relational-processual worlds. In this system, place relies on the simultaneous maintenance of two illusions that Lefebvre argues are central to the place of the nation: the ‘illusion of transparency’ and the ‘realistic illusion.’ Through the illusion of transparency, the place of the nation appears transparently “free, a container” into which the unknown is integrated seamlessly into the known (Lefebvre *Production* 28). At the same time, the nation perpetuates Eurocentric ‘progress’ as the only normal result of contact with new knowledges, which are assimilated into the system under the assumptions of the ‘realistic illusion.’ These two illusions ensure that “within the spatial realm the known and the transparent are one and the same thing” (Lefebvre *Production* 28).

³⁶ The ability to move, then, is associated with the freedom—and potential threat—of space, while the rules of place limit movement, but create a sense of security in valued systems of knowledge and allow for the perception of cultural location.

The monolithic archive of *Utopia* supports these illusions and, as a result, these texts *mirror* colonial discourses which seek to marginalize indigenous cultures, through empowering those with outside-in perspectives.³⁷

Although, structurally and thematically, *Utopia* represents no-place as separate from the world, it is *not* ‘nowhere,’ because it creates a colonized, albeit fictional, place. It also creates a ‘somewhere’ on the horizon of the known.³⁸ This fictitious place is more than a textual location, for it makes tangible to its readers the transformations of spaces into places essential to historical moments in which it was written. Colonizers needed stories to support the agenda of colonization. Indeed, Said links utopias to other discourses central to the worlding of the British Empire: “[t]he increasing influence of travel literature, imaginary utopias, moral voyages, and scientific reporting brought the Orient into sharper and more extended focus” (*Orientalism* 117). These narratives represent colonised sites, naturalizing control and disempowerment of indigenous peoples in relation to imperialist monarchs and colonial systems of government.

The government set up and maintained in *Utopia* integrates culture into imposed systems of knowledge. In controlling the relations between cultures, the concept of hybridity—of cultures or even in knowledge itself—is foreclosed. The integration of place, culture, and knowledge into dominant paradigms can be linked to the discourses of natural history and Orientalism that will be discussed in Chapters Two and Three. As containers of culture, these narratives mirror

³⁷ In “Who’s That in the Mirror?,” Herman discusses the ways in which *Utopia* is not simply a rewriting of England nor an image of the New World that is radically different from England, but “in good part a *mirror* in which the European reporter finds his own image reflected” (126, my emphasis).

³⁸ In his Introduction, Wegner discusses how the utopian locus encloses the horizon of the possible. I argue that this enclosure is a result of the foreclosure of spaces within places.

colonial discourse [that] produces the colonized as a social reality which is at once an ‘other’ and yet entirely knowable and visible. [Colonial discourse] resembles a form of narrative whereby the productivity and circulation of subjects and signs are bound in a reformed and recognizable totality. It employs a system of representation, a regime of truth, that is structurally similar to realism. (Said *Orientalism* 71)

The result is the representation of a fictional no-place that could exist elsewhere, and, I argue, does exist in relation to New World places.

Mary Louise Pratt’s seeing-man, the European global subject from early colonial times, interprets space as knowable. Textual worlds envisioned by seeing-men have “no existence of [their] own. . . . [They] only [get] ‘made’ for real when the traveller (or other survivor) returns home, and brings [them] into being through texts” (*Imperial Eyes* 204). This process of worlding leads to the creation of discourses that fit in to the systematic colonial grid. Pratt argues that later colonial discourses reflect a shift in European ‘planetary consciousness.’ This shift was “marked by an orientation toward interior exploration and the construction of global-scale meaning through the descriptive apparatuses of natural history” and European exploration of large sections of the world which, in turn, relied on and perpetuated dominant points of view (Pratt 15).³⁹ Assimilating the unknown into the known relies on the authority of an outside-in vision to produce place. Utopia only becomes part of the world beyond its borders through the stories told of it by travellers.

³⁹ In *Imperial Eyes*, Pratt identifies the year 1735 as central to this shift in “planetary consciousness” (18), as this was the year of both the La Condamine expedition—the primary purpose of which was to discover the physical nature of the world as a whole—and the publication of Linnaeus’ *Systema Natura* (Pratt 18-23), to be discussed further in Chapter Two.

Utopian knowledge-seekers must look to Raphael to add to their knowledge of the world beyond their ideal commonwealth. He is granted entry into the controlled place, and the Utopians' eager reception is evidence that they are "very desirous to know the state of the whole world" (67). However, Raphael's ties to the foundations of Western thought—as evidenced by the collection of books, including Plato and Aristotle, he carries with him on his fourth voyage (66)—ensures that he will not facilitate movement beyond the known. His own European subject position and Eurocentric knowledge systems allow for him to be recognized as a powerful figure and "be so well received" by the Utopians (67). His knowledge fits into the established archive and perpetuates its stability. Because Raphael's and King Utopus' agendas line up, his text-based knowledge is easily integrated into what the Utopians already know as Truth, and the "inquiries" it foregrounds are "very acceptable to the Author of nature" (66) known to them.

Utopia is not only a colonial discourse; it also represents a larger discursive formation, the ideal commonwealth. Its government relies on a unitary archive perpetuated by education and cultural containment through the active policing of the borders of these places. As a result, citizens' negotiations of difference—or spaces within places—are foreclosed in *Utopia*, as inhabitants are kept 'worlds apart' in 'worlds already worlded' by dominant authorities. In order to create 'perfect systems' of internal government, this leader enacts structures of governmentality that maintain purely imagined communities through education, while ensuring the maintenance of purity through preventing engagements with other cultures.

In *Utopia* the general population of original inhabitants has little say in the

government of its society or in deciding what counts as knowledge. Knowledge is both restricted by colonial monarchs and educated elites and accumulated and represented by travellers. This reflects emerging imperialist rhetoric at the time this text was written: knowledge is accessed by explorers who not only textualize it for reading members of dominant society, but also bring knowledge of Eurocentric ideals to unknown places.

In this environment, culture continues to be represented as an uncontested, definable, static, and limited *utopian* reality envisioned by traveller-explorers for citizens of a society. Decisions made by empowered intellectual elites determine indigenous proper placement within a limited set of internal formations, rather than in relation to other cultures. This traveller ironically can come to ‘know’ an indigenous culture better than members of that culture might know themselves. The indigenous people are expected to ingest knowledge, accepting it as their own regardless of how it relates to their locations. As a result of this reliance on outside-in perspectives representing the world *for* them (as ‘the represented’), the peoples of Utopia are rendered incapable of engaging with self-representation. Subjectivity is governed by those with access to power.

Utopian outside-in vision is a precursor to the seeing-man’s point of view in the same way that the utopian-progressive archive supports Orientalism. The desire to police borders to maintain ‘fixed’ sites of utopian no-places combined with the need to progressively fill these places with self-perpetuating systems of knowledge textualizes the need to control place that Said identifies as central to Orientalizing discourse. No-places become good-places as they integrate and assimilate spaces into

places to produce Eurocentric discursive formations.

A further result of governmental structures arising from outside-in vision is that any peoples living beyond the place of the commonwealth should necessarily desire integration into utopian place and assimilation into progressive knowledge systems. Because Utopia is a perfect model, it ‘naturally’ assimilates other places and cultures into proper placement within its structures of government. For example, in order to retain an ideal population level, a selected group of Utopians move to a “neighboring continent,” where, as Raphael notes, “if [the migrating Utopians] find that the inhabitants have more soil than they can well cultivate, [the Utopians] fix a colony, taking the inhabitants into their society” (45).

‘Fixing the colony’ involves assimilation but, should these inhabitants “refuse to conform themselves to their laws, [the Utopians] drive them out” (More 45). As Herman states, this is evidence of the fact that “like the Europeans in the New World, the Utopians refuse to allow any diversity within their newly conquered domain” (122). Diversity is assimilated or integrated on Utopian terms.

Goodness is associated with the desire and ability to assimilate into utopian-progressive imagined communities. Anderson proposes that discourses enable communities to imagine themselves. In the period Anderson studies, for example, the census, the map and the museum link together to promote and exhibit a system of knowledge constructed from the outside-in. For the first time, people living in nations could imagine themselves as part of a national community. According to Anderson,

[t]he ‘warp’ of this thinking was a totalizing classificatory

grid, which could be applied with endless flexibility to anything under the

state's real or contemplated control: peoples, regions, religions, languages, products, monuments and so forth. The effect of the grid was always to be able to say of anything that it was this, not that; it belongs here, not there. It was bounded, determinate, and therefore—in principle—countable. (Anderson 184)

Eurocentric thinking supports the maintenance of a utopian-progressive archive within Utopia under the guise of 'good government.' Utopia, then, is a precursor to the discourses discussed by Anderson that affirm 'imagined communities.'

What 'counts' within good-place, then, is what can be assimilated into Eurocentric vision through proper placement. My close reading of *Utopia* demonstrates how the utopian-progressive paradigm promotes integration and assimilation of places and cultures. As discussed above, in utopian places, such an archive is perpetuated by controlled education, policing of boundaries, and the containment of culture to ensure integration.

Imagined communities premised on the utopian-progressive paradigm control difference by foreclosing spaces within places. However, as Tuan notes, space is a necessary part of place. What happens, then, when one recognizes differences beyond the boundaries of imagined communities and attempts to negotiate these within the place of the community itself? I argue that the necessary hybrid moment of cultural relation that exposes the structural ambivalence inherent in the joining of 'utopian' with 'progressive' in Eurocentric discourses. The resultant ambivalent space locates hybridity and it has the potential to locate resistance to cultural containment and relocate culture beyond proper placement. The recognition of

hybridity in space counteracts cultural containment in place.

I turn now to my discussion of how these produced places are “made ambivalent in the colonial signifier” specifically (Bhabha *Location* 128). The colonial signifiers I am primarily concerned with—Aboriginal, Canadian, and New Zealand, Māori—are used to produce place for indigenous cultures in the Eurocentric discourses discussed in Chapters Two through Five. I turn here to a discussion of how the signifier ‘Utopian’ occupies a similar ambivalent place, as Utopian culture is located simultaneously in no-place and good-place through discourses.

Colonial Governmentality: The potential within catachrestic citizenship

Foreclosing hybrid relations between cultures enables, in part, the maintenance of colonial authority within Utopia. In this section, I demonstrate how utopian-progressive archives bring together the cultural traditions of utopianism and empirical progress in *Utopia* in ways that lead to what Bhabha calls the ‘splitting of the discursive moment’ (*Location* 130-2). This splitting opens up ambivalent spaces for negotiations of culture. However, these archives do not support the progressive amalgamation of centre and margin advocated by Ihimaera, Long, Ramsden, and Williams discussed above.

In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha argues that the space for cultures ‘beyond’ colonial discourses is actually the space ‘between’ competing cultural traditions. It is “the ‘inter’—the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *in-between* space—that carries the burden of the meaning of culture” (*Location* 38). Relational-processual worldviews can facilitate repositioning culture in the ambivalent space

between the static and the progressive because they require negotiations of the spaces between indigenous and colonial or national signifiers. The 'Utopian' signifier masks this cultural negotiation by representing a singular, simultaneously perfected, culturally integrated citizen. According to Bhabha, 'splitting' occurs in terms of colonized indigenous identities, because people cannot immediately assimilate into a new cultural reality, so "two contradictory and independent attitudes inhabit the same place" (*Location* 132). When the agenda of King Utopus is exposed as necessarily-enforced cultural containment "a splitting of the discourse of cultural governmentality [occurs] at the moment of its enunciation of authority" (Bhabha *Location* 131).

Exposing the ambivalence located in utopian-progressive governmentality foregrounds the necessity of systemic power relations. In my own close reading of *Utopia* I have drawn out specific aspects of the text to make this split evident, and to interrogate the outside-in perspective authorizing the utopian-progressive paradigm.

Hybridity is foreclosed to maintain systems of power within Utopia, as Utopians are cut off from other cultures to ensure the continuing authority of King Utopus. In contrast, recognizing hybridity enables redefinitions of culture. According to Bhabha, the "recognition of the split-space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an *international* culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity" (*Location* 38). When citizens negotiate hybridity, culture emerges as an "uneven, incomplete production of meaning and value, often composed of incommensurable demands and practices, produced in the act of social survival" (Bhabha "The Postcolonial" 190).

Reading King's and Grace's creation stories in counterpoint with More's utopian text reveals fundamental differences between the agendas of these authors. The worldviews promoted by King and Grace facilitate representing culture from inside-out perspectives as relational and always in process. In counterpoint, the Eurocentric systems in More's text premise both static locations and progressive disempowerment of indigenous cultures. In contrast, Aboriginal, and I add Māori, worldviews give rise to stories that "show their readers views of a reality far more complex than that which the European linear, causal mode of perception can accommodate" (Lutz 7-8). That said, indigenous writers feel compelled to write about these Eurocentric systems, just as they feel compelled to negotiate the Eurocentric systems with which the colony and Nation code themselves.

Even a cursory reading of *Truth and Bright Water* and *Potiki* sets up useful contrapuntal textual moments for a critical engagement with the colonial discourse of *Utopia*. In *Truth and Bright Water*, for example, Tecumseh 'rambles without a passport,' not only 'surviving socially,' but moving back and forth between Truth and Bright Water, negotiating the liminal space between the American border town and the Aboriginal Canadian reserve on Charlie Ron's ferry. He moves between two places, Canada and the United States, which usually requires Aboriginal peoples to recognize what, from their point of view, is an imaginary line separating the two geographical sites. Tecumseh is able to imagine his world as spanning both communities, placing himself in-between them successfully, while also realizing the ambivalent nature of that middle space. From the ferry, he observes that "space is just the distance between towns" (155).

Grace's novels also locate cultures in process and in relation to other cultures and to place. The Māori community in *Potiki* is centred in their ancestral lands; as Hemi repeats, 'everything they need is there.' But Hemi supports his children in their travels to access knowledge located outside their immediate community. James lives with the koroua, the master carver, to learn the skill of carving, while Tangimoana goes to university to study law. Both the Māori tradition of carving and the (neo)colonial legal system in New Zealand are negotiated by these characters. Spaces are opened up in these systems in which Tecumseh, James and Tangimoana can negotiate hybrid relations with worlds beyond the borders of their imagined communities. In negotiating their movement between places, they locate indigenous cultures in constantly evolving relationships between cultures and to the land. These characters emerge in sharp contrast to their Utopian counterparts. Reading colonial and indigenous stories together, using spiral strategies, foregrounds the connection between access to subjectivity and agency and the ability to negotiate spaces and places on one's own terms.

Bhabha argues that, in theorizing 'imagined communities,' Anderson fails to recognize the ambivalence inherent in enforced homogeneity. This ambivalence leads to a "gap in the midst of storytelling. From this split in the utterance . . . [the nation] begins, if that's the word, from that anterior space within the arbitrary sign which disturbs the homogenizing myth of cultural anonymity" (*Location* 311). In other words, it is the space opened up within the colonial signifier that further opens spaces within places from which to begin to negotiate cultural difference. From here, King's and Grace's characters negotiate the hybrid relationship between their indigenous

subject positions and their national ones through relational-processual engagements with the two.

Wegner argues that utopian fiction has an important “pedagogical operation: teaching its audiences how to think of the spaces they already inhabit in a critical fashion” (Wegner 17). Drawing on the work of Paul Ricoeur, Wegner maintains that

utopia exists in a dialectical relationship with ideology, the latter producing the place or apparent ontological constancy of any social reality, the former an imaginary discursive site ‘outside’ this reality that enables us to look upon the world with a critical eye . . . [so that] the utopia transforms the closed circle of ideology of belief into an open spiral. (Wegner 17)

Within spiral reading strategies, the closed circle of Eurocentric Truth opens up, making possible recognition of a relational-processual archive.

In contemporary times, Canada and New Zealand have both been represented as ‘utopias’ through discourse. In 2001, Joseph Heath gave his book the subtitle *Why Canada is as close to Utopia as it gets*, while John Baker describes New Zealand in the following way: “[g]eographically protected from the recurring troubles of the world, but in touch with all the new technologies, this ‘Utopia’ is an unspoiled jewel.” The production of these sites as utopian can be traced back to early colonial times. According to Ronald Wright, “[e]ver since Columbus, Europeans had dreamed up utopias in America. Sometimes they tried to build their own; more often they destroyed the ones they found” (1). Similarly, as Douglas Hoey

discusses, “settlement of New Zealand as a Utopian project is not just a historical metaphor but something that affected both the expectations and behaviour of the settlers. [...] New Zealand was perceived through a filter that portrayed it as a potential Utopia” (194). I have argued that two key aspects of this ‘filter’ are utopian: static space and progressive time. Combined, these two elements form the setting for the discursive formations of Canada and New Zealand as both colonies and nations.

Canada and New Zealand are recited societies and discursive formations. In this chapter, I have drawn on *Utopia* and the Biblical creation story as conceptual maps exhibiting the utopian-progressive settings grounding ‘no-places’ and ‘good-places.’ The spiral reading strategies began with the works of King and Grace, interrogating the ways in which they created stories, imaginatively affirming their relational-processual archives and critically negating Eurocentric ones. This discussion led to an examination of colonial place created through *Utopia*, exposing ambivalence, and planting the seeds for negotiations of catachrestic citizenship.

In the remaining four chapters, I will turn to the related production of colonial ‘every-places’ through the discourses of cartography, geography, and natural science, reading them in spiral relation to the novels of King and Grace. I will then examine discourses of assimilation, neocolonial tourism, and pluralism as they inform the Nation in terms of “what Foucault has called a ‘discursive formation—not simply an allegory or imaginative

vision, but a gestative political structure” (Brennan 46). As recited societies emerging from colonial histories, Canada and New Zealand define and represent cultures through discourses, locating settler-invader and indigenous cultures in relation to one another and the land in colonial and neocolonial systems of power. The series of truths perpetuated by the discursive formation of the Nation are neocolonial, as they have evolved from and are related to the colonial discourses of the past. I interrogate both colonial discourses that assimilate indigenous places and cultures, as well as neocolonial ones that attempt to integrate indigenous cultures into the contemporary Nation.

My interrogation is not limited to Eurocentric discourses, however; spiral reading strategies require that anti-colonial discourses, such as the novels of King and Grace, be read in counterpoint with one another and in relation to colonial and neocolonial texts. This is because all these stories are central to the “formation, transformation, and correlation” (McHoul and Grace 44) of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively, and are thus integral discourses constituting these nations as discursive formations.⁴⁰

In the remainder of this thesis, I will read indigenous worldviews as critically negating utopian-progressive structures of ‘government’ in order to unsettle assimilation and integration. Foucault himself insists that government did not refer only to political structures or to the management of states; rather, it designated the way in which the conduct of individuals or of

⁴⁰ Throughout this thesis, emphasis within quotations appears as it does in the original texts unless otherwise stated.

groups might be directed: the government of children, of souls, of communities, of families, of the sick. It did not only cover the legitimately constituted forms of political or economic subjection, but also modes of action, more or less considered and calculated, which were destined to act upon the possibilities of action of other people.

To govern, in this sense, is to structure the possible field of action (“Afterword” 221). My reading of relational-processual government recognizes hybrid conceptualizations of indigenous cultures as “space[s] of knowledge,” places capable of forming their own governments in relation to dominant systems of power (see Spivak “Neocolonialism” 237). The works of King and Grace emerge as textual speaking places, *turangawaewae*, from which their inside-out perspectives locate Aboriginal and Māori cultures in relation to Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand.

CHAPTER TWO

(Re)Mapping Colonial Places: Opening up

Spaces and ‘Novel’ Negotiations

*Beginning in the oral tradition, words and stories have always meant power in Native culture, and it is through this sacred power that Native people have always expressed their sense of identity and place on the land. (Armand Garnet Ruffo in “Inside Looking Out,” *Looking at the Words of Our People*)*

*There are two cultural maps of my country, the Maori and the Pakeha. The Pakeha map is dominant, its contours so firmly established that all New Zealanders including Maori are shaped by it. The Maori map has eroded and, although its emotional landscape is still to all intents and purposes intact, it has been unable to shape all New Zealanders including Pakeha. (Witi Ihimaera in “The Maori in Literature,” *Tihe Mauri Ora*)*

*If there is anything that radically distinguishes the imagination of anti-imperialism it is the primacy of the geographical element. Imperialism after all is an act of geographical violence through which virtually every space in the world is explored, charted, and finally brought under control. (Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism*)*

It has been almost forty years since Northrop Frye identified the question “where is here?” as central to Canadian literature, and, as Donna Palmateer Pennee points out, it is a question that “has turned out to be inseparable from ‘who am I?’” (*New Contexts* 203).¹ That these two questions are inseparable in the contexts of both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand highlights the continual negotiation of place and identity. This negotiation entails “devising, channelling, and controlling social

¹ See Frye’s *The Bush Garden* (220). These questions are also addressed in Māori literature and criticism directly. For example, Rapira asks “Who Am I?” in *Te Ao Marama: Contemporary Maori Writing*, Vol 3

interactions, and the construction of places, in the sense of known and definable areas” (McDowell 2). Indigenous cultures negotiate particular relations to the land, but in settler-invader societies, must further construct identity in relation to dominant cultures within the discursive formations of the Nation.

Irihapeti Ramsden (Ngāi Tahu/Rangitane) insists that Māori must inhabit Aotearoa New Zealand, as “there is no question of going somewhere else to replenish ourselves culturally, there is no other place where we can culturally rejuvenate” (262). How, then, can indigenous cultures create places beyond those determined by utopian-progressive colonial discourses? How can they acknowledge the ‘two cultural maps’ recognized by Ihimaera (see epigraph) and renew those places associated with their cultures in a relational process that includes, but is not limited by, ongoing relationships with the historical colony and the Nation?

In this chapter, I draw on the relational-processual archive discussed in Chapter One to interrogate the utopian-progressive archive of colonial and neocolonial discourses. I argue that envisioning the place of the colony from the inside-out enables both the opening of spaces within places and the reformulation of indigenous relationships with the land. As Said points out, imperial discourses disseminate places that could be “known, then invaded and possessed, then re-created” through imperial progress (*Orientalism* 92). For this reason, I begin with the Eurocentric discourses of cartography, Vidalian geography, and natural science, discourses with which Said, King and Grace all engage. I read these discourses using postcolonial and indigenous theories, and in counterpoint with specific textual

moments in King's *Green Grass, Running Water* and *Truth and Bright Water*, and Grace's *Baby No-eyes* and *Potiki*. This spiral reading exposes specific historical colonial discourses as part of the discursive formations of the locations – Canada and New Zealand – that became colonies perpetuating a tradition of assimilation.

According to Ruffo, it is through the 'sacred power' of stories that Aboriginal peoples, and I would add Māori, have set up and maintained their 'sense of identity and place on the land' (see epigraph). I will argue that maps, as discourses, are by which cultures set up their terms for engagement with one another and the places they occupy. The purpose of this chapter is to identify how stories mapping locations – expressed through criticism, the sciences, and creative work – imaginatively affirm and critically negate discourses and discursive systems enabling the assimilation of 'empty' and 'unknown' spaces of the colonies into the place of the Empire. My spiral reading begins with postcolonial and indigenous criticism of the discourse of mapmaking, in which Grace and King participate through their engagements with this discourse in their novels. I then analyze the related discourses of 'natural' science and geography in relation to King and Grace, unpacking the ways science and geography exclude indigenous knowledges.

Discourses of mapping enabled colonial possession and re-creation of indigenous lands as assimilated segments of the British Empire. Here, I relate the assimilation of spaces into places to the utopian-progressive paradigm envisioned by the 'seeing-man,' as established in Chapter One. Thus, I "connect the structures" of these Eurocentric discourses to "the ideas, concepts, experiences from which [they] draw support" (Said *Culture* 67). I ensure this contrapuntal reading strategy is

hybridized by exposing the ambivalence inherent in this discursive system and through reading Eurocentric mapping and geography in relation to the relational-processual worldviews located in works of King and Grace.² My reading interrogates the production of settler-invader colonies at both the archival and discursive levels. The second purpose of this chapter is to read the works of King and Grace for assertions of relational-processual settings that imaginatively affirm places to ‘escape’ Eurocentric maps without leaving the places of the colony and emergent Nation.

Neither Canada nor Aotearoa New Zealand is simply a geographical site that can be naturally mapped as part of the British Empire. Both are geographically distant from this European centre, as well as from each other. It is necessary for these sites to be known, invaded, possessed, and recreated in order for these sites to be fully assimilated as colonies (Said). Attempting to re/place these colonial sites from indigenous points of view does not involve simply rejecting the processes of assimilation, however. The normalized colonial tradition of geography, which Said identifies as central to the production of colonial sites and the placement of indigenous cultures in relation to the colony, must be confronted with the question ‘what is indigenous place?’ (see epigraph).

The answer must address how Aboriginal and Māori cultures are located in relation to colonial places. Spivak’s hesitation in answering similar questions concerning the abstract category of ‘woman’ indicates a postcolonial, and she argues more ethical, theoretical location from which to begin. She states that, rather than

² Geography as a subject of academic study emerged in the 1870s in France. Kristin Ross discusses the work of Vidal de la Blanche as primary to the establishment of geography as a study, and his work can be linked to Linnaeus, discussed below, as both are systemic discourses attempting to classify the whole world. Ross contrasts this to the work of Elisée Réclus, a social geographer who I will also discuss. See Ross’ “Rimbaud and Spatial History.”

asking ‘what is woman’—reiterating the question ‘what is man’ by setting up the masculinist binary— “perhaps the proper question of someone who has not been allowed to be the subject of history is to say: ‘What is man that he was obliged to produce such a text of history?’”

(“The Post-modern” 33). For the purposes of this chapter, then, I wish to reappropriate Spivak’s statement to ask, ‘what is the colonizer that he was obliged to produce such mappings of imperial place?’ The answer is that colonizers are members of dominant cultures attempting to assimilate lands beyond the original borders of their nations into the Empire. Here, I interrogate historical colonial mapping strategies as they function to assimilate indigenous lands into places produced by discourses reflecting the colonizer’s point of view. I resist the privilege of the colonizer’s knowledge systems. I then return to my primary question in this thesis: how do King and Grace, within this critical context, challenge colonial and neo-colonial worldviews and engage an emergent, relational order as the basis for new ways of imagining Aboriginal and Māori subjectivity within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand today?

Although cartographic maps are one discourse I will focus on in this chapter, I will also look at other discourses used to structure colonial place. The larger discourses of geography and natural science also mask the ambivalence of spaces within places to produce places on the terms of the dominant. This process must be linked first to stories because, as Said notes in *Culture and Imperialism*, it is stories that are

at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about strange regions of

the world; they also become the method colonized people use to assert their own identity and the existence of their history. The main battle in imperialism is over land, of course; but when it came to who owned the land, who had the right to settle and work on it, who kept it going, who won it back, and who now plans its future—these issues were reflected, contested, and even for a time decided in narrative. (6)

Between the 1830s and the 1880s these discourses became central to a new ‘story’ emerging from within and outside the contact zones of these Crown colonies: the story of assimilation.

In *Territorial Disputes: Maps and Mapping Strategies in Contemporary Canadian and Australian Fiction*, Graham Huggan opens up a critical space linking deconstruction and decolonisation. Through the trope of the map, Huggan critiques dominant systems in colonial discourse (150). Spiral reading strategies can be used to conceptualize what Huggan calls ‘literary cartography,’ which itself requires

the implementation of a series of creative revisions which register the uncertain transition from a colonial framework, within which the writer is compelled to recreate and reflect upon the restrictions of colonial space, to a postcolonial one, within which he or she acquires the freedom to engage in a series of ‘territorial disputes.’ (*Territorial* 155).

Both King and Grace envision literary cartographies from the inside out, re-mapping speaking places, or turangawaewae, from which to engage with the world. They can be seen both as ‘mapbreakers’ dismantling systems of representations and as

‘mapmakers’ outlining new locations for articulating indigenous experiences (Huggan *Territorial* 13).³ Spiral reading strategies engage both colonial and postcolonial frameworks and can thus locate ‘literary cartography’ within a relational-processual paradigm.

Between the late fifteenth and nineteenth centuries, the British Empire expanded around the world, eventually colonizing the geographical spaces now called Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Initial contact between Europeans and the indigenous populations of these two locations took place at completely different historical moments from one another. John Cabot (Giovanni Caboto) first reached what is now called Canada—likely Newfoundland—in 1497. Abel Tasman reached New Zealand in 1642, but an altercation with Māori prompted his crew’s swift departure. Therefore, James Cook’s voyages between 1769 and 1777 constitute the first substantial forays into the region by Europeans.

Multiple Aboriginal tribes were key players in early colonial forays into fisheries and the fur trade, the primary motivators for more extensive British, Dutch, and primarily French explorations of North America in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. J. R. Miller describes the early North American contact zone as based on commercial partnership and mutual benefit for both Aboriginal peoples and Europeans, although he insists that the Aboriginals were initially the ‘dominant

³ Adding indigenous authors to those Huggan identifies as participating in creating his ‘literary cartography’ is essential, as he focuses solely on white colonial culture as ‘the colonized’, stating that for “the various Canadian native Indian or Australian aboriginal peoples the map is generally seen in different terms altogether, as an elaborate communicational network that serves and supports an orally based culture” (*Territorial* 75). Stratton notes this exclusion, pointing out that “Huggan’s analysis is part of a general tendency in European Canadian culture to see itself as the colonized and not as the colonizer. It is a viewpoint which discounts First Nations experience of colonialism” (82). My hybrid contrapuntal engagement is a necessary expansion on his work. However, my brief engagement here does not resolve the exclusion of the indigenous perspective and I look forward to addressing this in future work.

partner' as "the Indians dictated that the trade should follow forms that had existed among them for centuries" (37). Settlements established by both the French and British facilitated these ventures, and missionaries soon followed traders as the "triad of fish, fur, and exploration," opened up in the seventeenth century to include a fourth motivation: faith (29-30). Both Catholic and Protestant missionaries established settlements to convert the Aboriginal peoples, with limited results. In the late seventeenth century, both the French and English presences in the area were confirmed by their respective imperial 'centres', as France established New France as a Crown Colony in 1663, and the British government chartered the Company of Adventurers of England trading into Hudson's Bay, or 'The Hudson's Bay Company,' in 1670.

Six years after the signing of the Royal Proclamation, in 1769, James Cook began his six-month circumnavigation of New Zealand. Initial trade in timber and flax, as well as sealing and whaling, enlarged the European-Māori contact zone, and by the early nineteenth century settlement had begun. The Church of England's Church Missionary Society arrived in 1814 under the auspices of Samuel Marsden, and other denominations soon followed. Although Britain was initially hesitant to colonize New Zealand, threats of French competition and increased tension between traders and Māori led to increased 'official' presence and attempts to implement Royal Proclamation policies. By the mid- nineteenth century, both New Zealand (1840) and Canada (1867) were established as official 'colonies' of the British Empire, and they began to develop similar discursive formations premising the centre of the Empire as central *to* the colony.

Several key differences emerge in an examination of pre-contact and early colonial histories of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Aboriginal peoples were more culturally diverse, had a higher population, and were spread through a much larger territory than the Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand.⁴ While Canada was ‘discovered’ in the late fifteenth century and has a long history of colonization, Aotearoa New Zealand was found and settled much later. Despite these differences, both of these geographical areas developed into settler-invader colonies of the British Empire, or what David Pearson calls ‘dominion societies’:

quintessential mass settler nation-states, not only in terms of their origins and subsequent relations of ethnic dominance and subordination, but also because of the enduring influence of their ethnic foundations, mythical or otherwise, and the current design of ethnic politics that have resulted from a mix of continuities and changes. (6)

This is not to imply that these distinct places developed interchangeable systems of government or identical contact zones. Rather, by the time the 1837 Select Committee on Aborigines in the British Colonies released its recommendations, the cultural relations between settler-invaders and indigenous peoples in the discursive formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand were not so radically different. Because colonial discourses masked spaces in colonial places, one report could be seen as applicable to the two

⁴ This categorization relies on national constructs of place and subjectivity. Many Māori self-identify as Pacific Islanders, thus expanding their frame of reference to a larger geographical space. So, too, many Aboriginal people refuse to recognize the border between Canada and the United States as legitimate. However, for the purposes of this discussion – framed as it is by colonial and national discourses and these sites as discursive formations in which King and Grace place themselves – I use the geographical places now defined as Canada and New Zealand here.

different locations.⁵

‘Empty Spaces’: The Production of Colonisable Place

In imperial discourse, colonial places are ‘known’ as both empty and waiting for settler-invasion. Settler-invader culture relies on this Eurocentric colonial envisioning of the world within the utopian-progressive paradigm. As discussed in Chapter One, colonial texts such as *Utopia* represented empty places open to settlement, perfect sites for progressive colonization through discourses supporting colonial ideals concerning place and culture. The resulting discursive system, internal to that particular text, delineates the “important philosophical and imaginative processes at work in the production as well as the acquisition, subordination, and settlement of space” (Said “Conversation” 4). These processes were enacted through multiple discourses supporting the colonial project. In order for Eurocentric systems to be established within the colonies, unknown spaces first had to be designated as primarily ‘empty’ places, places ready for colonization.

The legal-geographical concept *Terra nullius* was used in imperial times to indicate that “the land was unused, empty” unless it was organized in a European fashion (Harris xxi).⁶ According to Karen Piper, “the way to establish sovereignty was to mark a boundary or make a map, a method accepted in international law” (8).

Lands that were not bounded or mapped in imperial fashion thus became available for

⁵ This universalism is perpetuated within discursive formations. Although the effects of this report were different in Canada and New Zealand, the shared strategies producing ‘place’ (in light of Tuan) are my concern here.

⁶ This concept might initially be thought similar to Te Kore, the opening stage of the spiral of creation discussed in Chapter One. However, although both initially locate a space of potential, Te Kore represents a potential that emerges as chaotic unknown and (Te Po) then a world of possibility. In comparison, terra nullius is almost immediately envisioned from the outside as a space to be systematically filled through colonial settlement and land ownership.

appropriation because they were ‘empty’ of Eurocentric codes. Early explorers focussed on “navigational mapping” of the external natural borders of land—the coastlines—while leaving the interior unknown spaces blank (Pratt 30).

Henderson (Chickasaw) discusses these early imperial representations of place, citing “an emptiness of basic cultural institutions and people in much of the non-European world” (“Postcolonial” 61).⁷ Thus, like the Biblical creation story discussed in Chapter One, the story of colonization begins with the imperial assertion that prior to ‘contact’ there was, figuratively, nothing in place in either British North America or New Zealand. This vision of the potential colony begins by denying indigenous presence and indigenous peoples’ representations of the places they already inhabit in favour of Eurocentric re-creation. Discovery becomes a place-clearing gesture, emptying indigenous lands through discourses creating places ‘known’ as utopian sites perfect for colonization.

Henderson asserts that this ‘myth of emptiness’ is premised on four claims which, together, diffuse indigenous reality. The first posits that settlement does not displace indigenous populations, as the region is empty of ‘settled’ peoples. The second claim—that nomadic peoples, in comparison, have no rights—hinges on the third principle: if a culture does not define property rights in a colonial manner, the land can be taken and possessed. These structures enacting proper placement of land and cultures is foundational to the colonization of indigenous peoples themselves; not only was the land philosophically and actually emptied of its occupants through colonial ideologies and settlement, but those occupants were also ‘emptied’ of

⁷ Henderson terms this ‘classic diffusionism’ (“Postcolonial” 61-3).

intellectual creativity and values. This is the fourth premise: indigenous peoples, lacking Eurocentric governmentality, are represented as in need of proper placement (see Henderson “Postcolonial”). This diffusionist myth represents a set of limitations emerging from a utopian-progressive archive allowing these discourses to assert emptiness as a precursor to the production of the colony. The elements of this myth, then, give form to and limit representations of both indigenous cultures and land.

The diffusionist myth of emptiness focuses on the supposed absence of existing structures of governmentality; indigenous peoples’ relationships with the land did not count because their productions of places did not fit into the Eurocentric norms of ‘settlement.’ These norms were tied to Locke’s ‘labour theory of property,’ which asserted the availability of uncultivated land for colonial ownership. In his *Two Treatises on Government* (1680-1690), he states that ownership of land belongs to a man who “hath mixed his labour with [it and...] joined to it something that is his own [and...] remove[d] [it] out of the state that nature hath provided it and left it in” (qtd in Bentley 87).⁸ This view was also taken up by Emerich de Vattel almost a century later in the *Law of Nations* (1758), in which he argued that Europeans could seize indigenous lands because “the peoples in those vacant tracts of land rather roamed over than inhabited them” (qtd in Duchemin 70). ‘Vacancy,’ then, was tied not to actual emptiness, but rather to the lack of Eurocentric maps and boundaries and ideas regarding land use.

In *Baby No Eyes*, Grace unsettles the naturalization of these theories by addressing their impact from Kura’s Māori perspective. Kura reveals that her

⁸ Bhiku Parekh reads Locke in relation to Mill, arguing that Locke had “no doubt that English colonization of North America was fully justified, and provided its most articulate and influential philosophical defence” (83).

ancestor Pirinoa's grandfather resisted initial Pākehā attempts to purchase land "with guns, pots, pipes, blankets and beads to exchange for a name or a mark on a sale deed," asking instead, "[w]ill our grandchildren live in the wind?" (112). This question indicates that Māori did, indeed, inhabit the land, and that it was central to their ways of life. Initially, Pirinoa allowed Pākehā settlement not because Europeans had the 'right' to colonize, but because "it suited [her] people to have them living nearby" (112). According to stories handed down to Kura from her ancestors, the early colonial contact zone was one based on mutual benefit; however, for Māori it also centred on whakapapa. Māori, true to their future relations, "kept the authority of the land and wouldn't sell it. They didn't want to steal from their grandchildren's children" (112). The Pākehā worldview could not incorporate whakapapa, however, and Kura exposes the resulting colonial agenda: settler-invaders "wanted more land, they wanted the best land, they wanted all the land" (113). In other words, invasion inevitably led to the next step in Said's Orientalizing process: possession.

Neither Aboriginal nor Māori conceptualizations of land ownership would easily fit into the Eurocentric systems premising possession by individual land owners. In the Māori system,

Land and the resources of the land were assets inherited from the ancestors and held in trust by the current generation for future generations. All land was held tribally and there was no general right of individual or private ownership except the right of families to occupy, use or cultivate certain portions of tribal land subject to the paramount right of the tribe. (Mohamed and Clark 10)

Aboriginal peoples shared a similar view of land rights and, in both British North America and Aotearoa New Zealand, chiefs were often under the misapprehension that they were granting temporary rights of occupancy to European settlers, as they had traditionally granted user rights to nomadic tribes or visitors in the past. However, the European settlers believed that they were buying individual property rights to the land.⁹

Neither Aboriginal nor Māori cultures recognized individual ownership of lands, but other differences between these cultures ensured that the Eurocentric diffusionist myth of emptiness was more easily applied in historical discourses creating the place of the colony in slightly different ways. Although many Aboriginal tribes in North America were actively cultivating land at the time of contact, they did not share a common system of land control amongst themselves and they tended to be more nomadic, and Eurocentric discourses often focussed on this nomadic nature. In Aotearoa New Zealand, however Māori had a very clear grasp on the notion of ‘controlled access’ and, “[a]s cultivators rather than wandering herdsmen, Maori had a claim to territorial sovereignty or land ownership superior to most other indigenous peoples” (Orange 23).¹⁰ High population density, especially in the North Island, had led to land and resource controls that included pa, or fortified sites, to protect not only people but also crops from hostile neighbours.

Because Māori ideas of land ownership fit more closely with Eurocentric ones

⁹ For an extended discussion of the miscommunication involved in these land issues, see Ward’s *A show of justice*. See also J. R. Miller’s *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens*.

¹⁰ It is unfortunate that Orange here mirrors a colonial hierarchy placing cultivated land above land used in other ways. That said, Orange’s *Treaty of Waitangi* is highly recommended for further reading not only about the Treaty itself, but the contexts leading up to and emerging after its signing. In his review of the text, Robin Fisher states, “no one has examined the influence of this fundamental document throughout the whole course of New Zealand history . . . that it also raises interesting questions in the wider context in no way diminishes its significance” (144-5).

(Orange 23), there was a shift in emphasis in colonial discourses propagating the diffusionist myth. Claudia Orange argues that, by the 1830s, discourses depicted Māori as dying out and in need of ‘civilization.’ This allowed for a move “towards accepting that New Zealand was destined to be a British colony” (31). If Māori land could not be as easily represented as vacant, Māori culture was instead envisioned as ‘empty’ of systems of government capable of sustaining the population. This shift in focus to the fourth element of the diffusionist myth—emptiness of values and social structures—ensured the maintenance of the myth more generally: “No longer were [settler-invaders] considering a Maori New Zealand in which a place had to be found for British intruders, but a settler New Zealand in which a place had to be found for Maori” (Orange 31). This shift supports not only the assimilation of land, but also the assimilation of culture, to be discussed further in Chapter Three.

Reading Henderson’s diffusionist myth of emptiness as supporting the production of both utopian no-places ready for colonization and potential good-places in need of colonization for cultural survival reveals the utopian-progressive setting of assimilationist discourses. Empty spaces are inevitably to be filled with progressive systems representing colonial power. I propose that cartography is an early winner for the colonizers in what Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson identify as the primary focus of colonialism: “a contest of representation” (“Introduction” 10). After mapping the place as empty, cartographers map colonial places – including names of locations, churches, and trade routes – as palimpsests over the emptiness. Cartographic maps thus simultaneously re-create first, ‘no-place’, and then a ‘good-place’; they fit into the utopian-progressive paradigm because they ultimately produce colonisable places

as container for future colonies within the Empire.

As Simon Ryan discusses, “[m]aps themselves have played a significant role in the visual production of the continent as a *tabula rasa*, for cartographic emptiness is not simply a display of geographical ignorance but a statement of economic and demographic availability” (126).¹¹ The discursive act of emptying place evident in early imperial mapmaking is an act which, Ryan asserts, “does not simply or innocently reflect gaps in European knowledge but actively erases (and legitimizes the erasure of) existing social and geo-cultural formations in preparation for the projection and subsequent emplacement of a new order” through creating place (116).¹² What is ‘known,’ then is not the presence of unknown spaces, but the representation of places produced as vacant, available sites. Because “empty spaces can be settled” (Tiffin and Lawson 5), colonial mapping enabled the next steps in Said’s Orientalizing process: after places were ‘known’ as empty, they could be invaded and possessed.

As they gained authority in the imperial world, maps formed a discursive system purporting to be able to delineate the whole world. As Marcelo Escobar writes, “[f]rom the latter decades of the nineteenth century onwards neutralization of cartographic representation and naturalizations of the graphic shape of the state allowed geography to take its place as an autonomous scientific discipline” (50).¹³ As a discipline, geography normalizes Eurocentric discourses that perpetuate a utopian-

¹¹ It is not just the continent that was seen as this type of space, but also the indigenous mind. As early as 1634, it was thought that Native Canadian religion was useless and that “the Indian mind was a *tabula rasa*, just waiting to receive the teachings of Christianity.” See Armitage’s *Comparing the Policy* (72). This is the focus of Chapter Three.

¹² Simon Ryan links this directly to naming, which participates in “not merely *reflecting* a material arrangement, but *enabling* it” (128).

¹³ For an excellent overview of the development of mapping strategies from the Late Middle Ages to Imperialist times, see Escobar’s “Exploration, Cartography and the Modernization of State Power.”

progressive archive and mask the ambivalence at the heart of its paradigm. Grace's and King's critical negations of geographical discourses undermine the authority of this discipline and its 'worlding of worlds.'

'Colonized Place': Imperialist Cartographic and Figurative Mapping

The discursive formation of the Empire required that 'known' empty places be re-created to ensure their assimilation into their proper places as colonies.¹⁴ The progress from empty places to colonized places involved both invasion and possession. Maps needed to be 'filled' systematically in order to fulfill the utopian-progressive paradigm, because imperial "knowledge gives power, more power requires more knowledge, and so on in an increasingly profitable dialectic of information and control" (Said *Orientalism* 36). The resulting Truth – circular knowledge systems – was not only reflected in maps, but in multiple discourses creating

a complex Orient suitable for study in the academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction in the colonial office, for theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial, and historical theses about mankind and the universe. (Said *Orientalism* 7-8)

Together, these discourses figuratively mapped the place of the colony from outside-in perspectives of explorers and settler-invaders seeking to 'invade' and 'possess' indigenous lands (Said), both through maps and on the ground.

The establishment of European sovereignty over colonial territories through

¹⁴ For a more specific reading of rights discourses in relation to the locations of British Settler Colonies in this historical period, see Julie Evans et al., *Equal Subjects, Unequal Rights: Indigenous Peoples in British Settler Colonies, 1830-1910*.

mapping practices hinged on the related ideas of *Terra nullius*, discussed above, and *Terra incognita*. According to the latter concept, “the colonial task [was] to transform ‘the wilderness’ into ‘civilization’ by imposing European geometrical and cultivated order on it—by surveying, clearing, and settling it” (Stratton 87). This transformation of space into place reflects the points of view of those in power; they support Eurocentric envisioning of the colony from the outside-in. Because mapmakers assimilated land into imperial systems of government, “[a]s much as guns and warships, maps were the weapons of imperialism” (Harley 282). The places that would become Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand were mapped within the ideologies of imperialism and colonialism.

Colonial cartography, represented as factual science, supports Orientalist possession. As Wolfgang Kempf writes in his discussion of Pacific Island cosmologies, “[t]he world map is an exemplary product of the objectification that started with the Enlightenment—a process that homogenized and abstracted various spatial practices and narratives into a singular representation of geographic practices” (102). Mapmakers created places within discursive systems so that their representations were naturalized. As a result, the idea “[t]hat maps can produce a truly ‘scientific’ image of the world, in which factual information is represented without favour, is a view well embedded in our cultural mythology” (Harley 287). Grace’s and King’s texts remind the readers that colonial mapmaking strategies, and the maps produced, were not objective. They did not reflect indigenous realities, but rather colonizers’ views of the world. These writers’ works validate Ryan’s contention that explorers’ and surveyors’ “ways of seeing—and hence selecting—

details to be recorded, are predefined not just by the centuries-old traditions of European map-making but also by the ideology of expansionist colonialism which they serve” (115). The map-making tradition constitutes a series of discourses rather than a science reflecting universalist Truth, and its ongoing power as a set of discourses hinges on the four premises of the myth of emptiness discussed above.

In *Baby No-eyes*, Grace exposes both the Eurocentric vision in map-making as well as the notion of and ownership as antithetical to Māori worldviews. Although Māori had developed systems governing access to and use of land, these reflected whakapapa and did not reflect Eurocentric ownership systems. Kura critically negates the idea of a man owning land in “the same way as he owned his coat” (112) through her description of the figure of the Pākehā colonizer:

He believed that he, one person, could possess land and everything on that land by taking a signature from someone who didn't own land in that way. Or he believed that he could take land by drawing lines on paper.

For him it was a way laid down. (112)

Eurocentric worldviews enabled colonial invasion and possession through acts associated with mapping. In exposing this naturalized ‘way laid down,’ Kura exposes the ways in which mapping is a strategy supporting, and founded on, colonial discursive formations.

King also directly engages the discourse of maps, and Marlene Goldman argues that he “revises inherited maps and replaces them with representations that

speak to a Native worldview” (8).¹⁵ He does this specifically in *Green Grass, Running Water* through Buffalo Bill Bursum’s display of television sets reflecting the production of place emerging from both *terra nullius* and *terra incognita*. The Bursum character, a white man, has the power to create and organize place, and he himself names his creation “The Map.” This naming implies a singular Eurocentric vision that fits in with the colonial construction of cartographic discourse as a unitary science. This map is not one of many, but ‘*The Map*.’ King’s naming of this character also interrogates colonial authority in mapping place, as it refers to Holm O. Bursum, the New Mexican senator who proposed the Bursum Bill (1921) advocating large-scale removal of land titles and water rights from Pueblos to non-Native peoples. The nickname ‘Buffalo Bill’ was the pseudonym for William F. Cody, the man in charge of ‘Buffalo Bill Cody’s Wild West Show’ who used Aboriginal peoples in stereotypical ‘cowboys and Indians’ fashion for entertainment.¹⁶

Buffalo Bill Bursum displays the television sets in the shape of a map of North America. When sales assistant Minnie Smith asks, “What does it do?” (127), Bursum uses the remote control to operate *The Map*. Using his ‘imperial eye,’ he is able to world worlds from the outside-in.

For a moment there was nothing, and then each set blinked and a soft dot of gray light swelled to fill the screen. All two hundred screens glowed silver, creating a sense of space and great emptiness at the end of the store. . . . [After Bursum puts in a video] the screens came alive with

¹⁵ Goldman goes on to state that “King’s project also involves subverting a whole range of Western representational strategies, including the map, the linear narrative (in books—particularly the Bible—but in movies, as well), the stereotype, and literacy itself” (8).

¹⁶ See Flick’s “Reading Notes.”

brilliant colours. (127)

Prior to Bursum's actions, 'nothing' existed beyond the structures of the television sets, which can be compared to the coastlines outlined in navigational mapping.

When turned on, The Map fills up the sites in North America with a story chosen by Bursum. What the map 'does' is mirror Orientalist progression of place from known to possessed: the empty map, constructed by a member of dominant society, waits to be 'filled in' with a movie – Bursum's chosen text – which constructs a place for cultural engagement through the location, and cultural relations, in the movie itself.

Bursum himself is thrilled with The Map, recognizing the power it affords him as a producer of place. For him, it is "like having the universe there on the wall, being able to see everything, being in control" (128). His Eurocentric attitude extends to Aboriginal characters in the text directly, as he does not worry about whether his Aboriginal sales assistant Lionel is present at the unveiling. According to Bursum, Lionel will not understand "the unifying metaphor or the cultural impact . . . [because] power and control . . . [are] outside the range of the Indian imagination" (128). The Map, then, represents place within a singular archive informed by the diffusionist myth of emptiness: it denies not only Aboriginal control over their lands, but the importance of their points of view. King exposes the colonial agenda inherent in the diffusionist myth; Bursum, the colonizer, needs 'to see everything' in order to control the world on his own terms. The story of The Map unsettles representations of maps as 'natural' transparent representations of geographical locations. Bursum must 'create' the place in which he can produce a world fulfilling his neocolonial desire.

Through *The Map*, King interrogates not only the diffusionist myth of emptiness, but also the imagination of place as ready to be ‘filled in.’ This section of the text reminds the reader that, from the very beginning, “[t]racings on maps excluded as much as they enclosed” (Harley 285). Due to their presence as discourses within the larger discursive system of imperialism, maps participated in excluding indigenous worldviews and ‘forgetting’ their unique positions within the imagined communities of the colony. Reading maps as discourses ensures that readers recognize maps as “historically contingent sign systems” rather than “miraculous windows through which to snap shots of reality” that might be confused with the world itself (Woods 2). King and Grace set up this contrapuntal reading within their texts by calling on the reader to engage with colonial discourses through their stories.

In the imperial era, multiple sign systems worked together to form the discursive formations of the Empire. Although not all these systems created cartographic maps, they participated in figuratively mapping places. Swedish naturalist Linnaeus’ *Systema Natura* (1735), for example, sought to characterize the reproductive parts of plants in a classification system capable of encompassing all plant life, known and unknown. Pratt asserts that this shift constitutes not only a difference in the focus of mapping exercises, but a change in the structuring and perception of knowledge of the world, as “natural history conceived of the world as a chaos out of which the scientist *produced* an order” (30).¹⁷

¹⁷ Pratt sets this up as antithetical to navigational mapping, stating that natural history, in comparison, “is not, then, simply a question of depicting the planet as it was” (30). Although it could be argued that Europeans were more aware of their motives in assigning definitive realities through natural history, I

This production of place was expressly ‘factual,’ and thus knowable to those who had the capacity to read the accepted codes.¹⁸ The “classificatory systems created the task of locating every species on the planet, extracting it from its particular, arbitrary surroundings (the chaos), and placing it in its appropriate spot in the system” (Pratt 31). In this manner, colonial discourses located indigenous cultures as objects within the larger Eurocentric ‘grid of analysis’ outlined in Chapter One.

Of course, indigenous cultures utilized complex systems of organization of their own. Some Europeans recognized these systems and sought to include them in their writings. In 1868, William Colenso “wrote in admiration of Maori knowledge of life cycles of plants and insects that clearly predated Linnaeus” (M. Walker 17).¹⁹ According to Daniel E. Moerman, author of *Native American Ethnobotany*, Aboriginal peoples knew an incredible amount about plants in imperial times. However, because many scientific discourses seek to maintain a colonial and neocolonial archive,

science has worked actively to achieve its central role as producer and keeper of verifiable knowledge of the outside world. . . .

The technique used at all levels of both institutions and individuals has been to deem results derived from other knowledge systems ‘unscientific’ in nature or ‘scientifically invalid.’ (Moerman 17)

would argue that, as outlined above, both navigational mapping and natural history ‘produce’ knowledge in similar ways.

¹⁸ Linnaeus himself was such a ‘reader,’ one with particular power; he stayed home in Europe while others traveled with world collecting plants for classification. Pratt develops the metaphor of Linnaeus as the biblical Adam which she attributes initially to the work of Boorstin. See *Imperial Eyes* (32, 56)

¹⁹ See Colenso’s *On the Vegetable Food of the Ancient New Zealanders* (388).

In this way, outside-in perspectives were maintained in imperial discursive formations, with indigenous places and cultures defined by colonizers and colonial systems of knowledge.

The discipline of geography, with its emphasis on description and scientific cataloguing of details after the work of Vidal de la Blanche (1845-1918), “takes its model from the taxonomic dream of the natural sciences and is resolutely turned toward description” (Ross 361). According to Kristin Ross, “Western, Christian colonialism demands a certain construction of space that Vidalian, academic geography was to help provide: natural, which is to say non-historical—and one where all alterity is absent” (362). Vidalian geography, then, reflects a utopian-progressive archive, as it produces places that foreclose spaces. In Grace’s *Potiki*, James’s stories can be read in relation to Vidalian geography, as they are

about the earth and the universe. This school earth was divided by lines—latitude, longitude and equator. The people of this school earth lived in countries which were in continents, oceans and hemispheres . . . It was the charted rainfall, the sun, the hurricanes, the monsoons, the typhoons and snow, and it was the cross sections of mountains, rivers, land and soil. (40)

Grace includes these divisive discourses of geography, recognizing the importance of contemporary stories mapping out the world and the nations within it. However, she not only presents these as stories, she also brings them into relation with other geographical stories, which will be discussed below. Here, it is also important to note that these stories belong to James, a Māori youth. This places him in an ambivalent

subject position, as these global mapping and measuring strategies often support national boundaries which disempower Māori people within New Zealand. However, he must learn about and, indeed, live within, this world. Thus, he embodies, through his ownership of these ideas, Spivak's 'deconstructive position of the postcolonial,' which will be discussed in more detail below.

Not all historical discourses fit perfectly into colonial discursive formations. At times, new discourses emerged that enabled ambivalence within the utopian-progressive paradigm. This occurred when French geographer Elisée Réclus (1830-1905), for example, coined the term 'social geography' in opposition to Vidalian landscape-based geography in the late nineteenth century. Unlike Vidal de la Blanche and his colleagues, Réclus argued that "[g]eography is nothing but history in space . . . it is made, it is remade everyday; at each instant, it is modified by men's actions" (Ross 367). Réclus was, in his time not only "widely known as the foremost geographer of France." According to John Clark, he was also "feared by many as a dangerous political radical." His politics were radical because they challenged the singular 'scientific' nature of cartography as the sole way to map locations.²⁰

Potiki enacts its own politics promoting social geography and articulating various stories in relation to one another. Alongside James's geographical stories, Grace presents Tangimoana's

stories of people. Some of these were book stories of queens and kings, monsters, charmers, murderers, ghosts, orphans, demons and saints. And [iwi] had their own heroes and heroines, enchanters, wrongdoers, outcasts

²⁰ For more on the radical nature of Réclus' geographical discourses, John P. Clark's "The Dialectical Social Geography of Elisée Réclus."

and magicians to add to these stories from books. (40)

These particular stories demonstrate how stories create places and Māori storytellers map value systems, not only creating locations but determining what is heroic and what is not. Tangimoana envisions the world as composed of “living stories of the people around her. . . Some of the stories were about herself, and about [her Māori community] too” (40). Unlike Vidalian geography, these social geographies exist within a relational-processual paradigm. As a character promoting inside-out perspectives, Tangimoana is at the centre of her own story based on living, shifting stories constituting Māori place.

Unlike Grace, who allows James’ and Tangimoana’s discourses to exist in relation to one another, the discursive formation of the Empire elevated Vidalian geography above social geography, as Vidalian discourses—like natural science and cartographic mapping specifically—fit into the larger discursive formation of Imperialism reflecting the utopian- progressive archive. These discourses worked together to ensure that places previously known as empty could be possessed and assimilated on Eurocentric terms. These Orientalist discourses thus foreclose spaces within places by denying the presence of indigenous peoples and their worldviews. I turn now to an examination of the Eurocentric perspective central to the colonial discursive formations, before turning to additional indigenous literary cartographies set up by King and Grace.

The 'Imperial Eye': Naming Places using Outside-in Perspectives

The map and its interpreters were interdependent in the process of 'worlding worlds'.²¹ As Pratt discusses, "circumnavigation and mapmaking . . . [gave] rise to what one might call a European global or planetary subject . . . [who] is European, male, secular, and lettered; his planetary consciousness is the product. . . of his contact with print culture and infinitely more 'compleat' than the lived experience of the sailors." As noted in Chapter One, Pratt theorizes this subject as the 'seeing-man' (30).²² Discourses of history, geography and literature worked in conjunction to promote his unitary vision.

Because of their access to reading codes, members of the European elite could have greater access to new worlds through discourse than those entering actual locations through lived experience. As Daniel Defoe asserts in *The Compleat English Gentleman* (1730), the reader may

make a tour of the world in books, he may make himself a master of the geography of the universe in the maps, atlases, and measurements of our mathematicians. He may travel by land with the historians, by sea with the navigators. He may go round the globe . . . and kno' a thousand times more doing it than all those illiterate sailors. (qtd Pratt 15)

Through texts, a gentleman can come to know a place that he has never seen and experience realities distant from his own. Literate people accessed colonial discourses and recognized the colonial discursive formation without leaving the centre of Empire.

²¹ The concept of 'worlding worlds' was introduced in the Introduction. For further discussion, see Spivak *Critique* 1-4.

²² Here, Pratt makes reference to Daniel Defoe's *The Compleat English Gentleman* (1730) to which I refer in the following paragraph.

Cartography functioned within the parameters of academic Eurocentric discourses as a ‘factual science’ producing places fully known through text.²³ As discussed in Chapter One, the outside-in perspective relies on the naturalization of Eurocentric points of view ensured by the utopian-progressive archive. Historical (and contemporary) maps reflect this supposed objectivity: “the truth of what [map readers] saw was established by that claim to objectivity” (Rose 7). Thus, readers of maps—and, I would add, those accessing places mapped into texts—“can set sail once more with Columbus . . . [to access] the world we take for granted—the real world . . . presented to us on the platter of the map” for consumption (Woods 7).

The map as a ‘platter’ allowed explorers and early settler-invaders to arrange what they ‘discovered’ in a way that fit in with established systems. As Amelia Kalant argues, “Columbus and early settlers made the new world understandable by reading it through European mythology, religion, and landscapes as they attempted to grapple with the new in a context where Europeans were neither materially nor politically dominant” (21). Incomplete stories were ‘filled in’ from the centre of Empire using the ‘known’ so that knowledge was accumulated as a set of universalizing discourses. This is the cyclical maintenance of power through discourse, as the “universalizing discourse about the nature and location of civilization justified European occupation of the rest of the world for prestige, profit, and the benefit of the Natives” (Harris 50). This circular process need not involve physically going to the New World; colonialism was strengthened through discourses

²³ Woods quotes Harley as stating that in “Western culture, at least since the Enlightenment, cartography has been defined as a factual science” (18). See also Rose’s *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge* (7).

read by ‘seeing-men’ in the colonial centre and enacted in the colony itself.

By engaging with discourses of cartography, Vidalian geography, and natural science, the seeing-man passively ‘discovers’ places, producing them within the utopian- progressive paradigm. Because these discourses are presented as normalized, “the act of discovery itself, for which all the untold lives were sacrificed and miseries endured, consisted of what in European culture counts as a purely passive experience—that of seeing” (Pratt 204). The seeing-man, the European global subject, interprets place as knowable and his act of reading and validating these colonial discourses keeps the presence of space under erasure. Resultant textual worlds – unified, colonized, places – have “no existence of [their] own. . . . [They] only [get] ‘made’ for real when the traveler (or other survivor) returns home, and brings [them] into being through texts” (Pratt 204). Thus, the explorer and colonizer, outside of his homeland, looks in on new places, and then returns home. This ensures maintenance of outside-in perspectives that are fundamentally Eurocentric in nature.

These discursive systems can be tied to “curiosity and control,” the “origins of knowing” identified by Henderson.

Both ways of European knowing create the polarities of self as knower and the world as known. . . . Both of these ways put a distance between the self and the world. In this distance, the world can become a plaything—a malleable entity to be constructed and deconstructed according to desire or purpose. (“*Ayukpachi*” 267-8)

A certain distance is necessary to the maintenance of the colonial outside-in perspectives, as it denies indigenous subjectivity. Both indigenous lands and cultures

were deemed to be part of distant empty ‘new worlds’ to be logically assimilated into the Empire.

According to Pratt, colonial textual representations involved a growing ‘rhetoric of presence.’ Discourses reflected not the reality of the seen, but a combination of qualities. “The aesthetic qualities of the landscape [which] constitute the social and material value of the discovery to the explorer’s home culture [...combined with] aesthetic deficiencies suggest[ing] a need for social and material intervention by the home culture” (205). Thus, progressive colonial intervention was recognized as essential for the necessary assimilation of the colony into the commonwealth. This aesthetic is mirrored in the depiction of the vast prairie landscape that figured prominently in nineteenth century landscape paintings, a genre that participates in the final step of Said’s process toward colonized knowledge: the re-creation of place in a manner reflecting colonial possession. These paintings depicted indigenous lands as wild, empty places ready for – indeed, in need of – further colonization.²⁴

In King’s *Truth and Bright Water*, Aboriginal artist Monroe Swimmer specializes in restoring these paintings and, according to him, “they all look alike. Craggy mountains, foreboding trees, sublime valleys with wild rivers running through them. . . . A primeval paradise. Peaceful” (138). King critically negates this representation of Canadian place, however, when Swimmer is asked to restore *Sunrise on Little Turtle Lake*, a painting in which “everything was fine except that the paint along the shore had begun to fade, and images that weren’t in the original

²⁴ See, for example, John Frederick Kensett’s *Autumnal River Landscape* (1853) or Junius R. Sloan’s *Cool Morning on the Prairie* (1866).

painting were beginning to bleed through” (138). These images, which continue to come through Swimmer’s new layers of paint, comprise an Indian village on the lake. In this painting, the indigenous community refuses to be colonized through being painted out of the landscape.

Following this incident, Swimmer chooses to paint the Aboriginal peoples back into this particular landscape and many others, decolonizing colonial spaces despite resistance from curators who, according to Swimmer, did not want “their Indians restored [...because] they liked their Indians where they couldn’t see them” (261). King exposes the presence of empowered outside-in perspectives today; Eurocentrism continues to drive a (neo) colonial agenda envisioning indigenous lands as empty. The curators, Swimmer’s bosses, are exposed as contemporary seeing-men who continue to affirm Henderson’s diffusionist myth. But Swimmer is empowered in his position as an artist and storyteller; he, too, is a “landscape painter” capable of promoting his vision through appropriating what Ross calls “the perceptible, visible aspects of space” (361) and painting Aboriginal peoples back into these colonized places.

Reading *Truth and Bright Water* in counterpoint with Eurocentric discourses calls into question privileging the Imperial Eye that facilitates the establishment of inside-out perspectives. Not only does King critically negate Eurocentric points of view to ensure that a reader “feels the Orientalist and what he says as presence;” he also reminds his reader that “we must not forget that the Orientalist’s presence is enabled by the Orient’s effective absence” (*Orientalism* 208). Questioning of the absence of indigenous peoples within colonized places challenges the diffusionist

myth of emptiness. Cartographic maps, natural science, and Vidalian geography all demonstrate the inherent visual logic of colonial control, as they support the distance between the knowing readers of maps and the world to which they have access. However, reading maps in conjunction with postcolonial and indigenous direct critiques, and indigenous stories calls on the reader to recognize the perspectives of those envisioning worlds from the inside-out as well as the ambivalence located within discourses that fail to do so.

Ambivalence Within: Locating the Spaces in Mapped Places

In *Indifferent Boundaries*, Kathleen Kirby asserts that the mapper is ‘alien’ to the map’s location, as “[m]apping itself indicates that the subject is not native to the land—otherwise the activity would not be necessary” (49). Such a statement makes evident the forced nature of the utopian-progressive paradigm that is masked by the power of the Imperial Eye. One of the functions of imperial cartographic and figurative mapping is to erase ambivalence in productions of places. The structuring of maps “ensure[s] that the relationship between knower and known remains unidirectional. The mapper should be able to ‘master’ his environment, occupy a secure and superior position in relation to it, without it affecting him in return” (Kirby 50). Indigenous relational worldviews are antithetical to such Eurocentric ‘mastery’; they are left out of discourses of place as long as maps—and colonizers—retain their ability to colonize indigenous places for settler- invasion. Imperial mapmakers did this by first mapping ‘new worlds’ as empty, and then mapping colonial structures of government as a palimpsest over these empty places.

But the places that would become Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand were not empty, nor did indigenous peoples desire immediate and full assimilation into the Empire. The imperial discursive formation attempted to mask the ambivalence in this expression of the utopian-progressive paradigm through mapping in order to facilitate large-scale assimilation of places.

Imperial discourses discussed in this chapter participate(d) in the assimilationist project through delineating land as empty and then classifying it within imperial systems in order to produce—and thereby possess—place. However, the singular archive foregrounding Eurocentric place did not reflect that colonial sites were ‘contact zones,’ “social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination” (Pratt 4). Reading the works of King and Grace in counterpoint with colonial discourses of place, as I have done in this chapter, exposes the untenable nature of the colonial discursive formation. Recognizing that colonial locations were not empty and that indigenous peoples were present opens up ambivalent spaces with the place of the colony and, later, the Nation.

According to Zygmunt Bauman, ambivalence is “a failure of the naming (segregating) function that language is meant to perform,” a function evident in cartographic mapping (1). Eurocentric mapping attempted to eradicate ambivalence, declaring colonial spaces as empty before legitimating them as colonized places using discourses. Ambivalence, in this process, is failure *only* from Eurocentric points of view. Naming signifies control, so an inability to name—or to make a name ‘stick’—is often associated with a failure to maintain control. Recognizing that this control is

itself problematic, however, enables a reader to embrace ambivalence as “the alter-ego of language, and its permanent companion—indeed, its normal condition” (Bauman 1). Discursive systems, read as language-based maps, must embrace space as a permanent presence within place. The colonial desire to erase ambivalence within the system reflects a need to maintain singular archives to ensure the perpetuation of Eurocentric systems of truth. Colonial and neocolonial productions of place—through cartographic maps or discursive ‘maps’—continue to rely on similar foreclosures of ambivalence.

Both King and Grace challenge this foreclosure by critically negating imperial discourses; however, they also move beyond critical negation to imaginatively affirm indigenous places as locating ambivalence. They represent spaces within places, delineating locations that cannot be contained within Eurocentric maps. Although I will discuss many of these locations throughout the remainder of this thesis, I will turn now to a reading of King’s *Truth and Bright Water*, as this text not only locates ambivalent places, but makes explicit how ambivalent places resist assimilation and colonial possession.

In *Truth and Bright Water*, King writes contemporary Aboriginal locations into textualized geographical spaces beyond the limitations imposed by colonial cartography on place. He creates a living space originating in an area of Canada that, according to Eurocentric maps, is knowable as one of the emptiest: the Canadian Shield.²⁵ In King’s novel, the land is described not as empty, but as “fierce and alive,” almost violent in its natural power (1). Indeed, it is the source of life for more

²⁵ Kalant ties the “trope of Canadian vacancy” specifically to the Canadian shield through the work of Creighton, a mid-twentieth-century historian. She cites him as stating “[s]ettlement starved and shrivelled on the Shield,” an “unescapable and domineering” site (95).

populated areas, for out of this region springs the river, which “leaves the foothills and snakes across the belly of the prairies” (1). This geographical area was the site of the first official British charter in Canada, the Company of Adventurers of England trading into Hudson’s Bay (The Hudson’s Bay Company) in 1670, but King conceptually maps it as neither a passive, static space waiting for settler-invasion nor as a place to be assimilated into Eurocentric discursive formations. It is a shifting, changeable site, and it remains resistant to being mapped within an imperial place.

The more abstract nature of the world apart from modern settlement is also made evident in this novel at ‘the Horns,’ “an old place, silent and waiting” (2), unlikely to be acknowledged on a map or within Eurocentric discourses. However, those who travel to this site can conceive of the land as more than the two dimensions reflected in traditional maps: they can “feel the earth breathing or watch the Shield glow black and bright, as the evening shadows run out across the land like ribbons in the breeze” (2). The dynamic nature of this location acknowledges processual space in place without trying to contain it within the Eurocentric discourse of the map. The Horns is presented as a location more empowering than a location on a map.

The narrator originally locates this site in relation to its pre-contact past: the “shaggy rock crescent that hangs over the river [looks] like the hooked head of a buffalo” (2). This site is not limited to this historical past, but is a location enabling connections between past and present. It is here that Tecumseh and Lum see what they believe to be a woman “weav[ing] her way across the hard ground, her hair streaming, her arms spread wide as if she were a bird trying to catch the wind” before throwing something in the river and then jumping in after it (9-11). Subsequently, the

cousins find a skull up on the Horns, and Tecumseh feels this night—set at the Horns—has all the elements of a ‘good story.’ Thus, rather than being a site mappable through the scientific discourse of cartography, the Horns is mapped – and made known as a place – through stories. The stories, for which the Horns provides a shifting setting, promote a relational-processual paradigm.

The ‘freedom’ inherent in unknown, unmapped space is what draws tourists to the Canadian prairies in *Truth and Bright Water*. Tecumseh’s father tells him that tourists come not to see the ‘Indians’ or the ‘Buffalo’ or ‘the mountains,’ all of which have been assimilated into neocolonial discourses of Canada and New Zealand. Instead, these tourists “travel around the world to Bright Water because they’ve never seen space like this” (113). The indomitability of the landscape outside structured colonizing discourse allows the space to be powerfully ‘present,’ and this power “scares the shit out of them” (113). This fear is terminal for the Mays, a German couple driving into the prairies and found dead three weeks after departing, “sitting in the front seat with their seatbelts fastened. The windows were rolled up, the doors were locked, and there were no signs that they had ever gotten out” (164-5). Here, King undermines the power of their subject positions as ‘seeing- men’ in relation to the indigenous landscape. Looking at space from the outside-in, they are powerless to move.²⁶

The photographs developed from the film found in the car, like the

²⁶ In relation to the quotation from Frye at the outset of this chapter, it might be said that the Mays are debilitated because they cannot answer the question of ‘where is here?’ and ‘feel Canadian’. “To feel ‘Canadian’,” according to Frye, “was to feel part of a no-man’s land with huge rivers, lakes, and islands that very few Canadians had ever seen. ‘From sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth’—if Canada is not an island, the phrasing is still in the etymological sense isolating” (*Bush Garden* 220). The Mays are lost in this isolation.

cartographic representations discussed above, reflect the Mays' desire to 'know' and possess indigenous space through a limiting neocolonial (tourist) gaze: all the pictures are panoramas and landscapes,²⁷ but "everything in the distance, the rivers, the mountains, the clouds, the prairies, was slightly blurry and out of focus, while everything in the foreground, the steering wheel, the windshield wipers, the hood, was crisp and sharp" (*Truth* 164). Space, here, resists neocolonial mapping and control. As Ross Gibson indicates in his discussion of landscape in Australian film, in order

for a landscape to be regarded as the material of artistic discourse, the people utilizing it need to identify with it, need to feel they have control of that material, unless they want to signify nothing but awesome indomitability. The geography must have been domesticated (or at least regarded as such), rendered safe for human manipulation and consumption. (211)

The Mays remain incapable of this domestication, and unable to accept indominability. The 'Grand Cherokee'²⁸ fails as a 'vehicle' for colonial access because it limits their ability to negotiate unknown space.

As a result of their inability to interact with the space of the unknown, the Mays die of "exposure," trapped in their vehicle (164). King undermines the 'security' of place by foregrounding its essential dialectical relationship with space.

One must negotiate the potential danger of space, in order to retain the safety of place

²⁷ Pratt identifies the "panoramic landscape anchored in the seer" as a key imperial trope (*Imperial Eyes* 209).

²⁸ The name of this vehicle, produced by DaimlerChrysler Motors, appropriates 'Cherokee,' the name of one of the indigenous tribes in North America.

and simultaneously access some degree of freedom. The Mays' inability to negotiate the space of the indigenous landscape constitutes a slippage in the authority of the taught discourse of Eurocentric cartography; despite the safety of their location in their vehicle, they remain incapable of accessing indigenous places. The Mays are unable to focus on anything beyond the safe, Eurocentric place of the Grand Cherokee.²⁹

The Mays' trip into the area around Bright Water mirrors the Orientalist process identified by Said. Before they explore it, they 'know' the site as empty; the couple then attempts to invade and possess it, and ultimately, they desire to re-create the area by taking photographic images that fit into their own vision of indigenous places. Their failure to turn that space into place opens up an ambivalent site in which Eurocentric productions of place can be questioned. By maintaining spaces within places in *Truth and Bright Water* and denying the colonization of these places, King not only locates ambivalence itself, but also enables his characters to critically negate colonial maps and imaginatively affirm Aboriginal locations beyond those maps yet within the former colony and emergent Nation.

Novel Escapes: Mapping Spaces and Places

According to Huggan, territorial "disputes acknowledge, implicitly or explicitly, the relativity of modes of spatial (and by extension, cultural) perception" (*Territorial* 155). Eurocentric worldviews perpetuate a singular, colonial archive

²⁹ This can also be read as a comment on the naming of the vehicle itself, and the Mays' willingness to participate in a neocolonial capitalist misnaming of a product. The Mays rent a vehicle that references the Cherokee tribe, supporting the idea that one might occupy a position within Aboriginal culture, for a short amount of time, for the right price.

through discourses of cartographic mapping, Vidalian geography, and natural science. A spiral reading of the works of King and Grace disputes these territorial discourses, as it acknowledges the relational-processual worldviews of both King and Grace. Plotting these stories within spiral reading strategies enables the acknowledgement of stories as new maps, and of indigenous worldviews as integral to envisioning the places of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand historically in the contemporary moment.

In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, de Certeau posits, “what the map cuts up, the story cuts across,” (129) because it is the place of the story that “*authorize[s]* the establishment, displacement or transcendence of limits” (123). Reading the novels of King and Grace as mapping Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand from the inside-out authorizes the relational-processual paradigm as central to locations of culture. The relational- processual archive of these novels is antithetical to the colonial and neocolonial archive in that it does not promote a truth-system in which indigenous cultures reject the places of these colonies and nations outright. Rather, this archive promotes the production of relational-processual locations in which indigenous cultures can ‘escape without leaving,’ simultaneously negotiating both a way out of the power relationships denying their subjectivity and a way in to the place of the colony and nation through the story.³⁰

Indigenous worldviews challenge the myth of emptiness specifically by shifting the emphasis from control of land to negotiation of relations. At the archival level, this shift constitutes a movement from singular control to relational processes of

³⁰ See Buchanan’s “Extraordinary Spaces in Ordinary Places” for a discussion of the idea of ‘escape without leaving’ drawing on the work of de Certeau and Lefebvre explicitly.

negotiation. As E. T. Durie (Rangitāne) points out, the common feature of Māori law prior to contact with Europeans “was that it was not in fact about property, but about arranging relationships with people” (9) and, I add, with the land. In *Baby No-eyes*, Kura’s story about her ancestor, Pirinoa, is situated in this Māori belief system based on whakapapa, in which ownership belonged to the one who “defined the boundaries and who discussed exchanges of rights at different seasons, who allowed neighbouring peoples to live on land or fish certain reaches of the rivers, set up their eel weirs, hunt or garden in particular places” (110-111). Although it is ultimately her “birthright [that] gave her the authority” (111), Pirinoa’s knowledge of the land and her ability to share it appropriately were also essential. Pirinoa’s control of the land involved processes of negotiation with other Māori and European cultures as well.

Durie notes that the inclusion of early European traders in this system “should not be seen as the sale of land but the acquisition of people” (8). This is not just an historical belief, however; in *Potiki*, set in contemporary times, Roimata states “land does not belong to people, but . . . people belong to the land” (100). Whakapapa does not solely support historical connections, but processual connections between indigenous cultures and the land in the present. Kura points out that

land was all of life to [her Māori peoples]” and this was their “way laid down. They couldn’t live in the wind. They couldn’t give away their grandchildren’s lives. They couldn’t give away their own authority, because what would be the point in peace and prosperity. What would be the point in life? (113)

Through this rhetorical question, Grace asserts that, without whakapapa, Māori

culture cannot survive and, without land, whakapapa is untenable. For this reason, places, located within the relational-processual paradigm, can never be empty, as they are filled with the ‘way laid down’, the histories and stories told by the people who live, and have lived, there.

The inclusion of social geography—the stories producing relational places in process—enables Grace and King to each negotiate the ‘deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial.’ As outlined in the Introduction, Spivak posits that minority cultures must seize colonial apparatuses of power to ‘claim catachreses’ by negating and then appropriating “metaphor[s] without an adequate referent” (*Critique* 4). In claiming traditional elements of the discipline of geography—in particular the map—King and Grace unsettle the proper placement of the metaphors of ‘Aboriginal’ in ‘British North America’ and ‘Māori’ in ‘New Zealand’ to reclaim indigenous culture “from a space that one cannot not want to inhabit and yet must criticize” (Spivak “Marginality” 64). As discussed above, it is through social geography that people re/produce places within relational-processual paradigms.

Whereas “cartography may exist only as a perpetual digression from local knowledge in which the very object of the map is to destroy and replace local or indigenous knowledge” (Piper 180), the novels of King and Grace negate colonial discourses by exposing their underlying story: assimilation. These authors draw on historical discourses to create contemporary maps locating indigenous knowledges both in process and in relation. In other words, the novels of King and Grace create relational-processual settings from which to escape Eurocentric maps without leaving the geographical sites they purport to represent. Once again, King seems to

concentrate more on resisting colonial mentalities through critical negation of dominant discourses, whereas Grace focuses on redefining cultural identity through imaginative affirmation. Reading these stories contrapuntally enables an inside-out engagement with Eurocentric discourses that opens up a discussion of how indigenous cultures express identity in relation to other cultures and to the land.

In *Truth and Bright Water*, it is only through actively pursuing his relationship with Monroe Swimmer that Tecumseh is able to figure out that ‘the woman’ at the Horns was Monroe himself, and he was returning bones of Aboriginal children to the land in order to ‘free’ them from colonization.³¹ Monroe had stolen the remains from museums where they were “in drawers and boxes and stuck away on dusty shelves” (265). Both the Horns and the Canadian Shield resist placement within the utopian-progressive paradigm represented by the map, and they can be mapped as relational-processual locations facilitating not only this re-placement of historical indigenous peoples, but also Tecumseh’s own self-location. Here, Tecumseh is able to relate to the place of the Horns through stories, thereby accessing both the freedom of space and the security of place. He participates in the relational-processual “oral tradition” as a way of locating himself beyond neocolonial paradigms (204).

Tecumseh’s “epiphany” regarding Monroe’s actions at the Horns allows him to recognize Monroe’s political actions and include the artist’s access to the Horns as part of his own production of place (264). Tecumseh accepts Monroe’s re-placement of the Horns as “the centre of the universe” (265). Thus, rather than being located primarily as a geographical site outside the settlements of Bright Water and Truth, the

³¹ His attempts tell this story do not initially go well, as neither his mother (18), Lucy Rabbit (21), nor his father (34) are willing to listen or help him fill in what he does not know.

place of the Horns is mapped beyond cartographic discourse: it is defined by interconnected stories. In other words, Monroe's story about re/placing indigenous remains becomes part of Tecumseh's story, through which he produces a place for himself. The 'centre of the universe' is not a mythical site outside Tecumseh's known geography, however. Instead, in this text it marks the liminal space between two nations, Canada and the United States, and establishes its location through stories. It is here that Monroe symbolically relocates indigenous culture, 'freeing' the remains from their captivity at the museum and replacing them in connection with the land. This new centre not only reverses the historical placement of indigenous culture-as-artefact, but also seizes the remains to re/place them geographically, as well as through contemporary stories.

Tecumseh critically negates the power of the Nation to define him as its citizen. He refuses national border crossings and envisions the liminal location *between* the nations of Canada and the United States as the centre of his universe, a site not recognized on colonial and neocolonial maps. He engages with Spivak's 'deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial' in that he clearly does not want to leave his current location, but he can criticize it from his Aboriginal perspective while remaining within his country of citizenship, Canada. Tecumseh's focus, like much of King's work, remains on critical negation in this moment, as he rejects both the authority of the border crossing station and that of the museum curators through the choices he makes and the things he chooses to believe in.

The Māori characters in *Potiki* are also able to find this centre through interconnected stories. Unlike King, Grace's focus remains on imaginative

affirmation, as stories allow her characters to focus on ways in which they can “find and define [their] lives” (*Potiki* 104). The worlds that these stories map are relational and processual, and geographical sites facilitate affirmation of Māori imagined communities. Roimata deconstructs Spivak’s predicament itself, stating that their “main book was the wharenuī which was itself a story, a history, a gallery, a study, a design structure and a taonga [and] the land and the sea and the shores are a book too, and we found ourselves there. They were our science and our sustenance” (104). Roimata locates herself firmly in relation to the location of Aotearoa New Zealand, indicating emphatically that stories are scientifically valid and can sustain her people. She also criticizes this place, however. Unlike the assimilation enabled by the traditionally scientific discourses of cartography, Vidalian geography, and natural sciences, Roimata’s stories negotiate the discursive formations of both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Negotiation recognizes a spiral of stories that can include Eurocentric maps in relation with indigenous storied places. The resultant map illustrates that Māori worldviews (and I would add, Aboriginal) envision a place that is “as large and as extensive as any other universe that there is” (Grace *Potiki* 118). This universe is not exclusive: it allows for the existence of multiple universes – and multiple stories – simultaneously in relation to one another.

Maps and stories create places and tell their readers how to negotiate them. How, then, can literature more generally provide new mapping structures enabling conceptualizations of Aboriginal and Māori cultures within the places of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively? The first step in this process is to critically negate the structures supporting mappings of places. In *Green Grass, Running*

Water, King works against Eurocentric discourses and the neocolonial archive by undermining Bursum's control as a contemporary coloniser and introducing a new story into *The Mysterious Warrior*, the traditional western movie Bursum plays on The Map. The four Old Indians on a mission "to fix up the world" in this novel (133) 'fix' Bursum's favourite Western so that the Indians, instead of the cowboys, win control of the changeable textual space of the movie:

There at full charge, hundreds of soldiers in bright blue uniforms with gold buttons and sashes and stripes,
blue-eyed and rosy-cheeked, came over the last rise.
And disappeared.

Just like that.

"What the hell," said Bursum, and he stabbed at the remote. Everywhere was color [in the previously black and white movie].

Portland (renamed Iron-Eyes-Screeching-Eagle) turned and looked at [John] Wayne and [Richard] Widmark, who had stopped shouting and waving their hats and were standing around looking confused and dumb.

(321)

John Wayne and Richard Widmark are so accustomed to the Indians playing the villainous savages, while they play the heroes, that they are immobilized when the battle is no longer scripted. Bursum himself is mystified by the change in the story, sputtering, "Damn, you put your faith in good equipment and look what happens" (322).

By undermining the 'equipment' enabling colonial knowledge structures, King

calls into question the endurance of Eurocentric knowledge apart from the discourses supporting them. Here, Canadian Aboriginal culture makes its mark by enacting the ‘significant shift’ advocated by Caren Kaplan in *Questions of Travel*: this shift in power takes place “[w]hen a ‘place on a map’ can be seen to be a ‘place in history’ as well” (25). This is a practical application of de Certeau’s mission to give geography back to the historians, and it ensures that indigenous stories are part of that process.

In *Truth and Bright Water*, ambivalence is not foreclosed; instead, it is represented as opening up a space that enables movement. Access to two worldviews enables Tecumseh to negotiate mapped colonial places from Charlie Ron’s ferry, an old bucket-like contraption that provides a different means of crossing the Canadian-American border than driving to Prairie View. Although it would not appear on any official map, this method of crossing is still used by some Aboriginal elders and other key characters in the text, and from this location Tecumseh can cross a border that is unrecognized as such by many Aboriginal North Americans. He thereby negotiates spaces in place and comes to the realization that “there’re nothing scary out [t]here, just the land and the river and the mountains” (155). Tecumseh knows stories set in both *Bright Water* and *Truth*, and as a result of his location as both an Aboriginal and a Canadian he is able to negotiate the ambivalent spaces between these mapped locations.

According to Davidson, Watson, and Andrews, Tecumseh’s name is itself an “ironic comment on the fluidity of borders” because it alludes to the Shawnee chief by the same name. According to these authors, the Shawnee chief was a “pan-tribal political leader” in the years after the establishment of the United States until the early

nineteenth century. Tecumseh's border crossing then, comments directly on his historical namesake's struggles, as it reflects the chief's desire to "hold onto Native lands through tribal confederations" (Davidson, Watson, and Andrews 144).³²

Unlike the Mays, then, Tecumseh is able to negotiate spaces in places and establish his own position through social geography. He moves through ambivalence, rather than 'pause' to create places in this liminal space between (Tuan). Rather than dominating place, as a catachrestic citizen of North America, in this case, he accepts the ambivalent relationship between space and place as they coexist: "Out There, space is just the distance between towns (155). His stories—and the story of *Truth and Bright Water* more generally—envisions (British) North America from the inside-out, enabling both the opening of spaces within places and the reformulation of indigenous relationships with the land.

Tecumseh's fluid movement between Canada and the United States, and his refusal to cross at a designated border crossing, mirrors his negotiations of his ambivalent relationship with these two geographical sites as an Aboriginal person today. Maps—and structures of government including border crossings—deny this ambivalence. Instead, cartographic maps dividing North America into Canada and the United States reflect what Bauman argues is the

typically modern practice, the substance of modern politics,
of modern intellect, of modern life [which] is the effort to exterminate
ambivalence: an effort to define precisely—and to suppress or eliminate
everything that could not or would not be precisely defined. Modern

³² For more on Tecumseh's evolving efforts on behalf of Aboriginal peoples discussed in relation to literatures of resistance, see Gordon M. Sayre's recent text, *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero* (2005, especially pages 268-301).

practice is not aimed at the conquest of foreign lands, but at the filling of the blank spots in the *compleat mappa mundi*. It is the modern practice, not nature, that truly suffers no void. (7-8)

This erasure of the void is central to imperial discourses of cartography, Vidalian geography, and natural science. The diffusionist myth of emptiness fills the void of the unknown, first through knowing it as empty. Ultimately, these empty sites are re-created as places ready to be filled, and then mapped, by colonial discourses.

Tecumseh resists being mapped within the ‘*compleat mappa mundi*’, the discursive formation of colonial North America.

In *Baby No-Eyes*, Māori artist Tawera recognizes a space of ambivalence when he notes the structure of the void emerging on his canvas. This occurs when he fails to assimilate into the contemporary world as an artist and produce representations that fit into the dominant tradition.³³ His initial inability to recognize the ambivalence inherent in Eurocentric traditions renders him incapable of doing more than “staring at absence” on his canvas (292). He can neither participate in neocolonial representations of place—perhaps by painting Victorian landscapes—nor can he move beyond them. However, Tawera himself embodies catachrestic citizenship when he engages the creative dialectic and begins to envision his world from the inside-out. It is only after he accepts the ‘void’ as both Te Kore, the generative site of creation in Māori epistemology discussed in Chapter One, and the debilitating site of foreclosure within Eurocentric discourses discussed here that he is

³³ For a thorough critical reading of art and the visual and in this text, drawing on the Jean Baudrillard in particular, see Chris Prentice’s recent article, “From Visibility to Visuality: Patricia Grace’s *Baby No-Eyes* and the Cultural Politics of Decolonization.” See also Michelle Keown’s “‘Sister Seen’: Art, Mythology and the Semiotic in Patricia Grace’s *Baby No-Eyes*”.

able to begin producing places. In these productions, Tawera seeks to “enlarge [the void] . . . begin with it, embrace it, let it be there, make it be there, pushing [his] drawing further and further” (293). He knows that one day he will return to critically negate colonial representations, including such heavy colonial constructions as “the ship falling from a concrete-coloured sky” (294), but he must begin by placing himself “at the beginning of a road” (294).

Both Tawera and Tecumseh, then, are able to produce places by first negotiating the ambivalence inherent in neocolonial productions of place and then *moving through it*. They negotiate the spaces between their Māori and Aboriginal cultural positions and the places of Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada respectively. Reading these two characters’ stories in counterpoint enables the reader to realize that the way to escape containment within Eurocentric places is through opening up spaces within neocolonial places. Their actions support Tewa/Pueblo critic Gregory Cajete’s insistence that place must be ‘given back’ to indigenous cultures in particular, as working solely with the colonizers’ maps—both actual maps and knowledge as mapped through discourse—is debilitating for his peoples. He argues that “it’s only when we become our own ‘cartographers’ that we will be able to find our way through the territory” of indigenous identities (188).³⁴ King and Grace both map places beyond Eurocentric maps, critically negating cartographic and figurative mappings, undermining the authority of the Imperial Eye, and imaginatively affirming indigenous worldviews in their own ‘novel’ productions of place.

There is a recognition today, amongst critical geographers, that “[m]aps constitute geography according to [Europe’s] own cultural matrix. The maps the

³⁴ Cajete here is using an extended metaphor about education through discourse in general (181-91).

explorers made, though created in response to the features of the New World, transposed the new space into the logic of Europe” (Kirby 54). From Eurocentric perspectives, ‘new worlds’ were envisioned as empty and indigenous cultures were mapped out of existence as part of an Orientalist project that denied them power within “a complex Orient . . . [mapping out] anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial, and historical theses about mankind and the universe” (Said *Orientalism* 7-8). As will be discussed further in Chapter Three, the works of King and Grace negate historical discourses that promote assimilation of Aboriginal and Māori cultures and peoples into the Orientalist project. Both King and Grace are mapbreakers and mapmakers, as they critically negate and imaginatively affirm colonial places from inside-out perspectives, promoting relational ‘centres’ for indigenous universes that represent culture as always in process, in relation to location.

CHAPTER THREE

(Re)routing Progress: Assimilationist Discourses, Colonial Governmentality, and Spaces of Knowledge

*It seems to me that if we are to more adequately grasp the lineaments of our postcolonial modernity, what we ought to try to map more precisely is the political rationality through which the old [precolonial] footing was systematically displaced by a new one, such that the old would now only be imaginable along paths that belong to the new, always already transformed sets of coordinates, concepts and assumptions” (David Scott in “Colonial Governmentality,” *Social Text*, No. 43)*

*The civilizing journey is conceived more as a rise than as a fall, a process more of perfection than degradation—a long and arduous journey upward, culminating in being ‘them’ (James Youngblood Henderson in “Ayukpachi: Empowering Aboriginal Thought,” *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*)*

*The idea that the culture of ‘savages’ was fixed by their biology, co-existed with the idea that they could and should change to be like Europeans. Second, while indigenous peoples were encouraged and expected to assimilate, there was also a strongly held view that this led to their moral decline . . . a lose-lose situation! (Avril Bell in “‘Half-castes’ and ‘White Natives,’” *Cultural Studies in Aotearoa New Zealand*)*

The discourses of cartography, Vidalian geography, and natural science enabled colonial productions of place. According to Howard Marchitello, “claiming islands and mainland territories in the names of European monarchs, planting European national flags, constructing forts” and other historical colonial practices “stand as manifestations of what emerged as the standard European philosophy and method of responding to the surprise of and contact with the New World” (92-3). He

identifies “the desire to procure the other as the same *in the model of possession* that then serves to structure the New World encounter and the various discourses that arise out of it” (93). In the discursive formation of the colony, discourses enact this desire by naturalizing colonial rights to simultaneously *possess land* and *assimilate peoples*. As discussed in Chapter Two, the contact zone emerged as a place of encounter between cultures that answered the question ‘where is here?’ through mapping the colonies that would become Canada and New Zealand as utopian locations. In this chapter I argue that colonial structures of governmentality attempted to control interrelated answers to the question ‘who am I?’ through discourses of colonial governmentality perpetuating the assimilation of indigenous cultures into dominant culture. Within the colonial contact zone, assimilationist discourses reflected and promoted a colonial agenda premised on the utopian-progressive paradigm.

Assimilating unknown spaces into known, invaded, and possessed places precipitates the assimilation of indigenous cultures.¹ This perpetuates the same storyline: original emptiness in combination with necessary, and normalized, linear ‘progress’ toward inclusion within colonial social systems. The alternative to cultural assimilation within this utopian-progressive paradigm was exclusion of indigenous peoples due to their inability or unwillingness to fit into Eurocentric ideals. In this chapter, I begin with a discussion of ‘colonial governmentality’ as it is articulated by Foucault and further theorized by David Scott, applying Scott’s postcolonial reading to originary discourses related to these two locations: the Treaty of Waitangi and the Indian Act. King and Grace address the ways in which assimilationist discourses cast

¹ As discussed in Chapter Two, Said argues that colonial locations went through a series or steps as they were mapped as places; they were “known, then invaded and possessed, then re-created” to reflect imperial notions of progress (*Orientalism* 92).

indigenous peoples and their lands. I will explicate their different responses to the ‘model of possession’ in which these cultures have been cast. This spiral reading will highlight the ambivalence inherent in the utopian-progressive paradigm. With King and Grace, I will also examine two symbolic structures supporting the ‘civilizing’ project, the church and the school, thereby demonstrating how these authors answer Scott’s call to address not only the targets of colonial assimilation, but the “*fields of its operation*” (193). Through critically negating the authority of these structures and imaginatively affirming new places of knowledge, King and Grace not only create spaces of knowledge within colonial governmental systems for ‘strategic postcoloniality’; they also begin to establish places from which to negotiate catachrestic citizenship.

An important series of questions emerges here: what are the originary discourses establishing the relationships between ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Canada’, ‘Māori’ and ‘New Zealand’? How do spiral reading strategies that read historical discourses in relation to contemporary criticism challenge the place constructed for indigenous cultures in relation to their respective nations? How do Grace and King directly and indirectly address these historical discourses in their novels? Answering these questions unsettles the ‘grid’ of colonial discourse introduced in Chapter One, a grid identified by Foucault and critiqued by Said. According to Bhabha, this grid gives rise to ‘discourse-based governmentality’, which in turn dominates subjectivity within the location of the colony and emergent nation.

Government is linked here to subjectivity, to the ways in which political and economic structures and discourses determine the extent to which those falling under

its purview can act on the locations in which they live. According to Scott, this definition leads to an important question: “what then is the *conceptual* level to be assigned to ‘Europe’, understood not merely as a geographical space, but as an apparatus of dominant power- effects?” (192). How does the place of Europe set itself up as the colonial centre, ensuring its systems of knowledge are empowered and indigenous systems foreclosed?

I argue that Europe sets itself up as a discursive formation through creating and empowering various discourses enabling colonial power. These discourses are what Scott, drawing on Foucault, calls “historically constituted complexes of knowledge/power that give shape to colonial projects of political sovereignty” (193). According to Scott, engagements with colonial discourses associated with knowledge and power should not focus blindly on the centrality of Europe, but address both the “*targets* of colonial power (that is, the point or points of power’s application, the object or objects it aims at, and the means and instrumentalities it deploys)” and the “*field* of its operation (that is, the zone that it actively constructs for its functionality)” (193). In the previous chapter, I outlined one such field: the contact zone as a location mapped through colonial discourses as both ‘perfectly empty’ and available to be filled ‘progressively’ through colonialism. Here, I will map out that contact zone in a different way, as I examine discourses associated with the colonization of the peoples within that emergent place.

As discussed in Chapter One, Anderson links the discourses of the map, the census, and the novel specifically to ‘imagined communities’. They are ‘institutions of power’ that make possible the imagination of a political community that is “both

inherently limited and sovereign” (6). While maps literally created places available for colonial ownership, censuses and other discourses establishing what ‘counts’ within the colony located sites that could be “not so much grasped, appropriated, reduced, or codified, as lived in, exploited aesthetically and imaginatively as . . . roomy place[s] full of possibility” (Said *Orientalism* 181). Thus, the Empire’s exploration of ‘new worlds’ gave way to the mapping of colonial realities and the dis/placement of indigenous peoples: places full of possibility were created, but not for those who originally lived there. Colonial discourses enabled colonial ‘possession’ of indigenous cultures by envisioning them within Eurocentric systems. The resulting outside-in perspectives cast Aboriginal and Māori people within the model of possession that contained their culture within the utopian- progressive paradigm.

In *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, Pratt delineates ‘contact zones’ as “space[s] of colonial encounters . . . in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict” (6).² Although her discussion focuses on South American and African contexts, it is useful here, as it traces a historical evolution of how “travel and exploration writing *produced* ‘the rest of the world’ for European readerships at particular points in Europe’s expansionist trajectory” (Pratt 5), a trajectory that extended into both North America and the Pacific. This expansionist

² Pratt compares the ‘contact zone’ to the term ‘colonial frontier,’ but chooses the former to “invoke the spatial and temporal copresence of subjects previously separated by geographic and historical disjunctures, and whose trajectories now intersect” rather than focussing on the “Eurocentric expansionist perspective” reflected in the latter terminology (6-7).

trajectory was assimilationist; it traced a linear, forward-moving progressive path through utopian, empty space. Colonial discursive productions, central to the work of Anderson, Pratt and Said, facilitate the circular reproductions of Truth within colonized locations. While imagined communities and Orientalism seek to erase the power relations inherent in the production of place, Pratt's concept of the contact zone recognizes the ambivalence masked by not only colonial discourses mapping places, but their representations of the 'civilizing journey' as a progression toward perfection (see Henderson, epigraph).

Colonial discourses set up a series of processes that systematically erase differences within the contact zone and these promote assimilation as a 'progressive' movement into the perfect place of the Empire. King and Grace imaginatively affirm new stories that critically negate assimilationist discourses concerning lands and people. Their novels are examples of what Bhabha terms 'counter-narratives of the nation': they "continually evoke and erase [the nation's] totalizing boundaries—both actual and conceptual—[and] disturb those ideological manoeuvres through which 'imagined communities' are given essentialist identities" ("DissemiNation" 300). Through their novels, these writers challenge discourses and structures of governmentality that have facilitated the early imagination of their nations and the containment of their cultures.

According to Lefebvre, in addition to the national territory, "the state occupies a *mental space* that includes the representations of the state that people construct" ("Space" 85).³ I posit that, within colonial imagined communities, this

³ According to Lefebvre, discussions of space should never be separated from the world of its experience, as "space considered in isolation is an empty abstraction" (*Production* 12). The idea of the contact zone

mental ‘space’ becomes a limited and limiting ‘place’ for Māori and Aboriginal peoples. This chapter examines a selection of discourses central to the discursive formations of contact zones where assimilation was perpetuated in the mid- to late nineteenth century. When we confront critically the colonial discourses of governmentality central to the originary moments of Canada and New Zealand as nations, we open up ambivalent spaces within these discourses for what Spivak calls ‘strategic postcoloniality’.

In order to be counted as citizens in the emerging nations of British North America and New Zealand, Aboriginal and Māori peoples were often made to reject their cultures and any expression of their worldviews in favour of Eurocentric knowledge systems and structures of government. This happened in different ways and illustrates Spivak’s deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial, discussed earlier. As will be discussed below, key originary discourses of both New Zealand and Canada maintained that an individual could not be both Aboriginal *and* a Canadian, Māori *and* a New Zealander at the same time. Thus, the catachreses discussed throughout this project – ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘Māori New Zealander’ – can be linked to the colonial discourses delineating the emergence of the nation itself. According to Spivak, in order to resist colonial discourses, Grace and King must say “‘no’ to the ‘moral luck’ of the culture of imperialism while recognizing that [they] must inhabit it, indeed invest in it, to criticize it” (“Marginality” 63). This investment and critique enables a move beyond colonial

reflects this union of place production with subjectivity, as it recognizes individual and group experiences of places.

placement into a position of strategic ‘postcoloniality,’⁴ in which one “take[s] positions in terms not of the discovery of historical or philosophical grounds, but in terms of reversing, displacing, and seizing the apparatus of value-coding” (63).

Grace’s and King’s characters enact these processes.

As originally discussed in the Introduction, to read the work of King in particular using what I call postcolonialist strategies without carefully locating ‘the post-colonial’ is problematic, as he emphatically rejects the term and asserts that while it “strives to escape to find new centres, it remains, in the end, a hostage to nationalism” (“Godzilla” 243). Academic and film-maker Leonie Pihama (Te Ātiawa, Ngā Māhanga ā Tairi, Ngāti Māhanga) also “question[s] the validity of the term postcolonial (and the unsettling of binary structures it implies) in the contexts of a settler society in which independence from the imperial power is nonetheless accompanied by the continuing specifically colonial oppression of indigenous peoples” (qtd in Orr 74). My spiral reading strategies foreground strategic postcoloniality to address these concerns directly: it seeks to challenge singular colonial productions of place and their continuing processes of proper placement. At the same time, the spiral moves through historical colonialism, in recognition of the continuing presence of colonial points of view in the contemporary discursive

⁴ Spivak’s relationship with the terms postcolonial and postcolonialism is tenuous, and she herself rejects being called a ‘postcolonial critic’ despite Harasym’s title for her book of interviews. Here, she engages with the term ‘postcoloniality’ as the recognition of continuing colonialism, whereas ‘neo-colonialism’ is predicated on an economic imperative, rather than a territorial one. I refer to this postcoloniality as strategic in a similar way as Spivak defines it in ‘*strategic* essentialism: “a *strategic* use of positivist essentialism in a scrupulously visible political interest” (*In Other Worlds* 214). Strategic essentialism will be discussed further in chapter four. See also Spivak’s “Neocolonialism and the Secret Agent of Knowledge.”

formation.⁵

The particular use of postcolonial criticism in my work opens up the meaning of ‘post’ within spiral reading strategies. Postcolonial⁶ can itself constitute a catachresis unless the ‘post’ is read—as advocated by Samoan author Albert Wendt—as “around, through, out of, alongside, and against” the ‘colonial’(qtd in Wilson 3). These spiral reading strategies plot stories supported and maintained by the readings opened up as ‘postcolonial’ in this way. Spiral reading strategies place stories in counterpoint with dominant discourses and dismantles the problematic “privileg[ing of] one culture over another” (King “Godzilla” 243).⁷ Emphasizing negotiation, these structures enable Bhabha’s ‘postcolonial agency’ that “is made possible because the fixity of the signifier or the subject opens up a space that ‘displaces the value-coding’” inherent in colonial and neocolonial discourses (“Spirit” 330). This space enables indigenous cultures to escape the control of the place of the nation without leaving it, and to produce new places in relation to colonial and neocolonial productions.

Postcolonial agency requires more than displacing value-coding, however; strategic postcoloniality not only reverses and displaces discursive systems, but seizes

⁵ As Moss writes, ‘postcolonial’ can be read as “a chronological marker, a global condition, a geographical category, and a literary reading strategy” (2). My spiral reading strategies exemplify a discursive reading strategy, although they are informed by the other aspects of the term.

⁶ For criticism of the temporal associations of the term ‘postcolonial,’ see Shohat’s “Notes on the ‘Post-Colonial.’”

⁷ Instead of ‘postcolonial,’ here King “lean[s] towards terms such as tribal, interfusional, polemical, and associational to describe the range of Native writing” (243). Polemical literature reflects the European- Aboriginal contact zones, tribal literature includes stories that are shared within established communities, whereas interfusional describes the blending of oral and written literatures, and associational denotes the series of attributes reflecting Aboriginal values in contemporary Aboriginal literature. Each of these categories offers a “vantage point from which we can see a particular literary landscape” (244). Locating my critical approach in postcolonialist theory empowers multiple views, while recognizing historical and continuing colonialism as still-present in the various locations from which these views emerge.

them at the archival level. As a result, hybrid structures of governmentality enable one to envision indigenous cultures and their relations to others and the land from the inside-out. Analyzing the texts of King and Grace in counterpoint with colonial and neocolonial discourses works towards Bhabha's "ultimate goal [to] not simply to fracture a discourse but to exceed its boundaries" (*Location* 123). The colonial discourse is fractured when its assimilationist discourses, reflecting a utopian-progressive archive, are critically negated.

I turn now to two originary discourses of the nation that enact colonial governmentality, in order to establish the relationships between the 'targets' of its discourses – Aboriginal and Māori peoples – and its 'fields of operation' in both British North American and New Zealand respectively. I read both the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) and the Indian Act (1876) as "a splitting of the discourse of cultural governmentality at the moment of its enunciation of authority" (Bhabha *Location* 131).

The middle years of the nineteenth century involved a shift in the British Colonial Office's philosophies and methods in setting up relations within its colonies. In 1837, the publication of the Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines demonstrated how utopian constructions of place combined with progressive ideals, and it was in this year that the House of Commons accepted it was the responsibility of the Empire to 'target' and 'civilize' indigenous peoples. (Armitage 193-4).⁸ A

⁸ Armitage's *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand* is the key comparison of assimilationist discourses in both Canada and New Zealand. For a comprehensive survey of the pre-Confederation period in Canada, see R. Cole Harris' *The Reluctant Land Society, Space, and Environment in Canada before Confederation* (2008). For reading of the New Zealand context focussed more specifically on the mid-19th-century and intercultural relations, see James Belich's *The New Zealand Wars and the Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (1986).

rhetorical question posed in that report reflects the hidden agenda of assimilation foundational to the contact zone in that period: “Can we suppose otherwise than that it is our office to carry civilization and humanity, peace and good government, and above all the knowledge of the true God, to the uttermost ends of the earth?” (qtd in Armitage 3). As a result of the myth of emptiness, the ‘discovery’ of New Worlds led to the ‘worlding of worlds’ and the colonization of peoples through ‘good government’.⁹

In “Racial Rule,” David Theo Goldberg identifies two philosophical traditions of government co-existing in the mid-nineteenth century: the ‘naturalist’ and the ‘evolutionary.’ The former, which Goldberg links primarily to Jean Jacques Rousseau, argues that indigenous peoples are ‘less than’ European, inherently incapable of looking after themselves, while the latter, developed by John Stuart Mill and John Locke, claims that indigenous peoples are simply ‘behind’ Europeans. Both traditions supported discourses promoting assimilation, and both were used to facilitate the large-scale dispossession of indigenous peoples of their land.¹⁰ These belief systems can co-exist because they both erase ambivalence. Indigenous peoples were either included or excluded in relation to the utopian-progressive paradigm. The ‘naturalist’ tradition posits the utopian perfection of European cultures, and thereby excludes indigenous peoples, while the ‘evolutionary’ tradition asserts that indigenous peoples might progress into dominant paradigms under ideal conditions.

Both discourses reflect a colonial power recognized by Scott as “*a form of power not*

⁹ This exact terminology – “good government” – is not only used by More in describing the government of Utopia (34) but also reflects that adopted by King when discussing the government of the universe by the Christian God (*Truth about Stories* 23). Both discourses were discussed at length in Chapter One.

¹⁰ Goldberg links the ‘naturalist’ tradition to coercion-based societies, while the ‘evolutionary’ can be linked to those based on capital (83-84).

merely coincident with colonialism [but] concerned above all with disabling old forms of life by systematically breaking down their conditions, and with constructing in their place new conditions so as to enable – indeed, so as to *oblige* – new forms of life to come into being” (193).

Such ‘new forms of life’ were essential because, by the later nineteenth century, these two systems of thought culminated in the belief that indigenous cultures were ‘dying out.’ According to Eurocentric discourses, this process occurred naturally, as indigenous peoples could neither evolve fast enough nor assimilate into dominant culture fully. David Pearson states this was a “fate greeted with indifference, relief, and the occasional spark of sadness among white settlers or their descendents. They saw the indigenes as ‘a problem’ rather than a threat” (1).¹¹ The notion of Aboriginal culture ‘dying out’ ties not only to the diffusionist myth of emptiness discussed in Chapter Two; Cree/Métis critic Marilyn Dumont argues that the “19th Century notion of culture as static . . . is founded on the belief that there exists in the evolution of cultures, a pristine culture which if it responds to change is no longer pure” (47). Within the assimilationist system, lack of cultural purity does not lead to hybrid relationships between cultures; rather, Aboriginal and Māori culture, for example, should be absorbed into dominant cultures or be naturally eradicated.

As Scott notes, however, it is important to examine the ways in which colonial

¹¹ This is not to say that all authorities believed that indigenous cultures were destined to disappear. In an important lecture series at Oxford between 1839-41, Herman Merivale argued that movement from a savage to a civilized state was possible; and to “those who thought Native people would inevitably fade away before the European coming, he replied that there was no biological evidence” (R. Cole Harris *Making Native* 7). This was despite the fact that indigenous populations were falling drastically in both British North America and New Zealand at that time.

discourses not only cast indigenous cultures, but how they sought to act on them. For Scott, this leads to the following questions:

What does colonial power take as the *target* upon which to work?

Moreover, for what *project* does it require that target-object? And how does it go about securing it in order to realize its ends. In short, what in each instance is colonial power's *structure* and *projects* as it inserts itself into – more properly, as it *constitutes* – the domain of the colonial? (197)

Not only do these questions enable an unpacking of the colonial project, they also identify the place it creates which limits and enables indigenous subjectivity.

Displacing Cultures: (un)Naming Indigeneity in the Original discourses of the Colony

In Chapter One I demonstrated the ways in which the creation stories of King and Grace set up the places within their texts to promote All My Relations and whakapapa. These stories contrast both the biblical creation story and the story of the creation of Utopia, both of which promote a utopian-progressive paradigm. This paradigm also supports colonial discourses constructing colonial places through mapping and natural science. How, then, do discourses about the creation of the Nation fit with these other discourses? How do they create, maintain, and seek to engage with the 'target-objects' of indigenous peoples? As Bhabha writes, within colonial discourses "the predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for 'subject peoples' through the production of knowledge in the terms of which surveillance is exercised" (*Location* 70). In order for indigenous cultures to be contained within colonial systems, knowledge systems must encourage Europeans to

adopt the perspective of the seeing-man; as a result, indigenous peoples are more easily contained within the model of possession. In this section, I discuss two interrelated processes central to early colonial discourses: monolithic naming of indigenous cultures as ‘Indian’ and ‘Māori,’ and the establishment of binary relations between colonial and indigenous cultures. Both of these demonstrate the ways in which indigenous cultures were ‘targeted’ (Scott) in colonial discourses.

Pratt argues that the practices of naming evolved with the nature of colonization. The first type of naming identified in her work—“baptizing landmarks and geographical formations with Euro-Christian names” (Pratt 33)—can be linked directly to the discourse of cartography discussed in Chapter Two. The second type of naming

redeploys [things] into a new knowledge formation whose value lies precisely in its difference from the chaotic original. Here, the naming, the representing, the claiming are all one; the naming brings the reality of order into being. (Pratt 33)

This second type of naming not only designates difference, but also assimilates it into the model of possession essential to the colonial discursive formation. It empties lands and cultures of their original coding, and re/places them within Eurocentric discourses and colonial discursive formations.

Both naming types rely on the emptiness of place premised on the diffusionist myth discussed in Chapter Two. The monoliths ‘Indian’ and ‘Māori’ fall into the second type of naming identified by Pratt, because they represent an extension of the dual function of the diffusionist myth (Henderson): the (un)naming of multiplicity

first empties indigenous cultures of internal differences and then contains them as Others within the discursive formations of the colonies. The ‘chaos’ of multiple tribes and iwi resists a singular archive, as it does not fit easily with binary representations differentiating European from indigenous cultures. Discourses featuring this binary separate Aboriginal and Māori cultures from colonial culture, denying the variety of indigenous discursive formations and naming them instead as Europe’s “contrasting image, idea, personality, experience” (Said *Orientalism* 1). Governmental discourses reflected colonial thought processes and constructed Aboriginal and Māori cultures as singular, placing them in binary relationships with British culture in British North America and New Zealand. These relationships were established and reinforced at several historical leading up to the Treaty of Waitangi and the Indian Act.

In 1840, New Zealand was acknowledged as a Māori place by Captain William Hobson, who was sent by the British government to establish British rule. He qualified his recognition of Māori possession by adding “so far at least as it is possible to make that acknowledgement in favour of a people composed of numerous, dispersed, and petty tribes, who possess few political relations to each other, and are incompetent to act, or even deliberate, in concert” (qtd in Durie 2).¹² Despite the fact that Māori were not acting as a group according to Eurocentric standards, the Treaty of Waitangi attempted to enact one agreement with all iwi. This simultaneous emptying of Māori difference and containment of culture denied subjectivity while naming Māori as a singular Other to European peoples. As James Snead notes,

the progressivist conception of European history, in its ecumenical

¹² Hobson’s statement was recorded in the British Parliamentary Papers, Volume 3, in 1840.

appraisal of non-western cultures as potential and primitive versions of European society, achieved a vision of global cultural development that elevated and separated white Europeans from the ‘backward’ cultures they devalued. (235)

Because the establishment of New Zealand as a colony took place at the height of the liberal humanitarian tradition, early governmental policy “emphasiz[ed] the civilizing mission and the rights of Aboriginal peoples . . . which led to such relatively generous arrangements as the Treaty of Waitangi” (R. Harris *Making Native Space* 3). When Māori and Pākehā signed the treaty putting the experimental ‘good government’ into place on February 6, 1840, Hobson shook hands with each Māori chief who signed, saying “‘He iwi tahi tatou’ (We are one people)”.¹³

The Treaty of Waitangi established a relationship between Māori and settler-invaders based on humanitarian accommodation. This agreement between the Crown and Māori chiefs would be considered a “model for indigenous races everywhere” (Orange 136). Not only did it recognize the existence of Māori title, but it also gave Māori the ‘official’ status of British subjects.¹⁴ However, the ‘accommodating’ contact zone soon revealed itself to be “the primary instrument of legitimation for British colonisation” (Orr 77) and just six years after it was signed, George Grey disbanded the Māori Protectorate and started to implement overtly assimilationist

¹³ Although there was an attempt by British authorities in New Zealand to bring all iwi under one treaty agreement, a number of important chiefs did not sign the Treaty of Waitangi, and not all those who signed did so that day. There is much contention surrounding the treaty documents themselves, as multiple copies were made and there are discrepancies between the English and Māori versions in both form and meaning. Between February and the beginning of September, 1840, over 500 chiefs signed, and Hobson declared British sovereignty in May of that year. As noted in Chapter Two, for an excellent overview of the complex history of this treaty, see Orange’s *The Treaty of Waitangi*.

¹⁴ Thus, male Māori could vote over a hundred years before Aboriginal Canadians who did not give up individual ‘Indian’ status. Māori also held four seats in colonial parliament.

policies. As early as 1844, governmental policies indicated that Māori land rights only applied to cultivated land, villages, and burial sites. These policies culminated in enforced proper placement of land and cultures through the Native Land Act (1865) and the Native Schools Act (1867) and, by 1871, English was the only language to be spoken in schools. In 1877, Sir James Prendergast declared the Treaty of Waitangi void: “The government must be arbiter of its own justice in this regard [as] its acts in this particular cannot be examined or called in [sic] question by any tribunal because there exist no known principles upon which a regular adjudication can be based” (qtd in Lamb 80). In other words, by the late nineteenth century, the recognition of Māori rights legislated in the treaty was no longer valid for coding government discourses.

According to Ranginui Walker (Whakatōhea), the Treaty of Waitangi did not denote equal partnership between two cultures even in New Zealand’s early years; rather, it laid “down the ideology of assimilation that was to dominate colonial policy well into the twentieth century (96). Claudia Orange agrees, stating it is “important to remember that ‘salvation’ was not intended to preserve the traditional Maori society but ultimately to destroy it and to amalgamate Maori with the settler community. The Treaty laid the basis for this amalgamation” (Orange 2). Māori people were the ‘target’ of the Treaty, to use Scott’s terminology, and it required them to conform to Eurocentric systems of power. The Treaty created the colony, and the resultant “field of its operation” (Scott 198) reflected Hobson’s sentiment that the citizens would all be ‘one people’; however, his expectation reflected his assimilationist belief that Māori would become British citizens in more than name only.

The relationships between cultures in New Zealand exhibited particularly strong connections to the utopian-progressive paradigm, as the society was based on the two themes identified by Jonathan Lamb: firstly, a ‘strong utopianism’ built on the idea(l)s of beauty and wealth located in New Zealand combined with the ‘good’ relationship between Māori and settler-invaders. Secondly, social Darwinist notions of the evolution of ‘lesser races’ allowed settler-invaders to live in a democracy while refusing to recognize Māori structures of government. This binary relationship was properly placed within the singular discursive formation of the Empire, and the assimilationist agenda inherent in Hobson’s ‘he iwi tahi tatou’ dictated that the location of indigenous cultures within the emergent colony masked the ambivalence of biculturalism. According to Bhabha, unequal power relations within a colony ensure that “the difference of space return[ed] as the Sameness of time, turning the Territory into Tradition, turning the People into One” (Bhabha “DissemiNation” 300). In other words, the indigenous people of the colony would assimilate into one imagined community reflecting Eurocentric ideals, while hybrid relationships between colonial and indigenous cultures were foreclosed. In order to become full citizens of colonial New Zealand, Māori needed to participate in British systems of government.

By the late 1850s, humanitarianism was giving way to scientific racism¹⁵ and, in what would become British North America, “Native peoples that could not be assimilated . . . had to be forcibly repressed in the interests of colonial security” (R. Harris *Making Native Space* 3-4). Multiple treaties were made—and left unmade—

¹⁵ In *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia*. R. Cole Harris posits that the 1860s were the “high point of ‘scientific racism’” after the publication of Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (1859) (3).

within the large geographical area that would become Canada, and an examination of all of these is beyond the scope of this project. However, the “two modes wherein the Government may treat the Indian nations” identified by J. Provencher in 1873, exhibit the two extremes exhibited in treaties made by Europeans with Aboriginals.

Provencher stated:

Treaties can be made with them simply with a view of the extinction of their rights. . . . On the other side, they may be instructed, civilized, and led to a mode of life more in conformity with the new positions in this country and accordingly made good industrious and useful citizens. (qtd in Armitage 94)

The end point, then, is ‘civilization’ through assimilation or natural extinction as a result of the inability to fit into the colonial discursive formation. British North America was produced in early government discourses as a utopian ‘new’ place, and citizenship was either denied to a race thought to be ‘dying out’ or offered – in a limiting fashion – to those progressively adopting colonial systems of governmentality.

In 1867, the British North America Act initiated Canadian Confederation, and the colonial government assumed custodianship over Aboriginal peoples via the Indian Act (1876).¹⁶ This act depicted an assimilationist relationship between Aboriginals and colonists as nurturing a relationship between colonial ‘parent’ and indigenous ‘child’. Citizenship was only available to those who could ‘prove’ their

¹⁶ For an excellent survey of Aboriginal treaties in the Canadian context, see J.R. Miller’s latest book, *Compact, Contract, Covenant: Aboriginal Treaty-Making in Canada*. For an overview of the Indian Act in particular and a discussion of how it reflects other discourses of its time, see Sarah Carter’s *Aboriginal People and Colonizers of Western Canada to 1900*.

ability to fit into Eurocentric systems, but Indian enfranchisement—established in this Act—asserted that an indigenous citizen ceased, in law, to be an Indian. The act not only relegated Aboriginal Canadian people to the position of wards of the state, but also implied their complete lack of access to power and subjectivity in its phraseology: “The term ‘person’ means an individual other than an Indian” (qtd in Wright 327).

The British North American Indian Act (1876) not only enacts Pratt’s second type of naming; it also demonstrates the way in which the Indian monolith functioned specifically to deny hybridity and agency to Aboriginal peoples. As David Pearson states, this act “epitomized the creation of an aboriginal minority,” as it named Aboriginal peoples as either ‘status Indians’ or ‘non-status Indians,’ effectively abolishing indigenous rights for those in the latter category as well as for Métis and Inuit (28). The government then proceeded to set up churches and schools to ‘civilize’ those with ‘status’ so that if Aboriginal peoples were “successful in attaining a level of middle-class Victorian accomplishment and rectitude few settlers had accomplished, they could be enfranchised and granted private property” (D. Pearson 28). Thus, Aboriginal peoples were categorized as ‘Indian’ (or not) by the settler-invader government and then forced to progress beyond this categorization—and beyond a Eurocentric notion of progress requiring the rejection of Aboriginal culture—in order to be recognized as a member of the community of the colony.¹⁷

The utopian-progressive paradigm underlies the naming process in this governmental discourse and the ways in which this ensures the ‘target’ is undermined

¹⁷ In order to be enfranchised, Aboriginals had to demonstrate farming over a three-year period or become a minister, lawyer, teacher, or doctor. In 1922 application for enfranchisement became compulsory for those who qualified (Armitage 77-8).

within colonial governmentality. Those designated as ‘status Indian’ fulfilled the Eurocentric ideal of the perfect, pure Indian and fit into the model of possession as such when envisioned from the outside-in. Aboriginal peoples in Canada are thus objectively named—and ordered—on the terms of dominant culture. In addition, these same Aboriginal peoples were also expected to progress into their proper places within the Empire to become enfranchised citizens. Through this dual process of proper placement, hybridity is foreclosed temporally: Aboriginal peoples with ‘mixed blood’ cannot maintain their ‘status’ and those with status—deemed ‘pure’—“could not be British, later Canadians, *and* Indians. If the constitutional line between these two was crossed there was no going back” (Pearson 28).¹⁸ As David Pearson notes, “[f]ew Indians accepted the proffered hand of ‘acceptance’ into British North America. The price to be paid, a complete abrogation of one’s traditional identity as a distinct people, was too great” (28).

The Treaty of Waitangi and the British North America Indian Act both functioned as originary government discourses targeting Māori and Aboriginal cultures, locating them within colonial systems of governmentality in what would become Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada. Although both discourses target indigenous peoples, they stress different aspects of the utopian-progressive paradigm: the treaty focuses on the establishment of a utopian space of colonial good government while the act establishes a custodial relationship premising Aboriginal progress through colonization. However, despite these different emphases, a

¹⁸ This act also institutionalized Canadian Aboriginal women’s oppression, as a woman could only be enfranchised through her husband, and could not inherit land upon his death. Also, if an Aboriginal woman married a non-Aboriginal man, she ‘ceased to be an Indian’. See Julia Emberley’s *Thresholds of Difference* (87-91).

postcolonial reading reminds readers that both the Treaty of Waitangi and the British North American Indian Act perpetuate monolithic naming and the establishment of binary relationships of power. These acts of legislation set up the colony as a ‘field of operation’ that, ultimately, King and Grace challenge. I turn now to how these authors critically negate not only the targeting of Aboriginal and Māori cultures within the assimilationist paradigm, but also the structures central to what Scott terms colonial governmentality’s ‘field of operations.’

‘Civilization’ through ‘Progress’: Utopian-progressive assimilation

Henderson’s delineation of the ‘civilizing journey’ (see epigraph) traces the assimilation of indigenous cultures into dominant culture within what I have theorized as the utopian-progressive paradigm. It is important to note that the histories of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand are complex and that this paradigm expressed itself in multiple ways. However, the structures of government and places produced bear many striking similarities. I argue that these similarities evolved because ‘civilized’ place is always envisioned from the Eurocentric point of view emerging from a singular imperial archive. In this section, I read King’s and Grace’s contemporary engagements with (neo)colonial idea(l)s of progress in counterpoint with the structures of government linked to Empire that attempted to create a perfect place into which members of society could progress into full assimilation.

Lamb links the movement from ‘savage’ to ‘civilized’ in New Zealand discourse specifically to the idea of utopia, arguing that in the late nineteenth century, “[t]ime has nothing to accomplish but the ancillary task of gradually folding the

indigenous population into a perfect system of production” (80). According to Lamb, the resulting colonial “vision of Britain transplanted to the South Seas requires a whitened Māori who, by means of education and miscegenation, is bound eventually to make the transition from savagery to civility, and to enter the historyless utopic space of the colony. (80)¹⁹ This conceptualization of the place of the colony as ‘historyless’ relies on the diffusionist myth of emptiness: it empties sites of the multiplicity of indigenous histories and establishes originary discourses, such as those discussed above, to create the place of the colony from Eurocentric points of view. The necessary ‘civilization’ of Māori casts them within the model of possession. Within this model, ‘time’ folds indigenous peoples into dominant society by first excluding indigenous knowledges that do not fit into Eurocentric discursive systems that structure the civilizing journey and then by the monolithic naming of Māori cultures, these systems place them in a binary relationship with dominant European cultures.

King critically negates such assimilationist discourses. Challenging the ways in which they cast their targets, he examines the continuing monolithic representations of ‘Indians.’ In *Green Grass, Running Water*, Clifford Sifton identifies a contemporary lack in “Indian policy” because, in comparison to colonial times, neocolonial structures of government do not assert the control of Aboriginal lands and containment of cultures he feels is necessary (141). He yearns for the

¹⁹ In “The idea of utopia in the European settlement of New Zealand,” Lamb reads Samuel Butler’s *Erewhon, or Over the Range* (1872) against the background of Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s utopian philosophies and social Darwinist ideologies in an attempt to reconcile the contradictions inherent in the two. What is important to my work is that both fit into the assimilationist paradigm figuratively mapped above. Wakefield’s texts would be an interesting avenue for further research, given their connection to the New Zealand context.

historical policies denying Aboriginal power similar to those delineated by the Indian Act. After visiting Eli yet again to request that he leave his house, built on land tied to the dam he wishes to build, Sifton ironically responds to Eli's assertion of indigenous treaty rights, arguing treaties "aren't worth a *damn*. Government only made them for convenience. Who'd of guessed that there would still be Indians kicking around in the twentieth century" (141, my emphasis). Eli's name alludes to Elijah Harper, the Objibwa-Cree who was instrumental in the defeat of the Meech Lake Accord, legislation that attempted to grant more rights to the provinces without addressing Aboriginal concerns.²⁰ By linking the two, King highlights the power one Aboriginal person can have in preventing neocolonial 'progress.'²¹ He also brings racist reactions to Aboriginal land rights into counterpoint with colonial beliefs concerning indigenous populations 'dying out' to illuminate their shared assimilationist agenda.

By using the name 'Clifford Sifton,' King unsettles historical discourses and the authority of colonial power to name, in both ways identified by Pratt, indigenous place. Sir Clifford Sifton, a participant in the Prairie West movement in Canada, advocated Aboriginal deterritorialization. He was the Minister of the Interior and Superintendent of Indian Affairs at the close of the nineteenth century.²² Both the historical Sifton and his fictional namesake are examples of Pratt's figure of the 'seeing-man.' They both seek to "passively look out and possess" place and – as part

²⁰ King himself acknowledges this connection. See Davidson et al.'s *Border Crossings* (71).

²¹ See Patrick Monahan's *Meech Lake: The Inside Story* for more on the Meech Lake Accord and the contexts in which the constitutional crisis unfolded. For an interesting discussion of the Accord in light of power relations and identity, see Charles Taylor's "Politics of Recognition."

²² For an excellent comprehensive reading of the textual complexities in *Green Grass, Running Water*, see Jane Flick's "Reading Notes."

of this same colonial project – disregard or assimilate Aboriginal peoples (Pratt 7). King undermines the authority of the seeing-man’s point of view by ensuring Eli’s presence on the dam site, living in his mother’s house, precludes the fictional Sifton’s ability to control place. As a result, King is able to reverse colonial authority and displace Sifton’s power—as both a historical and contemporary fictional figure—in the narrative present of the novel.

Sifton shares the colonial beliefs prevalent during the lifetime of his historical namesake; the ‘Indian’ monolith is firmly in place and being Indian involves either full assimilation or the rejection of progress and eventual eradication. Despite Eli’s contention that it is “not exactly the nineteenth century,” Sifton insists that the Aboriginal peoples in the area are not “real Indians” because they “drive cars, watch television, go to hockey games” (141). Sifton also believes careers such as university professor, restaurant owner, and television salesperson precludes one from being Aboriginal. Sifton feels that these professions cannot be pursued by “traditionalists” and, in order to be truly ‘Indian,’ one must be ‘traditional’, a binary opposite to the European ‘progressive.’ Eli maintains, however, that “being Indian isn’t a profession”; his culture does not fit into the binary relationship Sifton constructs, as he can be both traditional and progressive (141).

This binary relationship between ‘traditional’ and ‘progressive’ mirrors the ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ catachresis that is set up by the utopian-progressive paradigm: at the same time as Indians must be traditionalists, Sifton argues that they “*can’t* live in the past” and should give up on treaty negotiations associated with his dam (my emphasis, 141). Here, Sifton attempts to control an indigenous place through

separating it from indigenous cultures through time: he argues that his “dam is part of the twentieth century. [Eli’s] house is part of the nineteenth” (141). Sifton denies Eli’s inside-out perspective concerning Aboriginal lands now governed by Canada, and ultimately he rejects Eli’s refusal to allow the takeover of his land by the Grand Baleen dam. Accordingly, Sifton casts Eli within the Aboriginal Canadian catachresis from his outside-in perspective. Eli cannot not want to be Aboriginal within Canada, but he must critique the government of his place, his home. Sifton’s comments open up an ambivalent space because the reader recognizes that, as a result of them, Eli cannot be an Aboriginal respecting his worldviews and a Canadian respecting the progressive needs of the nation. Eli enacts strategic postcoloniality to a degree: he is able to reverse Sifton’s value-coding temporarily by blocking the dam construction, and he displaces Sifton’s authority to define him as an ‘Indian’ by insisting on an ambivalent location of that cultural signifier.

Sifton’s unwillingness to listen in the present is particularly ironic, as the historical Sifton was deaf (Davidson et al. 89).²³ Both the historical figure and the fictional character are incapable of listening to inside-out perspectives concerning Aboriginal locations. Here, King critically negates the target-object set up by colonial discourses within the contemporary moment. Eli cannot stop the progress of the dam permanently through this engagement with Sifton, however; his postcolonial position remains strategic as he cannot ‘seize’ the capitalist value systems underlying this

²³ Stratton associates the name “Grand Baleen” with the second phase of the James Bay project: the Great Whale hydroelectric project in northern Quebec. Baleen means ‘whale’ in Cree. “In 1992, Great Whale suffered a tremendous setback when New York state cancelled its contract to purchase power from Hydro Quebec, the result of a Quebec Cree campaign against further development. It is a victory King implicitly celebrates in his novel. In 1994, the project was cancelled altogether” (Stratton 93).

situation and prevent neocolonial progress.

Grace, too, critically negates the ways in which Māori people continue to be targets of colonial discourses expressed in neocolonizing circumstances. In *Potiki*, her critical negation focuses explicitly on neocolonial control of land as it relates to colonial control. In *Potiki*, Mr. Dolman is surprised by what he perceives as a failure in the civilizing mission in New Zealand in a contemporary moment. The Māori community rejects the notion that a tourist resort should be built on their land.²⁴ His desire to move the whare tipuna and cemetery shows no recognition of Māori worldviews, and his outside-in perspective fails to recognize whakapapa in play.²⁵ As he points out,

there's no real worry, let me assure you. Well it's nothing new, it's been done often enough before. A new site, somewhere nearby. And we've already had a think about this. All laid out, properly lawned, fenced, everything taken care of, everything in place... and you'll be well paid... for your land. (91)

The idea that Mr. Dolman, renamed 'Dollarman' by the Māori community, knows what is 'proper' and attempts to put a price on land without a recognition of Māori beliefs and systems of ownership exposes his Eurocentric outside-in perspective and his neocolonial agenda.

The Māori narrator in this chapter notes that "the roads had been shown to [the Māori people] on maps by the money men again and again, who had kept saying that our house could be shifted without cost to us [it could be] . . . shifted nearer to town,

²⁴ Holly Walker addresses the notion of development in relation to this text and *Dogside Story* in "Developing Difference: Attitudes toward Maori 'development'."

²⁵ Tipuna, or tupuna, refers to one's ancestor's. A whare tipuna, then, is an ancestral house (Reed 65).

to a more central place” (100). ‘Cost,’ here, is purely economic and tied to colonial governmentality promoting capitalist notions of land value; Māori place is emptied of Māori value systems based on communal use and relations with the land in favour of individual colonial ownership and restricted use by members of dominant society, namely tourists. In stressing that the Māori will be “well paid . . . for [their] land” (91), Dollarman not only highlights economic discourses, but fails to align this with other ‘costs’. He cannot comprehend this worldview as embodied in the *whare tipuna*. His argument that “it could be shifted nearer to town, to a more central place” (100) is met with laughter, “because [he] had not understood that the house was central already and could not be more central” (100). Grace decentres Europe as the location of power here in similar ways to King in the section of *Truth and Bright Water* discussed at the close of Chapter Two. Thus, through their stories Grace and King not only create characters that enact ‘strategic postcoloniality’ within their stories: they also reverse and displace the value coding of Eurocentric discourses through their own acts of writing.

Dollarman sees the Māori land as the perfect site for his tourist operation, so he cannot incorporate Māori worldviews – or a continuing Māori presence – into his utopian production. Because the Māori people in this community refuse to allow the building of roadways on their land for his tourist resort, Dollarman believes they are denying access to a “facility” (92). Despite the fact that the Māori have never prevented anyone from visiting, he expects them to more actively assume the role of ‘hosts,’ and that they should be “more accommodating” (93). The Māori community rejects the attempt to render their lands as appropriate/d spaces, as they refuse to be

“so accommodating as to allow the removal of our wharenuī, which is our meeting place, our identity, our security... [or] so accommodating as to allow the displacement of the dead and the disruption of a sacred site” (93). As a result, Dollarman insists repeatedly that the Māori people are preventing the development, indeed rejecting ‘progress.’

Dollarman insists that this Māori resistance to his development plans is related to the incomplete nature of the iwi’s collective ‘civilization journey.’ As the target-objects of colonial governmentality, they have failed to assimilate and adopt the required field of operations, as they do not ‘feel obliged’ to fit into Dollarman’s Eurocentric story. In order to encourage further progress and acceptance of his plan, Dollarman states, “I really believe that you people have come a long way...” (93). If Sifton is read as deaf to Eli’s refusals, Dollarman is blind to the responses of the Māori people. As a result of his Eurocentric vision, he cannot recognize different conceptions of progress. In comparison, the members of the Māori community recognize that he is unable to see their point of view. Members of the community state, it is “[n]ot [progress] to you. Not in your eyes. But what we’re doing is important. To us. To us that’s progress” (*Potiki* 90). Although Dollarman travels there to meet with the Māori community, he remains incapable of ‘meeting’ them through discussion. His desire to move the whare tipuna and cemetery shows no recognition of Māori belief systems tying the sacredness of the site to its original physical location.

Dollarman also cannot see the Māori return to the land as progressive because he refuses to recognize that his own point of view is constructed by a neocolonial

archive that conceives of progress, in part, as “an attitude towards land, because progress was seen to be manifest in the growing European ability to dominate nature” (R. Harris *Making Native Space* 53). Grace’s location of the Māori community’s ‘progress’ in counterpoint with Dollarman’s Eurocentric view exposes Dollarman’s agenda as neocolonial domination of land. From this point of view, he can only see that the tourist venture will bring more money and tourist industry-related jobs to the area, while the Māori community is more interested in a sustainable relationship between people and the land. Because Māori worldviews do not fit into the utopian-progressive paradigm, Dollarman cannot recognize the legitimacy of their value-coding. Indeed, *Potiki*’s narrator realises “that the man had not, had never, understood anything we had ever said, and never would” (100). This Māori community displaces Dolman’s authority through reversing the order of colonial discourses, as they rename him in a way that disempowers him. They also displace his authority by refusing to accept his vision for their place. That said, they remain incapable of seizing the discourse to create something new in this moment of contact.

King also engages specifically with a contact zone as a ‘field of operations’ reflecting colonial governmentality. In *Truth and Bright Water*, King maps Bright Water, a Canadian Aboriginal reserve, as divided from Truth, a predominantly white settlement, by a river flowing from the Canadian Shield that acts as a contact zone between the two places. Most people cannot easily move back and forth, however, as they must drive forty extra minutes to cross the border by car at an official border crossing in Prairie View. Thus, the route between countries—and between cultures—is not direct and without barriers, and it is controlled by the nation’s structures of

government. Many Aboriginal Canadians move from the Aboriginal reserve to Truth to go to school and open businesses—movement that reflects colonial progress in relation to the structures supporting it. The tourist-oriented ‘Indian Days,’ discussed in Chapter Four, is the only reason why a large number of people travel from Truth to Bright Water.

King produces this place as a site for a story that further maps the complexity of indigenous negotiations of the utopian-progressive paradigm. Emery Youngman’s failed attempt to go to Truth to take in a western movie at the Frontier theatre highlights how Eurocentric structures, symbolized by the bridge, can impede indigenous peoples’ attempts to take the ‘civilizing journey.’ The bridge can impede Aboriginal peoples’ attempts to complete the ‘civilizing journey’. The bridge acts as a field of operations for colonial governmentality: it enables and prevents the actions of Emery and his ability to move. He gets

more than halfway across the bridge when he stepped on the edge of a warped plank and [was] thrown off the bridge decking. Emery banged his head pretty good and he tore his shirt, but when he tried to get up and climb back onto the plywood, he discovered that his leg was jammed tight. (42)

After Emery is discovered the next day, his position as a target is made clear; he is “laid out against the sky like a trout in a net,” and his family tries to rescue him, but they lack the proper tools and call the fire department (42). Emery’s attempt to access the Frontier’s stereotypical Aboriginal utopian historical (represented in the Western movie) by crossing the bridge leaves him in danger.

Emery's lack of progress from Bright Water to Truth leads to a head injury and, in the end, he is incapable of escaping from the field of Eurocentric vision. Although he attempts to seize the value-coding of colonialism through attending the movie and seeing it with a different perspective than its intended audience, he can neither reverse his course of action – he is stuck on the bridge – nor can he displace the power relations inherent in this story. He must rely on Truth's infrastructure—the fire department—to cut him free from the bridge itself. This 'rescue' can be read in counterpoint with discourses bemoaning indigenous dependency on government in contemporary times, and King highlights that Emery's family has the skills and desire to rescue him; but they did not have the necessary tools. Thus, *Truth and Bright Water* sets up movement between places mimicking, yet unsettling, imperial progress: sites are defined by their cultures, and movement into Eurocentric place *implies* progress, but assimilation is not guaranteed and can be dangerous. The colonizers also do not advocate progress at any cost to themselves: the fire department, after reluctantly rescuing Emery, does not offer to leave their tools behind.

Movement in the other direction—from Truth to Bright Water—is facilitated by appeals to dominant stereotypes that fit into the binary constructions of cultures found in the originary colonial discourses discussed above. As Elvin explains to his son Tecumseh, it is much easier to get across the border if one pulls a "dumb Indian routine," acting like an Aboriginal person in Western movies to fit into the white border patrol officers' 'vision' of the 'Indian' (90). Unlike Tecumseh, who uses Charlie Ron's ferry to negotiate ambivalent spaces within places, Elvin facilitates his own proper placement by the border guards. The structure that should ensure more

direct movement between places—the bridge—remains incomplete and perilous; its explicitly “*pale supports* rise out of the earth like dead trees,” ensuring that “the only thing that moves in the shadows is the wind” (3, my emphasis).

King thus demonstrates that the Eurocentric vision enables structures that limit movement while purporting to advocate ‘progress’; discursive systems seek to control place and contain cultures to continually mask the ambivalence within neocolonial productions of place.

In *Baby No-Eyes*, Te Paania goes through explicit assimilation processes when her parents sign her up for a “deruralisation course, an attempt at making a country frog into a city frog, an attempt at making a native frog exotic” (101).²⁶ She moves from her Māori community into white-dominated Wellington, where she

learned how to catch buses, buy tickets, fill out forms and applications, use the telephone. Learned about walking smartly and sitting with our knees together, about how to enter a room and how to behave at interviews. Learned that our clothes were all wrong. (101)

Te Paania enacts strategic postcoloniality when she embraces ‘progress,’ quickly moving from work experience to a permanent job and taking night school courses to become a typist and, eventually, an office manager. She insistently puts her name forward for new jobs in order to be recognised by dominant members of society, until Anthony, her boss, says “All right, give her a go” (104).

But Te Paania realises that she cannot fully reverse or displace the neocolonial

²⁶ Jen Crawford recently addressed parental relationships with their children in relation to this text in “Spaze: Void States and the Mother-Child Relationship in *The Matriarch*, *The Dream Swimmer*, and *Baby No-Eyes*.”

system of her workplace. Her boss still views her from his Eurocentric perspective, and Te Paania begins to recognize that she will never fit in. She eventually refuses to continue to enact strategic postcoloniality; she is tired of being an ‘exotic frog’ and quits her job as a successful office manager. She takes a new job working for Māori causes and dissociates herself from Eurocentric ideals of progress, displacing their value coding within her own life. She asserts that her life is “not bad for a frog” (281); she reverses and displaces the Eurocentric discourses that label her a ‘frog,’ and seizes the negative value-coding of this term by insisting that her chosen life is ‘not bad.’

The characters in *Green Grass, Running Water*, *Potiki*, *Truth and Bright Water*, and *Baby No-eyes* interrogate the assimilation of Aboriginal and Māori culture within the utopian model of possession and the progressive civilizing journey. In different ways, the Aboriginal and Māori characters discussed in this section negotiate colonial and neocolonial structures of governmentality to resist singular naming and binary relationships of power in order to assert strategic postcoloniality and value-coding associated with indigenous worldviews. As a result, their stories challenge the naturalized narrative of Eurocentric progress evolving from early colonial discourses of governmentality and open up spaces in the place of the nation from which to engage with the ambivalence at the heart of the utopian-progressive paradigm.

Ambivalence and Spaces of Knowledge: Opening up the ‘Fields of Operations’

Ross King argues that progress is the metanarrative of modernity, and that “[o]nce the metanarratives are revealed as empty, and ultimately arbitrary, we are left

with the narratives that reflect the position of the narrator” (5). I argue that exposing the ambivalence inherent in the utopian-progressive paradigm unsettles colonial authority and critically negates outside-in perspectives. How, then, can the recognition of ambivalence lead to the imaginative affirmation of discursive formations beyond the model of possession? King and Grace draw on indigenous worldviews to assert indigenous subjectivity and replace the indigenous characters discussed above; they critically negate colonial discourses of governmentality in various ways, enabling their characters to position themselves in strategically postcolonial ways.

Envisioning worlds from the inside-out involves not only both critical negation and imaginative affirmation, however. As Marion O’Callaghan notes,

[i]magination is the selecting out and rearrangement of ‘facts’ in order to provide coherence, framework, and seeming unity between ideas and action, or more precisely to provide a basis for the direction of social relationships and the social creation of categories. It is what is imagined that posits the ‘natural,’ that is, the normal, the fixed and unchanging.
(22)

In order to establish an empowering relationship between the Nation and its Aboriginal and Māori citizens, King and Grace need to normalize social systems valuing indigenous cultures. Although the imaginative affirmations of King and Grace select and arrange facts, the ‘framework’ for their arrangements is relational and processual, and what is imagined, therefore, is not fixed and unchanging. The arrangement of ‘facts’ resists the binary classifications of the Orientalist grid, yet still

enables the creation of a contact zone that imaginatively affirms a positive relationship between culture and location.

Both King and Grace challenge structures of colonial governmentality by not only examining the ways in which various ‘targets’ respond to colonization. They also critically negate the key ‘fields of operation’ promoting the assimilation of Aboriginal and Māori peoples. As Scott notes, an examination of the structures managing “the arrangement and disposition of the instrumentalities and institutions that sustain [colonial governmentality]” enables critical examinations of the ways in which “new rights-bearing and self-governing subjects do as they ought” (203). Lefebvre’s recognition that “the school [and] . . . the church . . . each possess an ‘appropriate’ space” (Lefebvre “Space” 84) facilitating assimilation is instructive here. In both colonial sites Eurocentric ideas of ‘appropriate’ knowledge led to the cyclical production and reproduction of Truth. Churches and schools were not only sites for teaching acceptable Eurocentric discourses; they also facilitated the colonization of indigenous places and cultures.

The establishment of churches and schools was central to colonization in both Canada and New Zealand; the physical presence of these structures put settlements ‘on the map’ and ensured continuing progress. Churches and schools participated in perpetuating the discursive formation of the colony through both their actual presence and their role in facilitating assimilation. King and Grace identify these as important ‘contact zones’ historically and in contemporary times; they negate the power of these zones within mapped places as well as in the systems figuratively mapped through the discourses they support.

In *Truth and Bright Water*, ownership of the church, originally built by missionary Methodists seeking to convert Aboriginal peoples, transfers between various religious denominations and, at the outset of the story, sits abandoned on a rise *above* the town of Truth.²⁷ The church is out of place on the land and its ties to colonialism—and indigenous resistance to it—are made apparent through how it is described from Tecumseh’s point of view: the steeple resembles a “thick spike [that] has been driven through the church itself and hammered into the prairies” (2). Depending on one’s point of view, one “might imagine that what [one] see[s] is not a church gone to hell but a ship leaned at the keel, sparkling in the light, pitching over the horizon in search of a new world” (2). King links the colonization of cultures to both religion and the historical ‘discovery’ of the New World. If the church is like Columbus’ ship, then both can be seen to constitute the ‘discovery’ of a land that is already inhabited by indigenous peoples. The fact that the church must be forcibly attached to the prairie landscape reminds readers that this structure is not a natural element in that place.

Aboriginal artist Monroe Swimmer buys the church and makes it his own ‘mission’ to paint the structure out of the landscape. Through this character’s actions, King conceptually maps the site of the church and then opens it up; through “identification of and perceived dissociation from the empowering strategies of colonial discourse” Monroe begins to ‘decolonize the map’ (Huggan “Decolonizing” 129). After the

²⁷ In *Truth and Bright Water*, “the church was built by the Methodists as a mission to the Indians. The Baptists owned it for a while in the forties. They sold it to the Nazarenes, who sold it to the First Assembly of God, who sold it to the Sacred Word Gospel, who left the church standing empty and moved down the river to Prairie View” (King 2). That the church sits *above* Truth is, of course, ironic; as is discussed throughout this chapter, Europeans placed Eurocentric knowledge constructions above indigenous truths through excluding their indigenous worldviews and demanding assimilation.

artist is in town for a few weeks, “the entire east side of the church is gone. Or at least it looks gone. [Swimmer has] painted this side so it blends in with the prairies and the sky, and he’s done such a good job that it looks as if part of the church has been chewed off” (44). Swimmer continues with this decolonizing project until the church is painted out of the picture—“no roof, no steeple, no door. No church” (230). After the completion of this project, the artist decides his next work will involve a residential school near Medicine River (262).

The church is a powerful symbol of an institution promoting assimilation, and painting the church simultaneously into and out of the landscape is the equivalent of erasing a key element of the colonial discursive formation. This enacts the critical negation of Eurocentric discourses necessary for an establishment of inside-out perspectives. The decolonization of the landscape accomplished by Monroe is a proactive reversal of (neo)colonial control and it displaces the authority of Eurocentric vision in this appropriate/d space. However, Tecumseh, who is impressed with the church’s disappearance, is also aware that the structure is still there, despite the fact that it is no longer visible. Even after he and Monroe empty the church of its contents and give them away, the structure itself remains in place.

Thus, Swimmer’s act of decolonization remains incapable of changing the colonial discursive formation. Monroe’s actions fulfill two important parts of Spivak’s strategic postcoloniality: they reverse and displace the presence of the church. However, this decolonizing act cannot seize the church to strategically displace it. In other words, Monroe critically negates the church’s authority and position but does not imaginatively affirm a new use for it that negotiates both

Eurocentric and indigenous worldviews and, as a result, it remains a neocolonial appropriate/d space. He fulfills only half of Wilson’s creative dialectic and the resulting inside-out perspective is skewed. By removing the church from what can be ‘seen,’ Monroe prevents future negotiations of the complex ambivalent relationship between indigenous cultures and Christianity, as well as future relations with a structure that will remain, despite its perceived absence, very much a part of both Imperial history and the neocolonial discursive formation. Monroe removes a colonial representation, but his act precludes negotiations of colonial discourses still central to the discursive formation of the Nation. Spiral reading strategies allow for, and necessitate, the visibility of all discourses and thus resolve the either/or dichotomy that Monroe’s painting of the church fails to negotiate fully.

In *Baby No-eyes*, Grace demonstrates that contemporary negotiations of sites of colonial assimilation are central to decolonizing the locations occupied – mentally and physically - by individual characters. Grace addresses the ambivalent historical relationship between schools and Māori communities: Kura recognizes that the school, and colonial education, was “what we wanted” and that Māori people donated community land for school sites (29).²⁸ Kura acknowledges that Māori parents facilitated educational processes of assimilation and the establishment of binary relationships of power. She recalls her grandmother saying to her,

We don’t want our children to be hurt at school. That’s why you have to be very good. You have to listen, you have to obey. We know that

²⁸ Kura has a dual meaning with significance here: “chief” and “school” (Reed 23). As is discussed below, the character Kura creates her own learning environment, to which whakapapa is central, as this text progresses. Ultimately, she also also participates in the building of a Maori-centred school. She adopts a leadership role in the school system later in life, thus taking her position as an elder, or chief.

you're clever and we know you'll learn. That's what our school is for, for you to learn, for our children to learn. You're very lucky to have a school and be allowed to go to school. (30)

The binary relationship sanctioned by Māori elders is clear: Europeans have authority over Māori, and Māori should feel 'lucky' to be allowed access to 'progress.'

Kura grows up learning to fit into the Eurocentric world, and she names her son Shane in the hope that he, too, will fit in. She gives him this "name of [his] own. . . . A name for today's world," but Shane recognizes that his European name denies negotiation of Māori culture (26). When Shane wants to know about his tipuna name, Gran Kura asks, "what good is knowing?" (26).²⁹ Shane, "stumbling drunk," explains in this way:

'Black, but what to go with it? Shane for a name. Shane, Shame, Blame, Tame, Lane, Pain. Nothing to go with this,' he prodded at his chest with his stiff stick fingers, 'nothing to go with this. How can I be Pakeha with this colour, this body, this face, this head, this heart? How can I be Māori without... without... without what? Don't even know without what. Without what?' (27)

Shane's question—"[w]here's my tipuna name?" (26, emphasis added)—gestures toward his inability to produce a place for himself in a neocolonial society in which Pākehā-centred (un)naming is synonymous with Māori 'shame,' 'blame,' 'tame,' and 'pain.' His lack of a Māori name is symptomatic of his disconnection from Māori culture and, as a result, he cannot envision the relationship between 'this'—

²⁹ One's tipuna name refers to an ancestral name. Teina refers to a younger cousin or sibling of the same gender.

himself—and his world. He cannot bring together the two questions presented in Chapter Two – ‘Where is here?’ and ‘Who am I?’. Although he is given a European name, Shane cannot enact Pratt’s second order of naming to ‘bring the reality of order into being’ and is, as a result, incapacitated (‘lame’) and lost instead in “Nothing, nothing, nothing” (26). He lacks the “names, the secrets, [the] stories” (26) essential to accessing Māori place and negotiating culture as relational and in process.

Shane’s outburst wakens a story within Gran Kura allowing her to unsettle Eurocentric ‘goodness’ and assimilation. She begins her story of Riripeti/Betty with “There was a school,” and she tells of the assimilationist agenda embodied by this structure. As she states, it is because Riripeti/Betty was “too good to guess what to say, too good to know what lies to tell, too good to know what to do” (33) that she was shaken and “smacked and sent to stand in the bad place [until] . . . she couldn’t go to school. Her spirit was out of her,” and could not be located in the place of the school (34). Although she is revived for a period of time through a holiday visit with her grandmother, Riripeti/Betty falls ill when the time to return to school draws near, and, as Gran Kura remembers years later, “[n]ot long after that she died. Killed by school. Dead of fear” (38). This fear was predicated on Riripeti/Betty’s inability to fit into the model of possession; she dies because she cannot access Māori place within the colonial discursive formation.

In insisting that Riripeti/Betty was ‘too good,’ however, Gran Kura rejects her mother’s childhood instructions years after her schooling, and separates goodness from ‘listening to and obeying’ the conventions of Pākehā culture. In this passage, Grace can be read as critically negating the utopian-progressive ‘goodness’ of school.

Riripeti/Betty's failure to fit into the place of the school becomes an important story for Kura, and Kura's revisioning of goodness allows her to work with her other grandson, Tawera, toward establishing a contemporary school site premised on hybrid relations between cultures. Tawera's 'good' education incorporates both Māori and Eurocentric discourses, and Kura volunteers at the school to facilitate this process. Kura thus enacts strategic postcoloniality and rejects her mother's assertion that she is 'lucky' to have been colonized, saying 'no' to the 'moral luck' identified by Spivak in order to 'seize' school as a place where her grandson can negotiate the relationship between 'Māori' and 'Aotearoa New Zealand.'

Both King and Grace tell stories of 'appropriate' spaces in these texts, a church and a school respectively. Reading their stories in counterpoint brings to the foreground the necessity for critical negation to lead to imaginative affirmation. Although Monroe is able to paint the church out of the picture, he is unable to redefine Aboriginal cultural identity in direct relation to the Eurocentric ideals that site represents. Kura's ability to redefine the school as an educational place capable of supporting Māori 'goodness' opens up a renewed place for indigenous cultural engagement within a historically colonial institution.

Kura's story demonstrates how Māori worldviews, brought into relation with colonial history, allow her to recognize the ambivalence inherent in assimilationist discourse and – in the resultant space – she inserts Māori value systems concerning 'goodness' into neocolonial place. This process not only unsettles binary relations between European and Māori cultures; it also recognizes indigenous culture as a legitimate location from which to produce a place of knowledge.

In the contact zones of school and the workplace delineated in *Baby No-eyes*, Te Paania speaks loudly in order to be seen on her own terms, responding to domination by imaginatively moving “beyond frog” through a “wildness that makes [her] eyes bug out. It’s [her] bugging-out eyes that enable [her] to see wildly, according to Gran Kura” (143). Rather than reflecting a version of the ‘savage’ Māori discussed by Lamb or the ‘naturalist’ behaviour outlined by Goldberg, Te Paania’s ‘wildness’ is a type of ‘knowing’ that she shares with her ancestor, Pirinoa. Rather than necessitating assimilation, this wildness allows them to resist it, as “no one can order” them (144). She challenges her teachers and bosses, and at the end of the novel her position as narrator is established: she lectures on the use of Māori genes in medical research. She produces a place within the contact zone from which she can negotiate Māori and Pākehā cultures in relation to her Māori worldviews. At the close of the novel, Tawera describes Te Paania as a “part-time lover . . . [and] also a traveller. She’s getting up noses and under skins, stepping out” (276).

Te Paania’s travel does not reflect the ‘civilization journey,’ as she resists processes of proper placement and challenges neocolonial control of Māori cultures. Her ‘wildness’ can be read in counterpoint with the philosophies of Locke, for whom indigenous peoples were “‘wild,’ ‘like savages’ and devoid of the capacity to raise themselves unaided to the level of the ‘civilized part of mankind’” (Parekh 87). It is Te Paania’s wildness, however, that enables her to critique colonial and neocolonial ideas of progress, as it allows her to narrate her own story, and insist that “[p]rogress is people having clean water and enough food” (281). From Te Paania’s perspective, progress is not about being properly placed within neocolonial discourses associated

with science, but rather about survival, which is associated with confidently proclaiming “I’m a frog” and refusing to be assimilated into dominant culture (279). Reading Te Paania’s stories involves recognizing her inside-out perspective: she critically negates the agenda of neocolonial proper placement and imaginatively affirms a place premised on the relational-processual paradigm. Her Māori culture is not a containable object, but a way she can relate to—and narrate—the world.

The recognition of ‘wildness’ as a way of *knowing* moves beyond ‘strategic postcoloniality’ because, through this knowledge system, Te Paania is able to not only displace, reverse, and seize colonial systems; she can also imaginatively affirm Māori worlds. This unsettles the centrality of ‘Europe’ and, challenges both the placement of Māori as other and the place that enables such discourses. Through her work from within Māori cultures, she uses her inside-out perspective to educate others in Aotearoa New Zealand, and begins to establish new “coordinates, concepts, and assumptions” (see Scott, epigraph) that can cast the emergent nation within a more relational-processual paradigm. She ‘steps out’ of, rather than falling in line with, her position as a Māori person within assimilationist discourses. This ‘stepping out’ involves stepping up to affirm Māori culture as the location from which she speaks.

Te Paania’s stories emerge from this location, and the link between her ‘wildness’ and that of her ancestor, Pirinoa, recognizes that the negotiation of cultural location is always in process. In “The Order of Discourse,” Foucault argues that the “protocols of Western academic historiography activated ‘the rules of a discursive “policing”’ which banished traditional Indigenous historical discourses to ‘the space of wild exteriority’” (qtd Van Toorn 45). Te Paania embraces this wildness and

promotes its inclusion within the place of Aotearoa New Zealand. She rejects the rules of discourse policing her position as Māori and, instead, begins to negotiate forms of catachrestic citizenship.

In contrast, King discusses the possibilities of catachrestic citizenship in much more metaphorical terms. In *Truth and Bright Water*, King challenges the colonial ‘field of operations’ with a field of his own. Aboriginal artist Monroe Swimmer places a bright green platform in the middle of the prairies inscribed with the words ‘Teaching the Grass About Green’. Stumbling onto it, Tecumseh is initially angry when he hurts himself, and he believes the platform “looks strange in the middle of the prairie grass.” Indeed, he immediately labels it as a “hazard” created by a “fool” (44-5). The novel establishes that attempting to assimilate ‘Aboriginal’ places into Eurocentric paradigms cannot be easily dismissed as ‘hazardous’ and ‘foolish,’ particularly since structures of assimilation have a long-term impact on the imagination of Canada. Notwithstanding Tecumseh’s recognition of the inappropriateness of this colour categorization in the prairie context (he thinks of grass *as* yellow), he fails in his attempts to move the platform or even find out what is underneath it. Despite kicking it and trying to lift it up, the platform—symbolizing, in part, universalist idea(l)s—is “too heavy to move” (45).

This platform reflects the Eurocentric desire at the heart of assimilation cast in the utopian-progressive paradigm; like colonial discourses of governmentality, it represents and attempts to assert the power of a Eurocentric point of view. The platform depicts the ideal shade of green while also purporting to instruct the ‘imperfect’ grass to become like the ideal. King interrogates assimilation;

Tecumseh's reactions to it expose the inappropriate nature of this platform in indigenous place. But King does more than critically negate this inappropriate attempt to properly place the landscape; this platform forces negotiations between colonial and indigenous productions of place. 'Green,' which can be seen to function at the archival level as an abstract idea which needs to be structured in discourse to be 'seen' through the novel, must negotiate both the Eurocentric 'norm' and Tecumseh's view of the grass as 'yellow'.

When Tecumseh stumbles upon the platform later in the story, "it's no longer bright green. Now it's the same colour as the grass and almost impossible to see" (134). Although Swimmer keeps painting it green, the structure succumbs to *native* "Peer pressure" from the plants surrounding it and turns yellow (134). This platform reflects a hybrid relationship between Eurocentric and indigenous worldviews within this place: although the assimilationist structure remains in place and partially visible, the field of its operation responds to its Aboriginal surroundings. Unlike Monroe's painting of the church out of the landscape, his platform project resists and displaces colonial productions of place. It then unsettles the Eurocentric ability to name the colour of the grass following Pratt's second order of naming and seizes the processes of proper placement by ensuring the platform assimilates into the indigenous place surrounding it. The platform can be read as potentially promoting catachrestic citizenship: standing on it, Tecumseh could envision himself, as an *Aboriginal* youth, in relation to the larger place of *Truth*, the place in which he lives.

The platform reflects the tension within the "logic of the 'civilizing mission'" identified by Avril Bell. Bell points out that discourses of assimilation supported two

contradictory ideas: the idea that “the culture of savages was fixed by their biology co-existed with the idea that they could and should change to be like Europeans” (124). Bell argues that this tension within the discourse supported the assimilation of Maori peoples, yet also led to a ‘lose-lose’ situation (see epigraph). “These hybridised Natives were no longer properly themselves, nor would they ever be accepted as fully European” within the colonized place of New Zealand (124). King’s platform resists this ‘lose-lose’ situation, as the platform, still labeled ‘Teaching the Grass about Green,’ now reflects what is considered green by Tecumseh, who lives in the village of Truth. Thus, the English word for green exists in a productive hybrid relation with the grass and is represented on the platform. The grass is green on hybrid, yet Aboriginal terms.

Neither the platform’s colour nor Te Paania’s wildness represent a closed system. Rather, they both constitute hybridity. Both the colour of the grass and wildness refuse to be named within established colonial discourse. The structure of the platform and the stories enabled by Te Paania’s wildness replace indigenous perspectives as emerging from hybrid locations negotiating Aboriginal and Māori worldviews in relation to the national locations in which they find themselves. These perspectives envision counter-assimilative, wild ‘culture’ enabling indigenous negotiations with dominant culture and its discursive systems. This definition of culture links to the work of de Certeau, who states that culture

articulates conflicts and alternately legitimizes, displaces, or controls the superior force. It develops in an atmosphere of tensions, and often of violence, for it provides symbolic balances, [and] contracts of

compatibility and compromises. (*Practice* xvii).

In other words, cultures continually change as a result of hybrid negotiations with other cultures. Thus engagements between indigenous and Eurocentric worldviews in colonial and neocolonial contact zones provide a place from which one can envision indigeneity from the inside-out: they enable the critical negation of colonial productions of place and the imaginative affirmation of emergent cultural identities beyond the (neo)colonial model of possession.

Both the platform's colour and Te Paania's wildness demonstrate hybridity; they constitute a rejection of essentialism and involve negotiations with the places produced by dominant representations.³⁰ For this hybridity to occur, culture must be redefined as processual and relocated in liminal spaces of negotiation that are themselves located in the place of the colony and nation. According to de Certeau, this re/placement of cultures requires the appropriation of processes of proper placement to ensure indigenous control of the 'staging of culture' itself. Such appropriation requires engagement with not only the discourses of a society, but also "the intellectual tools that belong to it" (de Certeau *Practice* xi). Aboriginal Canadian and Māori worldviews centre the concepts of 'process' and 'relation' and, together, these concepts premise *negotiation* as a primary 'intellectual tool' for engaging with dominant processes of proper placement within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand.

I argue that foregrounding hybridity as an intellectual tool ensures that indigenous worldviews not only resist colonial governmentality but participate in the

³⁰ I will discuss the complex relationships between indigenous cultures and essentialism in Chapters Four and Five.

creation of spaces of knowledge. Because “cultural hybridity . . . entertains difference without the imposed hierarchy” requiring assimilation into dominant culture (Bhabha *Location* 4), it can lead to a new kind of place, one premised on cultural relations.

The narrators in the novels of King and Grace are thus able to undermine and break the rules of discursive policing central to colonial governmentality. King and Grace draw on Aboriginal and Māori worldviews to locate their own work in indigenous cultures, and their novels become locations from which their characters and, simultaneously, King and Grace negotiate the discursive formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively.

The assimilation of indigenous cultures supports and maintains the model of possession. Eurocentric discourses empty indigenous cultures of their complexity and locate them as monolithic objects in a binary relationship enabling European subjectivity and denying hybridity. Through my reading of their original governmental discourses, the discursive formations of British North America and New Zealand emerged as what Brennan identifies as ‘gestative political structures,’ naming and locating indigenous peoples and cultures within the utopian-progressive paradigm (46). Neocolonial and pluralist imagined communities, which will be discussed in the next two chapters, produce places linked to the colonial governmentality discussed here. Continued assertions of neocolonial authority require forgetting the violent origins and histories of colonies to maintain the utopian-progressive paradigm supporting the nation. As Bhabha states, “[t]o be obliged to forget—in the construction of the national present—is not a question of historical memory; it is the construction of a discourse on society that performs the problematic

totalization of the national will” (“DissemiNation” 311). My discussion of the spaces and times of Canada’s and New Zealand’s shared history of assimilation works against neocolonial ‘forgetting’ and fractures the colonial discursive formation and the authority of the colonial governmentality it supports.

What must not be forgotten, as I turn now to discuss contemporary productions of place, is that ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Zealand Māori’ catachreses originated in colonial stories of assimilation and are perpetuated in contemporary discourses of integration. Imperialist policies sanctioned Aboriginal and Māori inclusion in the colonies that would become Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand on the ‘progressive’ terms of the colonizers. Simultaneously, the unassimilable purity – the unassimilable historical ‘nature’ – of ‘Indian’ and Māori cultures was expected to ‘die out’ over time, along with large parts of the population. Explicitly assimilationist policy did not succeed in absorbing the ‘Aboriginal’ into ‘Canadian,’ or the ‘Māori’ into ‘New Zealand,’ however; indigenous cultures in both locations are not faltering today, and rising population numbers indicate that neither Aboriginal peoples nor Māori are ‘dying out’.³¹ How, then, do today’s dominant cultures create and support discourses supporting the story of the Nation, a discursive formation evolving from colonial productions of place? I argue that the neocolonial discursive formation attempts to integrate indigenous culture, and I now turn to a critical engagement of integration as it is expressed through neocolonial tourism and the pluralist structures of governmentality, biculturalism and multiculturalism.

³¹ See “Highlights,” *2001 Census > Māori*, 12 August 2005, www.stats.govt.nz/census/2001-Māori/highlights.htm. See also “Aboriginal peoples of Canada: a demographic profile,” *2001 Census: analysis series*, 10 December 2004, <www12.statscan.ca>. Population statistics demonstrate that both Māori and Canadian Aboriginal populations are on the rise.

CHAPTER FOUR

Performing the Pedagogical: Neocolonial Tourism and Discourses of Integration

Pākehā New Zealanders have never been slow to exploit this indigenous culture in promotion and advertising, often in ways that drew Maori disapproval. There was a time when foreigners could have been excused for thinking, by the posters and the videos they saw, that New Zealand existed solely of flax-skirted Maori jumping in and out of steam pools. (D. Barber, qtd in Briar O'Connor's "The Dilemma of Souvenirs")

*How I loathe the term 'Indian' ... 'Indian' is a term used to sell things—souvenirs, cigars, cigarettes, gasoline, cars... 'Indian' is a figment of the white man's imagination. (Lenore Keeshig-Tobias, qtd in Ronald Wright's *Stolen Continents: the Americas through Indian Eyes Since 1492*)*

Travel... the perfect freedom. (Motto, National Tour Association, United States of America)

Susan L. Roberson introduces *Defining Travel: Diverse Visions* by stating, “whether we travel to foreign lands or just across the room, we all journey and from our journeying define ourselves” (xi). The colonial collection of knowledge reflects this travel motif; through his discussion of the views espoused by British colonist Arthur James Balfour, Said defines colonial knowledge as “rising above immediacy, beyond self, into the foreign and distant” (*Orientalism* 32). Drawing on a singular archive, the seeing-man envisioned the colonial landscape from the outside-in and enacted processes of proper placement to ensure indigenous cultures fit into his Eurocentric utopian-progressive paradigm. Rising ‘beyond self’ always involved a

Eurocentric and circular return to what could be counted within the colonial discursive formation as Truth. But what happens when the places of the colonies evolve into the places of the Nation? How do settler-invader societies place indigenous cultures in relation to dominant cultures when colonial assimilationist strategies are no longer tenable? I argue that certain neocolonial tourist sites in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand promote indigenous cultures as utopian objects, containing the concept of culture within histories that act within the discursive formations of these nations.

In this chapter I examine the complex relationship between ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Canada’ and ‘Māori’ and ‘Aotearoa New Zealand’ specifically within selected sites promoting heritage tourism. I expose the reading codes and roles imbedded in these neocolonial discourses as central to the discursive formations of these two nations and the continuing dominance of Eurocentric points of view. Spiral reading strategies allow me to read the novels of King and Grace in counterpoint with neocolonial tourist discourses in order to show how new systems of governmentality emerge from, and maintain, shifting ‘target-objects’ within emergent ‘fields of operation’ (Scott) which continue to cast indigenous cultures within a utopian-progressive paradigm. I focus on King’s *Medicine River* as well as Grace’s *Cousins* and *Dogside Story*, and refer to the other novels already discussed in this thesis, to further illustrate how both authors critically negate discursive systems to open up ambivalent spaces within tourist sites, and imaginatively affirm places beyond these systems in which to re-place indigenous cultures as both relational and processual. In these novels, King and Grace imaginatively affirm indigenous cultures as locating

positions from which indigenous characters can access both the freedom of travel and the stability of a continuing relation to place.

According to Bhabha, citizens of contemporary nations must “be thought of in double-time”; they must negotiate their own positions as pedagogical ‘objects’ and signifying ‘subjects’ (“DissemiNation” 297). Discourses of neocolonial tourism limit this negotiation for members of indigenous cultures within neocolonial discursive sites. That is, they produce places in which indigenous peoples must perform the pedagogical: they signify pedagogical objects envisioned from the outside-in. Within these sites, ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Māori’ peoples perform cultural histories that are integrated into the larger stories of these nations. As a result, joining these terms to form the nouns ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘Māori New Zealander’ results in catachreses that bring the concept of indigenous culture within the place of the nation to crisis. This is because ‘culture’ cannot be both Aboriginal and Canadian, New Zealand and Māori within the contemporary context. Some indigenous peoples perform the histories of these nations; they are integrated into national discourses reflecting Eurocentric histories, a process they participate in in various ways.

What began as a colonial demand to assimilate evolved into the national demand to integrate.¹ These two systems differ: the model of possession promotes the assimilated indigene as the ‘end’ of progress, while integrationist models appear to produce places for difference within the larger place of the Nation. However, the singular archive of neocolonial discourses gives form to and limits Bhabha’s double-time. It controls contemporary indigenous negotiations of objectivity and subjectivity

¹ This evolution from assimilationist colonial politics to integrationist pluralist systems will be discussed further in the next chapter.

to perpetuate monolithic representations of the 'Indian' and 'Māori' within binary relations of power. Within the discursive formation of these nations, the

technology-centered myth of progress, based on Western rationality, ascribes to the Euro-American vision of history a sense of objectivity: a single, true measure of world events that denies the legitimacy of other historical and spatial versions, or even fails to recognize their existence. The basis here is a hierarchically organized system that gives precedence to unity, homogeneity, continuity, and closedness over heterogeneity, discontinuity, chance, and openness. (Kempf 102)

This myth places indigenous cultures in a binary relationship with dominant cultures, sanctioning Eurocentric knowledge systems, containing their cultures within neocolonial representations that ensure their worldviews remain unrecognized as spaces of knowledge.

The move from assimilation to integration represents a shift from colonial to neocolonial governmentality. This, in turn, represents a shift within the utopian-progressive paradigm to accommodate the evolving myths of progress: although indigenous peoples were still expected to assimilate into the nation in their everyday life, indigenous 'cultures' could be contained as historical and then integrated into the progressive place of the nation as part of the discourse of its past. This shift allows Eurocentric outside-in perspectives to continue to control the contact zones afforded indigenous culture in relation to the colony and the nation. Indigenous cultures are simultaneously included as static, monolithic representations of the past and excluded from producing places in the present. The Eurocentric perspective thus ignores the

assimilationist, violent colonial history, shifting the focus from inevitable and necessary progress toward integration through history and exclusion from present-day citizenship.

Neocolonial tourism masks the catachreses of ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Zealand Māori’, glossing inherent fractures through folkloric inclusion. However, the always-ambivalent status of indigenous cultures’ representations of a past performed, and reformed, in the present opens up spaces in which indigenous cultures can negotiate, and produce, places. I argue that, in order for ‘double-time’ to enable the negotiation Bhabha encourages, culture must be situated within a relational-processual paradigm. Eurocentric outside-in perspectives support representations of what Bhabha calls ‘cultural diversity’: the Nation as a discursive formation includes Aboriginal Canadian and Māori peoples as “epistemological object[s] and] . . . object[s] of empirical knowledge” (*Location* 34). As discussed in the Introduction, Bhabha’s alternative to cultural diversity is ‘cultural difference,’ in which cultural agents must be recognized as “knowledgeable, authoritative, adequate to the construction of systems of cultural identification” (*Location* 34). King and Grace demand this recognition as writers, and their stories engage with sites of neocolonial tourism in order to critically negate neocolonialism, while imaginatively affirming the tourist site as a potential location for the recognition of ambivalence and performance of cultural difference.

Cultural difference enables the re/placement of indigenous cultures from inside-out perspectives. King and Grace revision the colonial history represented in tourist sites within spiral time, “refiguring [the past] as a contingent ‘in-between’

space, that innovates and interrupts the performance of the present” (Bhabha *Location* 7). They reject not only neocolonial representations of history, but the ways in which these discourses foreclose spaces within places. Both King and Grace construct systems of cultural identification that reflect relational-processual paradigms and seize on the ambivalent locations of indigenous cultures within neocolonial sites to challenge the monolithic categorization of indigenous cultures and the binary relationships between European knower and indigenous known. Ultimately, they negotiate a hybrid relationship between the pedagogic and the performative that enables the signification of indigenous cultures in processual relation to the places of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand, a performance embodying the potential for catachrestic negotiations of neocolonial discourses of integration.

Reading the History of Travel: Coding Colonial Connections

In *Home and Harem*, Inderpal Grewal outlines how colonialism perpetuates a complex ‘European culture of travel,’ a culture in which “mobility not only came to signify an unequal relation between the tourist/traveler and the ‘native,’ but also a notion of freedom, thus implicitly validating the discourse” of imperialism and continuing colonization (136). Thus, the traditions of travel writing, like the colonial discourses assimilating space and cultures discussed in Chapters Two and Three, defined indigenous cultures. The figurative mapping resulting from colonial travel writing denied mobility to the colonized, and focused on the production of New Worlds available for both settler- invasion and tourism.

If travel is historically envisioned as “transformative and freeing, [...]”

promoting change for the individual and for institutions,” indigenous peoples have been traditionally denied this “double voyage of discovery” (Roberson xii) within and in relation to Eurocentric discourses. Both indigenous place and subjectivity are denied in early travel writing, as discourses of Vidalian geography, natural science, and Orientalism ‘worlded the world’ as empty, and proceeded to ‘fill in the map’ with colonial constructions of place and culture promoting assimilation. Travel developed into a utopian dream: like *Utopia*’s Raphael, dominant travelers could visit unknown places to educate themselves and the indigenous cultures, sharing European knowledge for the good of all nations and figuratively mapping potential colonies into the Empire through discourses reflecting the Orientalist grid.

Tourism romanticizes a return home; it negotiates a complex combination of desire for the experience of the exotic of elsewhere with the need to take something tangible or experiential home that can be appreciated as ‘authentic’ in the home environment.² In this chapter I discuss what I call ‘neocolonial tourism’; specifically, I focus on two tourist sites that contribute to the continuing internal colonization of Aboriginal and Māori peoples within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand through representations of indigenous cultures and places. Despite appearing to engage indigenous subjectivity, these representations continue to be limited by outside-in perspectives targeting indigenous culture. This follows from Spivak’s definition of neocolonialism as “fabricating its allies by proposing a share of the centre in a seemingly new way (not a rupture but a displacement)” (qtd in Huggan *Postcolonial* 7). Aboriginal and Māori peoples, then, integrate themselves into national discursive

² Cohen discusses, and expands on, this definition of the tourist. See also Crick’s “Tourists, Locals, and Anthropologists.” The latter provides a particularly lucid discussion of the interrelationships between historical travel, anthropology, and contemporary tourism.

formations by producing ‘authentic’ places in which the dominant can experience indigenous cultures. This integration reflects, in a new way, the “self-regulating field of the social” that supported colonial governmentality (Scott 203), as the “rights-bearing and self-governing” indigenous peoples working within these sites “do as they ought” (Scott 203): they perform repeatedly in historical colonial discourses which leads, in turn, to further containment within neocolonial governmental systems today.

Indira Karamcheti, drawing on Said, argues that the “received map of reading codes” emerging from colonial discourses remains in use today, directing ‘cultural interpreters’ to utilize three strategies for signification: stasis, binarism, and atextuality.³ Karamcheti’s map encodes what is valued by the neocolonial tourist: static, knowable indigenous cultures. Stasis connotes both timelessness and changelessness, while binarism creates dichotomous relations between cultures based on power, and atextuality “presumes that certain texts lack power to convince of the ‘truth’ of their representation” (127-8). In short, these categories encode indigenous peoples as frozen in space and time, Othered in relation to dominant culture, and reliant on tourists to complete the production of place. Due to “a lack of written (textual) tradition that makes real the world [Othered] writers describe” (Karamcheti 129), indigenous peoples become objects to be experienced by those occupying—and projecting—the European subject position. In the contemporary climate of neocolonial tourism, the occupation of indigenous places, and objectification of

³ Although Karamcheti focuses on colonial and postcolonial ‘woman’, her classification of these ‘legends’ is very useful to my discussion of ‘travel,’ and she herself notes a connection to indigenous peoples: “Just as colonial space encodes distance from metropolitan centres, colonial and postcolonial ‘woman’ conventionally signifies remoteness and lack of movement... Moreover the ‘native’ woman is often physically confined to limited spaces” (128).

indigenous cultures, continues both physically and metaphorically and hinges on the continued power of these Eurocentric, outside-in points of view.

The neocolonial tourist subject position envisions the world through what John Urry theorizes as the ‘tourist gaze.’ Urry draws on Foucault’s conceptualization of the medical gaze to assert that the tourist gaze is “as socially organized and systematized as the gaze of the medic,” because it draws on systems of knowledge and integrates the unknown into the known while searching for differences from established norms.⁴ According to Urry, “[t]here is no single tourist gaze as such,” but a fluctuating series of perspectives reflecting dominant discursive systems. Although there are multiple variations of the tourist gaze, as Urry suggests, neocolonial tourist gazes, like the Eurocentric vision of the seeing-man, envision indigenous cultures from the outside-in. Urry states, “[t]ourism results from a binary relationship between the ordinary/everyday and the extraordinary,” and I argue that the neocolonial tourist sites addressed in this chapter perpetuate a binary relationship between Eurocentric, normalized nationhood and what it envisions as contained within its history: indigenous, Othered cultures.

The tourist gaze envisions what Huggan theorizes as the ‘exotic,’ as the places and cultures integrated as a result of “the domesticating process through which commodities are taken from the margins and reabsorbed into the mainstream culture” (*Postcolonial* 22). Huggan notes,

exoticism describes . . . a particular mode of aesthetic perception— one which renders people, objects and places strange even as it domesticates

⁴ See Urry’s “The Tourist Gaze.”

them, and which effectively manufactures otherness even as it claims to surrender to its immanent mystery. . . . Exoticism, in this context, might be described as a kind of semiotic circuit that oscillates between the opposite poles of strangeness and familiarity. Within this circuit, the strange and the familiar, as well as the relationship between them, may be recoded to serve different, even contradictory, political needs and ends. (*Postcolonial* 13)

The strange can thus be contained by rendering diversity familiar through ensuring tourist access to cultures in tourist sites. Stasis, binarism and atextuality ensure that tourist sites are coded to serve the neocolonial need to integrate ‘familiar’ indigenous cultures into the ‘utopian’ history of the nation, while satisfying, and erasing, the contradictory desire to exclude their ‘strange’ worldviews from the contemporary ‘progressive’ site of the nation.⁵

The colonial “‘business of ‘knowing’ other peoples [that] underpinned imperial dominance and became the mode by which [colonized peoples] were increasingly persuaded to know themselves” (*Postcolonial* Ashcroft *et al.* 1) evolved into a very lucrative business with similar codes of knowledge: neocolonial tourism. This type of tourism incorporates de Certeau’s conception of ‘folklorization of difference,’ in which the ‘remainder’ of indigenous cultures after assimilation is included in the place of the nation as its history (Ahearne 142). Because indigenous peoples did not ‘die out,’ aspects of their cultures that could not be assimilated into Eurocentric systems of knowledge were objectively integrated into those systems as

⁵ This simultaneous inclusion and exclusion of indigenous cultures within multicultural and bicultural discursive formations in Canada and New Zealand respectively will be discussed in Chapter Five.

‘Indian’ and ‘Māori.’ Integration premised on the folklorization of difference, and read using the above codes, supports ‘cultural diversity,’ as it contains indigenous cultures within these monolithic categories, which can be traced back to colonial discourses and which continue to reflect Eurocentric norms.

Neocolonial tourism hinges on a binary relationship between indigenous hosts and tourists that reflects, in some ways, the relationship between settler-invaders and indigenous peoples discussed in Chapter Three. The variety of indigenous discursive formations is denied as indigenous representations provide the ‘contrasting image’ to the everyday lives of members of dominant cultures; tourists visit tourist-oriented places produced to highlight this contrast, and are hosted by indigenous peoples participating in colonial history. This relationship casts indigenous cultures as tied to a historical place, enabling the freedom of dominant travelers.

A historical connection between freedom and travel is very much part of contemporary national discursive formations. In an article for “Traveling Today,” Gwen Morrison discusses the National Tour Association’s theme, “Travel... the perfect freedom,” (epigraph) which hinges on the message “Go, see, do, experience!” The president of the association, Hank Phillips, states that “[t]he point of this theme is to help the public more fully understand the direct link between freedom in general and specifically our freedom to travel.” These freedoms, like the notion of freedom identified by Grewal as central to imperial discourses of travel, reflect an unequal relationship between tourist and indigene that privileges the tourist gaze. Just as colonial discourses created places full of possibility (Said), neocolonial discourses continue to create places enabling dominant Eurocentric engagement.

As will be discussed later in this chapter, King and Grace both critically negate the tourist gaze and its reading codes of stasis, binarism, and atextuality. In their novels, they prove that these encoding strategies not only produce sites of signification, but also, as Karamcheti points out, of contestation. They identify and resist dominant cultures' constructions of the 'postcolonial exotic' and the denial of indigenous physical and temporal mobility. These authors not only subvert traditions of tourism by assigning indigenous and white characters varying degrees of spatial mobility; they also address the complexities of physical and metaphorical 'traveling' in relation to indigenous places. Key characters in these novels negotiate spaces in places and produce the sites of the Sun Dance and the marae as cultural locations. Rather than producing sites of cultural containment, many of their characters access both the freedom Tuan associates with movement and the security he connects with 'pausing' to produce places that are based in the relational- processual paradigm.

Reading the Neocolonial Tourist Map: Two Exemplars

Stasis, binarism, and atextuality are three reading codes that are central to the proper placement of indigeneity through 'integration,' the cultural containment strategy evolving from assimilation within the utopian-progressive paradigm. These reading codes support integration within the utopian-progressive paradigm in that they rely on keeping the colonial agenda of assimilation, and its evolution into integration, under erasure. I turn now to a close reading of two neocolonial tourist sites integrating indigenous cultures through their representations of the histories of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand: Old Fort William, just outside of Thunder Bay,

Ontario, Canada and the Tamaki Brothers' Māori Village near Rotorua, Aotearoa New Zealand.⁶ My spiral reading of these two exemplars exposes how Karamcheti's reading codes promote Aboriginal peoples' inclusion within the Nation on the terms of the dominating cultures, sanctioning tourists' 'mastery of places through sight.' Instead of being assimilated 'progressively' into the colony through Imperial vision, indigenous cultures are integrated by dominant cultures, as tourists incorporate indigenous stories into the national story through traveling back in time to see utopian representations of pre-contact cultures through the tourist gaze.

The first of the sites I discuss, Thunder Bay's Old Fort William, is promoted as an "authentic 1815 fur-trading post" where culture is performed for, and sold to, tourists.⁷ Here, Aboriginal place, the wigwam, is represented spatially in a binary relationship with settler-invader culture: its place is outside the palisade fence surrounding the fort itself. When I visited the actual site, no Aboriginal characters entered the fort, and one 'Indian' interpreter asserted that Aboriginal life remained static after the arrival of the Europeans: "we live the same way today as we did many moons ago." Binarism is tied to atextuality at Old Fort William, as it is "when you step through the palisade gates, [that] you really are in another world: 180 years ago." The unassimilated Aboriginal culture remains a part of the representation of Old Fort William, yet it is represented as *outside* the sanctioned space of the fort.

At this tourist attraction, the web site states, tourists can see "Native creations, such as the birch bark canoe and snowshoes, [that] enabled Europeans to reap

⁶ Although I have been to both places as a tourist, I concentrate on the discursive formations of these locations as they are represented on their websites, as this is in keeping with my project's focus on cultural representations as they are mediated through discourse.

⁷ I cite all references to Old Fort William from its official website. "Welcome to Old Fort William." This reflects a concern with not only the site, but the discourses with which it represents itself.

tremendous success from the fur trade.” Aboriginal peoples are depicted as supporting European colonizers, and they continue to enable neocolonial tourists to access the history of Canada in the present, as they perform ‘Indian-ness’ for tourists. This sanctioned history focuses on European needs, highlighting the neocolonial integration. While Aboriginal culture is depicted as separate from European cultures, its primary use-value is defined in its relationship to supporting colonial life. The indigenous presence at Old Fort William is caught in the ambivalent space between indigenous and colonial cultures, despite the website’s rhetoric’s efforts to include indigenous cultures within this story.

Much is forgotten at Old Fort William through its imagination of an ‘exotic’ historical community and its production of colonial place. The Aboriginal people are welcoming hosts, and they invite visitors to “relax in a wigwam” to “escape from the rat race” of contemporary times. Despite the fort’s historical representation of colonial times, its representation of Aboriginal culture focuses on pre-contact culture and the contribution this culture made to colonial life. Going back in time to visit indigenous cultures is a tourist-oriented practice that foregrounds utopian space as an *escape* from the ‘real world’ of the everyday. The continued integration of Aboriginal cultural diversity maintains the utopianism colonial discourses: it facilitates necessary ‘forgetting’ and erases the violence of colonization, while ensuring the presence of an indigenous connection to a static colonial history separate from, yet accessible within, the contemporary moment.

The Tamaki Maori Village offers a similar tourist experience, “begin[ning] with a journey back in time. Your driver/guide will lead you back to pre-European

times with stories, history and protocols.”⁸ The site itself represents Māori culture as static, and tourists are encouraged to envision Māori as “the people of days gone by.” The site sets up a binary relationship between the tourist’s world and Māori ‘traditional’ culture, located in the past. These historical Māori are bound by atextuality; although they perform culture for tourists, a present-day “host” is required to interpret culture and, ultimately, “ensure [tourists’] safe return home.”

Visitors experiencing this site are encouraged to envision Māori people as the “flax-skirted Maori jumping in and out of steam pools” (see epigraph). Briar O’Connor argues sites like Tamaki Maori village fulfil a necessary function in that they enable the tourist gaze. Like images on souvenirs, these representations serve a dual purpose. “Because the stereotyped images have been presented to tourists in travel brochures and advertisements before arrival in New Zealand, they are what visitors expect to see once [t]here. Tourists seek out these (often misappropriated) images in souvenirs, as they believe that these accurately represent Māori” (O’Connor 167). Cultural sites like Tamaki Maori village fulfil tourist expectations; they represent culture on the terms of those looking at the culture from the outside-in.

Old Fort William and Tamaki Maori Village, and their websites, integrate Aboriginal and Māori culture into the discursive formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. As both demonstrate, Canadian and New Zealand tourist industries continue to include the Indian and Māori monoliths through Certalian ‘folklorization

⁸ Unless otherwise stated, references to Tamaki Maori Village are taken from its website with New Zealand Tourism Online, “Tamaki Maori Village.” I have chosen not to include the macrons in the name of this place, as this reflects the site’s self-identification.

of difference’⁹. Both sites reflect the configuration of double-time that is central to the utopian-progressive paradigm: indigenous performances of cultures highlight the ‘pedagogic,’ as indigenous characters at these tourist sites represent “‘subjects’ of a process of signification that must erase any prior or originary presence” (Bhabha *Location* 145). Indigenous cultures are read, through the neocolonial tourist gaze, as static, exotic, and diverse objects awaiting the presence of tourists for the completion of their stories.

Atextuality dictates that indigenous knowledge cannot be fully sanctioned until it is integrated into the discursive formation of the traveler. The websites for both Old Fort William and Tamaki Maori Village highlight their successes in integrating representations of Aboriginal and Māori histories into Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively. Old Fort William was “among 15 national competitors to receive the award of excellence from *Attractions Canada*” in 2005 and it has won similar awards from Attractions Ontario for several consecutive years. Tamaki Maori Village’s website proclaims that it is the “Winner of New Zealand’s Supreme Tourism Award and four times winner of the national heritage and cultural tourism awards.” The Old Fort’s purpose relates to the “Tamaki brothers’ vision [...] to sell New Zealand as a story.”¹⁰ In order for this story to ‘sell,’ and be integrated into the discursive formation of these nations, Aboriginal and Māori cultures must,

⁹ De Certeau asserts that inclusions of indigeneity as part of the history of the State can be discussed in terms of ‘folklorization of difference.’ This process, like integration, did “not contest but rather complemented a policy of national unity” (Ahearne 142).

¹⁰ Mike Tamaki, owner-operator of Tamaki Maori Village, shares this vision with the unnamed writer of “Research builds business case for tourism investment.” He states, “Like a novel, each region [of New Zealand] is a chapter and you can’t make sense of it without following the chapters from start to finish. That’s the way we’re selling New Zealand.” Tamaki is referring to the business plan for his company, which involves the set up of three different tourist sites: the pre-European one in Rotorua, a blend of colonial and Maori culture in Christchurch, and a site focusing on the ‘southern man’ in Glenorchy (*re:think*).

and are made to, fit into their places within the utopian-progressive paradigm. They perform the pedagogical within utopian places outside the progressive centre of the contemporary nation.

The telling of these stories is complex; for example, both indigenous and non-indigenous interpreters participate in the production of both places, performing culture to ensure it satisfies the tourist gaze. Old Fort William is operated by the Ontario government, while Maori Village is owned and operated by the Tamaki brothers, who received much government funding to set up the village in Rotorua. In this section, I demonstrate how stasis, binarism, and atextuality encode two neocolonial tourist representations central to the nations I discuss. After discussing the definitions of the 'tourist,' I will turn to the ways in which King and Grace critically negate the reading codes and roles central to neocolonial tourism in order to imaginatively affirm indigenous places and cultures beyond systematic integration.

(Re)visioning a System: Neocolonial Sites and the Processes of Proper Placement

Although tourism sanctions a binary relationship between tourist and host, the system of neocolonial tourism enables many different types of tourist experiences. In an effort to reflect this complexity, Erik Cohen outlines a "Phenomenology of Tourist experiences" consisting of five modes that "span the spectrum between the experience of the tourist as the traveler in pursuit of 'mere' pleasure in the strange and novel, to

that of the modern pilgrim in quest of meaning at somebody else's centre" (34).¹¹ According to Cohen, the "recreational mode" occurs when "the tourist gets what he wants—the pleasure of entertainment, for which authenticity is largely irrelevant" (Cohen 36). Other modes include the 'diversionary mode,' in which travelers "escape from the boredom and meaninglessness of routine [...] into the forgetfulness of a vacation," and the 'experiential mode,' through which tourists seek meaning from the aesthetic 'experience' of "the authenticity of the life of others" (38). In the 'experimental' mode, a tourist engages "in that authentic life but refuses fully to commit himself to it." This person is "in search of himself", insofar as in a trial and error process, he seeks to discover that form of life which elicits a resonance in himself" (41). Finally, the 'existential mode' involves a "traveler who is fully committed to an 'elective' spiritual centre, i.e. one external to the mainstream of his Aboriginal society and culture. The acceptance of such a centre comes phenomenologically closest to a religious conversion, to 'switching worlds'" (42).

Existential tourists can never have full access to worlds other than their own, as even these tourists must return home. They cannot subvert the binary and move to the elective centre,

but will live in two worlds: the world of their everyday life, where they follow their practical pursuits, but which for them is devoid of deeper meaning; and the world of their 'elective' centre, to which they will depart on periodical pilgrimages to derive spiritual sustenance (Cohen 42).

¹¹ According to Urry, the works of both Cohen and MacCannell, discussed below, are central to recent advancements in theorizing the complexity of the role of the tourist. See Urry's *The Tourist Gaze*.

Cohen's phenomenology thus can be said to reflect a continuum of tourists' desires that maintain the binary relationship between tourists and hosts by opposing tourists' experiences of host cultures to their everyday lives 'at home.' This binary perpetuates cultural diversity coded by indigenous atextuality, as the experience of 'culture' becomes a traveler-centred experience of the Other, and denies indigenous cultures' ability to produce contemporary, 'everyday' places of the Nation. Although the tourist gaze incorporates multiple perspectives spanning a range of tourist types, the binary relationship between the tourist subject and the objectified host remains intact.

The binary division remains because it relies on a singular archive which normalizes integrationist discourses that represent indigenous cultures as located in, and locating, a utopian, contained place fixed in historical time. These processes enact the three aspects of commodity fetishism outlined by Huggan, including "mystification (or leveling-out) of historical experiences; imagined access to the cultural other through the process of consumption; reification of people and places into exchangeable aesthetic objects" (*Postcolonial* 19).¹² In other words, monolithic representations of indigenous cultures encourage tourists to integrate these cultures into their known worlds as accessible, consumable objects; tourists integrate the past into the present by commodifying cultures and making the history of indigenous cultures part of the singular 'truth' system of the nation. Regardless of where tourists fit into Cohen's phenomenology, their gazes envision indigenous culture from the outside-in. Sites like Old Fort William and Tamaki Maori Village integrate utopian,

¹² Huggan discusses 'commodity fetishism' and its "classic Marxian formulation [which] describes the veiling of the material circumstances under which commodities are produced and consumed." He also ties this to Jameson's work on commodification as a process central to postmodernism (*Postcolonial* 18).

consumable culture into the dominant place of the nation on terms that exotify indigenous cultures.

Persisting with connections to the land, King unsettles the binary relationship between dominant travelers and indigenous hosts, as well as monolithic representations of indigenous peoples as ‘stuck in the past’. In *Green Grass, Running Water*, for example, he illustrates that the binary relationship does not always divide along racial lines. Aboriginal Canadian Charlie returns to his original Aboriginal community in Alberta as a tourist of sorts. He stays in a hotel and, in his room, he has a ‘diversionary’ engagement with the magazine *Alberta Now* that reflects his desire to conquer boredom through “skim[ming]” through articles “catching a phrase here, a graph there, glancing at the photographs, considering the illustrations” (373). He does not actively engage with either the contemporary places represented in this magazine or the movie playing in his hotel room that perpetuates stereotypical representations of Aboriginal peoples, *The Mystic Warrior*. Although he is the implied subject of the magazine article—a “demographic study of the number of lawyers in western Canada” (373)—and one of the implied objects of the movie, an ‘Indian,’ he refuses to engage with either representation. Instead he is intrigued by another place unconnected to his personal situation: a “stunning three-bedroom condo located in West Edmonton Mall” (390). He has no interest in seeing the ‘real’ condominium, but this location facilitates escape from his own world and allows him to be a ‘recreational tourist’ through the magazine: he envisions the mall-based condo as an entertaining place.

Although he is an Aboriginal traveller, Charlie’s point of view is that of the

diversionary tourist, and through this character King unsettles not only the binary relationship between dominant traveller and indigenous host, but also the concept that all indigenous peoples must feel an essential(ized) connection to their lands and traditional ways of life. Charlie defies the two roles that dominant discourse offers him. He is entertained by and metaphorically escapes from his hotel room in Blossom, Alberta to the condo in West Edmonton Mall, eventually integrating it into his own version of ‘progress’ by imagining how this place would fit into his own progressive lifestyle. He muses,

Perhaps you got free tickets for all the rides or a season pass for the wave pool. As he remembered, there was a car dealership in the mall and that would probably be handy if you lived there. And the restaurants and the bars and the movie theatres and the hundreds of stores. A three-bedroom condo in the West Edmonton Mall. Intriguing. (390)

Charlie ignores the movie and the other articles in the magazine, selecting instead objects from the site of the mall to integrate into his own imagined experience of that place. Charlie’s actions are in line with Cohen’s contention that, for the tourist, recreational travel is not usually conceived as “serious business in itself.” However, it “performs a serious ‘function’—it resituates the individual in his [*sic*] society and its values, which, despite the pressures they generate, constitute the centre of his world” (36). Charlie does not choose to value two of the subject positions available within the utopian-progressive paradigm while in his hotel room: performing the pedagogic, as an ‘Indian warrior’ in the movie, or fulfilling the assimilationist agenda, as a western Canadian lawyer. Instead, he chooses a recreational and diversionary

experience that draws on and supports his own capitalist system of values.

Unlike Charlie, Eli's white partner Karen would not be satisfied with a moment of distraction, as she yearns for a deeper engagement, a cultural experience. She likes "the idea that Eli [is] Indian" (163) and she renames him possessively as her own "Mystic Warrior" (164). In *Green Grass, Running Water*, she travels to the Sun Dance as an 'experiential tourist,' and she is very excited that the site looks "like it's right out of a movie" and that the experience is "like going back in time" (203). She sees the Sun Dance as a 'static' site, and she integrates her experiences into her own system of knowledge, a process that supports commodity fetishism and the consumption of culture. King alludes to this process of consumption metaphorically: on the way to the Sun Dance, Karen mistakes a vulture for an eagle. She identifies with the eagle, which signifies her superficial desire to experience 'authentic' indigeneity, but the vulture signifies her suppressed desire to consume 'dead' cultures, Aboriginal traditions which fulfill her need for a containable, authentic experience.

Upon her return to Toronto, Karen integrates her experience into her world at home, making it a central part of her own story: "for months afterward, she found ways of working the Sun Dance into the conversation" (263). At this point, it is something to share with friends and family, and her father summarizes her stories as "one hell of a vacation" (263). When Karen goes into remission after battling cancer, however, she tells Eli that they must look for deeper meaning and "do something with the rest of [their] lives" (342). When Eli questions her about what she would like to do first, it is return to the Sun Dance. Although her subsequent death in a car accident

prevents her from traveling in this ‘experimental,’ or perhaps even ‘existential,’ mode, her desire to seek a new centre in Eli’s culture signifies a shift in her subject position as a tourist. However, this shift does not change her ideas of what the Sun Dance should be; she wants to return to it, not to see it evolve or to have a different experience, but to change her experience in relation to the same place. The place—and the indigenous cultures Karen locates there—provides a utopian backdrop for her own progress as an individual.

Karen’s focus on integration produces this utopian place, and she relies on the colonial reading codes to support her outside-in perspective. She wants to return to the same Sun Dance, where she hopes to integrate herself as a tourist so that she can tell the story of the experience to others. Her story foregrounds this inside-out perspective, and her participation as a neocolonial tourist. As will be discussed further at the close of this chapter, other characters experience the Sun Dance within the relational-processual paradigm, providing evidence that the point of view from which one engages a site has a profound impact on the places experienced.

Neocolonial discursive sites focused on containing indigenous cultures in the past erase the processes by which such fixity is produced. According to de Certeau, there are two levels of production: “the production of the image and the secondary production hidden in the process of its utilization” (*Practice* xiii). In neocolonial tourist sites, the ‘terms’ of integration foreground the primary level of pedagogic production for the tourist, and hide the secondary level of performance. The result maintains the Eurocentric nature of outside-in perspectives. Tourists experience a static, utopian place that resists progressive assimilation, while the secondary level

hides the integrationist agenda of these sites. The ‘strange’ is domesticated as cultural diversity is contained. However, the neocolonial touristic site is, I argue, a container that cannot hold. Although it attempts to foreclose spaces in places, the integrationist discourse only masks the ambivalence inherent within neocolonial productions of place. This ambivalence is located in the space between the utopian and progressive, between the production of static indigenous cultures and the secondary production excluding their worldviews from the narrative of linear progress and enshrining singular archives within neocolonial discursive formations.

Although it could be argued that, like other “modern communities” Dean MacCannell discusses, the “touristic value” of an indigenous community “lies in the way it organizes social, historical, cultural and natural elements into a stream of impressions,” (“Sightseeing” 21), this organization for both Canadian Aboriginal and Māori cultures within neocolonial tourist attractions specifically focuses tourists’ gazes on de Certeau’s primary level of production. As a result, the worlds that indigenous cultures are meant to feel ‘fully part of’ are placed in historical times; Aboriginal culture cannot be placed within contemporary Canada, nor Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. A catachrestic space opens up between ‘indigenous culture’ and ‘the place of the nation,’ fracturing the discursive formation that relies on stories of integration. This fracture locates ambivalence within the utopian-progressive paradigm. How, then, can a recognition of the shift from assimilation to integration within the colonial-neocolonial discursive formation become part of the spiral reading strategies legitimating a reading of tourist sites within the North American and Aotearoa New Zealand contexts?

Infiltrating the Touristic System: Custer's Last Stand and the Battle of Little

Bighorn

The utopian-progressive paradigm masks ambivalence within neocolonial discourses of governmentality that can be linked to what MacCannell theorizes as the 'touristic system,' a system based on "an empirical relationship between a tourist, a sight, and a marker (a piece of information about a sight)" ("Sightseeing" 15). In this structure, tourists access discursive 'markers'—guidebooks, travelogues, souvenirs—to support their outside-in perspectives. The site's recognition as an attraction is dependent on its ability to be read using the reading codes of stasis, binarism, and atextuality. Both King and Grace critically negate these reading codes and the binary roles of dominant tourist and indigenous host. In this section, I turn to a close reading of King's *Medicine River*, focusing on his engagement with the site of the Battle of Little Bighorn or 'Custer's Last Stand.' Employing spiral reading strategies, I read King's text in counterpoint with contemporary representations of the site to expose the integrationist agenda of dominant discourses and King's dismantling of that agenda.

In *Medicine River*, King addresses neocolonial control of touristic systems in conjunction with Little Big Horn, the site of the Custer National Monument. On the way home from an invitational basketball tournament hosted by the Native Students' Association at the University of Utah, Harlen suggests that he and Will stop to see

this monument in Montana.¹³ This site is marked by the story of ‘Custer’s Last Stand,’ the battle in which members of the Lakota, Cheyenne, and Arapaho tribes banded together under the leadership of Crazy Horse to defeat Custer’s Seventh Cavalry of the United States army. In 1879 the battlefield was established as a national cemetery and three years later the monument itself was erected, commemorating Custer and key Euro-American leaders that were killed in the battle.¹⁴

Will’s cynical question, “do you think they let Indians in?” (107), alludes to the exclusion of contemporary Aboriginal peoples at the site, both in regards to their potential connections to cultural markers and as tourists. Harlen’s response, “Why would they keep us out?” (107), merits consideration.¹⁵ Neocolonial tourist sites, then, ‘keep out’ indigenous people who are not performing the pedagogic, as they do not fit in with the sites’ representations of them. Even before seeing this site for the first time, Aboriginal photographer Will anticipates that he will not fit in at Little Bighorn; he feels he will have little connection with the anticipated “bunch of plaques and some farmer’s field with a fancy fence around it” (107). Harlen is more optimistic, insisting that it is “History, Will. It’s part of our history.” Harlen refuses to be integrated into the touristic system on the neocolonial terms, however; he wants

¹³ Defined by the National Park Service as the site of “one of America’s most significant and famous battles, the Battle of the Little Bighorn,” it was here on June 25 and 26, 1876 that “two divergent cultures clashed in a life or death struggle” (“Indian Memorial”).

¹⁴ As the National Parks Service now recognizes, “these early interpretations were largely monocultural, honouring only the U.S. Army’s perspective, with headstones marking where each [soldier] fell” (“Indian Memorial”) At the time of the publication of *Medicine River* (1989), there was no memorial in honour of Native Americans, despite the fact that they had won the battle.

¹⁵This statement is one of many negative ones made by Will throughout this novel. For a critical discussion of such statements in relation to identity politics, see Francis Zichy’s “‘There isn’t a Mr. Heavyman’: Will’s Negatives in *Medicine River*.”

to be a tourist at a site in which indigenous peoples are historicized and he refuses to 'buy in' to its markers: "I don't want a postcard, Will. Hell, we're going to see the real thing" (109).

As Harlen and Will approach the 'real' site of Custer National Monument they begin to negotiate it from their complex points of view. They enact the tourist gaze by integrating the unknown into their known systems of thought. Will jokes, "I'll bet Custer wasn't even close at half time," with Harlen responding "Crazy Horse slam-dunked that bastard." This comparison to their own recent experiences at the basketball tournament continues: "Time out . . . That's what Custer was yelling when all those Indians came riding out of the hills," Will adds (111). King uses humour to highlight the role that perspectives play in forming representations, and thereby also unsettles the normalization of the connections between the tourist gaze and Eurocentric vision. Will and Harlen's self-aware engagements with historical representations of indigenous peoples in the present also draw attention to de Certeau's two levels of place production: the places produced and the processes of cultural placement inherent in production itself. Their alternative points of view – both outside and inside these discourses – and the systems of knowledge into which they begin to integrate this site, challenge the Eurocentric focus on Custer's Last Stand valorized at Little Bighorn.

Whether there is a 'real thing' that either Will or Harlen can buy into remains dubious here. History, it is said colloquially, is a story told by the winners. The memorialization of 'Custer's Last Stand' as a tourist attraction participates in a Eurocentric history that ultimately includes, and continues to include, Aboriginal

people on the terms of the dominant. As will be discussed further in Chapter Five, this discourse fails to ‘recognize’ indigenous culture and, as a result, fails to recognize the place of these two characters within the story of the Nation. This particular story reflects Eurocentricity, as it focuses on Custer’s valiant loss, as opposed to Aboriginal victory. The official National Park Services web site acknowledges this is problematic, noting “the essential irony of the Battle of the Little Bighorn . . . : that the victors lost their nomadic way of life after their victory” (“Indian Memorial”). What I read as the ‘trophy’ at the site of the Little Bighorn Battlefield— Custer’s monument—honours the eventual colonial winners, not the winners of this single, albeit important, battle.

A spiral reading of discourses concerning the tourist site of the battle of Little Bighorn exposes that the Eurocentric focus is more than simply ironic; it serves to include this historical battle in the utopian-progressive paradigm that enables the integration of indigenous stories into colonial history produced in the present. In terms of their location as contemporary citizens, it is telling that Will and Harlen cannot access the site. Their subject positions are coded either as historical *and* colonized subjects, or as ‘not-quite’ citizens in the contemporary moment. Harlen embodies his willingness to buy into neocolonial conceptualizations of indigenous subjectivity through his desire for recognition – and participation – in a discursive system that disempowers him.

Prior to *Medicine River*’s publication in 1989, the site itself included the monument, inscribed with the names of Custer and important members of the American army, and headstones scattered throughout the battlefield where members

of the American army, including a few Indian scouts, fell. These colonial markers have been supported by other systemic ‘markers’ throughout the twentieth century: according to Wilkinson, “the lion’s share of public education at the battlefield focused on the movements of the cavalry, treating Indians as nearly invisible. Indeed, with no significant markers to call their own, many Indians have felt oddly out of place.”

Reading King’s text in counterpoint with dominant discourses reveals the integrationist agenda coded by atextuality: the dominant, Euro-American cavalry is present and textualized, whereas Aboriginal people are defined by their absence. Harlen and Will leave the site not only ‘feeling out of place,’ but denied the opportunity to see the site from their points of view and participate in the re/production of that site.

The continued exclusion of Aboriginal people from the site is mirrored in Will’s and Harlen’s experience as tourists in *Medicine River*. Despite Harlen’s insistence that the battle is part of their history, and despite the online statistic that nearly 400,000 people visit the park each year (Reece),¹⁶ Harlen and Will are unable to access the site. The anticipated ‘fancy fence’ denies them access; after a brief detour, they arrive “just in time to see some fellow in a Bronco closing the gate” (111). The white male gatekeeper is symbolic of the European ‘seeing-man’: he controls the site. His response to Harlen’s revelation that they are ‘Indian’ is to say “he was sorry” (112). This empty apology angers Will, prompting him to get out of the car, where he “imagined [he] could see that kid hiding in the dark, hunkered down behind the fender of the Bronco, his hands shaking around his rifle, waiting for

¹⁶ According to the Friends of Little Bighorn, nearly 400,000 people visit the site each year. See Reece’s “Visitors of Another Kind.” This naming of the site as a ‘park’ sanctions recreational and diversionary tourism, as a park connotes recreation rather than re/creation.

[them] to come screaming and whooping and crashing through the gate” (112). This textual moment highlights the connection between Will’s experiences and those of the Aboriginal people fighting in the Battle of the Little Bighorn, as members of Custer’s cavalry did indeed use their horses, as “breastworks,” to defend themselves. (“Custer’s”).

Despite what Harlen identifies as a shared history with the winners of the Battle of Little Bighorn, Harlen and Will cannot access the site. The fact that they cannot participate in the ‘real thing’ because history is redefined in the present to exclude contemporary reflections of indigenous cultures is mirrored in their experience: in the narrative present they are too late and the site is closed. They, here, fulfill the colonial expectations concerning assimilation outlined in Chapter Three: they are behind and excluded. Perhaps, if *Medicine River* were written today, Harlen and Will would be better able to enter, as the site now attempts to recognize Aboriginal absence with the inclusion of an Indian Memorial.¹⁷ On the occasion of the unveiling, Enos Poor Bear Jr., a Lakota Sioux, tied the importance of the marker specifically to both discursive power and continuing indigenous ‘battles’ in the present: “We can begin to rewrite history with this memorial if we [western tribes] can get our act together and form a unified effort. It’s an opportunity to honour the way of life that we struggled to maintain” (Wilkinson). The memorial recognizes Aboriginal peoples killed in ‘Custer’s Last Stand,’ placing their deaths in a specific historical moment and subsequently tying their fight for indigenous rights to a

¹⁷ This memorial was unveiled on the 127th anniversary of the battle in June 2003. The 2.3 million USD memorial is located on the same hill as Custer’s monument. According to Wilkinson, “the main architectural element is a circular stone wall, part of which is topped by Indian figures on horseback, sculpted out of steel rod. The spherical design is inspired by ancient ‘medicine wheel’ worship sites.”

continued fight for a place through the theme of the monument: “Peace through Unity” (“Indian Memorial”). Indeed, Aboriginal visitors are also encouraged to recite history: “Two ‘weeping walls’ have been reserved for tribes to inscribe names or words to honour the 100 Native Americans who fell in the epic struggle” (“Indian Memorial”). This site integrates the indigenous historical presence within the sanctioned place of the tourist site as a whole.

The evolution of this site is evidence of how touristic systems accommodate changing neocolonial systems that contain history. As Said notes, the

object of [Orientalist] knowledge is inherently vulnerable to scrutiny: the object is a ‘fact’ which develops, changes, or otherwise transforms itself in the way that civilizations frequently do, nevertheless, it is fundamentally, even ontologically, stable. To have such knowledge of such things is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for ‘us’ to deny ‘it’... since we know it and it exists, in a sense, as we know it. (*Orientalism* 32)

Indigenous cultures are the target-objects of the system of colonial governmentality Scott discusses. Neocolonial systems do not radically alter the positions allotted to indigenous cultures as target-objects, but the fields of operation shift to favour integration rather than assimilation. Elements like the weeping wall in this site purport to represent indigenous subjectivity. The shift—from assimilation to integration—still requires indigenous participation within a field of operations premised on touristic systems that reflect a utopian-progressive paradigm.

What remains constant, in this case, is an emphasis on culture premised on

‘diversity’ and the continued objectification of culture as knowable. This site’s name change from ‘Custer Battlefield’ to ‘Little Bighorn Battlefield’ (1991) and the inclusion of red headstones amongst the white ones and the weeping walls, are all additions to this site reflecting an increased need to integrate representations of indigenous cultures in the histories of colonized nations. At this site, however, these changes do little to displace ‘Custer’s Last Stand’ as its central discourse because they are integrated into Custer’s story. The objectification of indigenous culture is sanctioned by the continued Eurocentric points of view encouraged by the site itself, and indigenous cultures are required to fit into this vision. The words of Northern Cheyenne leader Two Moons are used to facilitate the idea of “Peace and Unity” through integration: “Forty years ago I fought Custer till all were dead. I was then the enemy of the Whitemen. Now I am the friend and brother, living in peace together under the flag of our country” (“Indian Memorial”). ‘Peace’ involves forgetting colonial history and choosing to integrate into the contemporary, positive, place of the nation.

Integration of neocolonial sites involves not only erasing the violence of colonial history, but masking the processes that mirror the colonial ‘progressive’ assimilation of place and culture discussed in Chapters Two and Three. The Little Bighorn Battlefield is emptied of its original identity—as indigenous lands—and sacralized as the site of ‘Custer’s Last Stand,’ a Euro-American monocultural representation of wartime History. This assimilation of place gives way to its integration within the discursive formation of the nation, as a ‘multicultural’ representation of American peace and unity. This integration is assured because

Little Bighorn Battlefield fulfills the three aspects of commodity fetishism identified by Huggan. It represents monolithic Indian culture through 'red' grave markers, while focusing on the binary relationship between these and their white counterparts. It is the white markers that tell the important story. Throughout the progression from assimilated to integrated place, the centre is controlled by Eurocentric constructions of knowledge while indigenous worldviews remain unrecognized, their stories largely untold.

MacCannell traces a similar path toward the production of neocolonial touristic places. This process begins "when the sight is marked off from similar objects worthy of preservation" ("Sightseeing" 17). As the choice to privilege Custer's 'last stand' over the victory of the Aboriginal tribes demonstrates, this 'marking off' excludes Aboriginal people and sacralizes the dominant stories of the past in order to support the contemporary discursive formation of the Nation. The second phase, 'framing and elevation,' involves erecting an "official boundary around the object" (18). It is a boundary that keeps Aboriginal people, and their fictional counterparts, Will and Harlen, out. The third phase, "enshrinement," puts the elements of the available site into a larger frame of reference, in this case a recreational 'park' defined by the absence of Aboriginal people. The fourth phase is the mechanical reproduction of the sight through further markers. This is followed by the fifth phase: social reproduction, in which "groups, cities, and regions begin to name themselves after famous attractions" (18). In this way, neocolonial tourism participates in constituting the discursive formation of the Nation.

MacCannell links 'authenticity' of tourist sites specifically to their ability to

facilitate pedagogy, textualizing a story that educates the nation about its historical past. What validates a site is not the strength of the marker, however, but the possibility of ‘fixing’ it with replication—a sight “becomes ‘authentic’ only after the first copy of it is produced” (MacCannell “Sightseeing” 20-1). Within recited societies, the Battle of Little Bighorn is authenticated again and again: it is staged as a local play each summer and the battle was re-enacted onsite on its 125th anniversary and captured as “Custer’s Last Stand” as part of *The Western Sets* film collection. Reading King’s text in counterpoint with these additional texts highlights that Aboriginal cultures are limited to a pedagogical role precluding them from producing discourses premised on indigenous worldviews. Although there is no mention of Aboriginal American actors in the promotion of this film, it is noted that “Steve Alexander, America’s foremost Custer living history actor,” who has played General Custer in over a dozen films, is its star.¹⁸ Because a large majority of representations privilege Custer’s Last Stand, rather than that of the Aboriginal people, the Little Bighorn Battlefield is only authentic when it produces a colonial representation ‘starring’ a white man and producing a related neocolonial tourist experience.

Will and Harlen’s inability to participate in the Little Bighorn Battlefield not only symbolizes Aboriginal exclusion from this site; this episode critically negates neocolonial tourism and its continued validation of the utopian-progressive paradigm. When Harlen states that this site is ‘part of our history,’ he recognizes the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial. Although Harlen and Will are denied entry into the battlefield, they arguably experience part of the ‘real thing’ Harlen

¹⁸ See ‘the Western sets’ at “Custer’s Last Stand.”

seeks in that production of place. They are denied access to the primary level of production de Certeau identifies, but readers are able to see clearly the ‘secondary production hidden in the process of its utilization’: the ongoing re/production of a place that can be integrated into the discursive formation of the American nation.¹⁹

Performing the Pedagogical Process: Ambivalent Relations between Traveler and Host

Kenneth Parker discusses the ‘traveler’ as the opposite of the ‘host’ in a binary construction inherent in various forms of travel. He engages specifically with the binary relationship between the “traveler who goes somewhere else . . . [and] an (invariably unwilling) host to others from elsewhere” (16). I argue that these elements of the touristic system—along with the markers produced within that system—produce static representations of indigenous cultures in order to contain them within ‘utopian’ sites supporting the neocolonial progressive discursive system. In this way, neocolonial tourism attempts to control the formulation of ‘double-time’ to integrate indigenous cultures into the nation when they perform their roles as objectified hosts. The processes of integration inherent in this performance—the second level of de Certeau’s production of place— attempt to foreclose the

¹⁹ The Little Bighorn Battlefield is located in the United States of America, rather than Canada. Both Harlen and Will live in Canada and travel to the United States for the basketball tournament. I do not mean to conflate Canada and America as national sites, as they both possess complex colonial and neocolonial histories that share similarities and have profound differences. A comparison of Canada and America is beyond the scope of this thesis, but future work on King’s representation of America would be productive, especially given first, that many Aboriginal people refuse to recognize the political boundary between Canada and the United States and second, King’s own position as a dual citizen of both countries.

ambivalence within a system requiring indigenous cultures to perform Eurocentric reconstructions of the past in the present. In this system, the power relations between the traveler and the host can be relocated in ambivalent spaces between the utopian and progressive, spaces in which indigenous characters willingly perform the pedagogic. I now turn to the ways in which indigenous characters within the novels of King and Grace seize this ambivalence to reformulate ‘double-time’ and enable indigenous subjectivity.

King and Grace critically negate the binary relationship between tourist and host identified by Parker by engaging with Aboriginal and Māori characters ‘willing’ to act as hosts. Although it recognizes that some groups “fall somewhere between resistance and acquiescence to tourism,” (25), MacCannell’s touristic system also denies the complexity of the relationship between “proud” people who resist the role of host and “practical” hosts who facilitate tourist sites. (25) Practical hosts negate their pride by acquiescing fully to travelers’ desires; members of indigenous cultures are

presented as a valued object through a so-called ‘leisure’ activity that is thought to be ‘fun,’ society is renewed in the heart of the individual through warm, open, unquestioned relations, characterized by a near absence of alienation when compared with other contemporary relationships. (“Sightseeing” 27)

Just as each category in Cohen’s phenomenology of tourist experiences enacts the Eurocentric tourist gaze, MacCannell’s binary relationship between tourist and host denies indigenous subjectivity in that the ‘near absence of alienation’ results from

indigenous cultures' willingness to fulfill tourists' desires. The 'warm, open, unquestioned relations' remain uninterrogated because they fulfill a normalized, binary relationship evolving from the colonial discursive system and Orientalist grid.

Indigenous peoples participate in neocolonial tourism through creating representations of their cultures for tourists' consumption. This is not always a question of sacrificing pride, however; it can involve strategically relying on the "alibi of *cultural* identity (more or less grandiose and nostalgic) constructed by the science of ethnology" (de Certeau *Heterologies* 228). In *Truth and Bright Water*, for example, Tecumseh's father, Elvin, performs the pedagogic for profit. After seeing an advertisement in a magazine for stone turtle carvings selling for what he considers the unbelievably high price of one hundred and fifty dollars, Elvin carves a series of coyotes out of wood, signing his name on the bottom of each one "so they know it's authentic" (33). He thinks it is "clever" that the turtles come with cards outlining their symbolic function in Aboriginal epistemology and that the artist chooses to use his "Indian name" (33), but he firmly distinguishes between this sort of product, which can be aligned with Chippewa writer Leonore Keeshig-Tobias' use of the term 'Indian' (see epigraph), and 'art'. When the local restaurant owner compares him to Monroe Swimmer, Elvin states emphatically "Hell, Skee, Monroe's an artist. . . . This is business" (35), and he includes this sort of product as part of "all that shit they advertise in the sports magazines" (35).

When Elvin leaves the carvings on the restaurant counter and Skee "drags a rag across the counter, pulling the pieces of corn and the gravy and the chicken fat and the coyotes over the edge and into the garbage," it highlights that the coyote

carvings are considered another part of consumable culture by those living in the community (38). The coyotes are markers fulfilling Huggan's definition of the exotic, and they participate in a touristic system perpetuating commodity fetishism. Read through the reading codes of stasis, binarism and atextuality, the coyotes are static representations that fulfill the tourist's desire for indigenous markers which, in turn, integrate into the neocolonial story of the past. Elvin's production of coyotes falls into what Huggan theorizes as "strategic exoticism," as he works "from within exoticist codes of representation" for his own personal gain, thereby "redeploying [tourist codes] for the purposes of uncovering differential relations of power" (*Postcolonial* 32).

According to Tecumseh, it is during the annual 'Indian Days' that Bright Water is transformed into the most easily accessible 'Indian' place, as tourists can get almost anything they want. Beaded belt buckles, acrylic paintings of the mountains, drawings of old-time Indians on horseback, deer-horn knives, bone chokers, T-shirts that said things like 'Indian and Proud,' and 'Indian Affairs Are the Best.' And all of it, according to the signs that everyone puts up, is 'authentic' and 'traditional.' (221)

This emphasis on fitting into the vision of 'authenticity' central to neocolonial touristic desire supports MacCannell's idea of 'authenticity' as that which is repeated most often. It is demonstrated to be part of the 'strategic' process designed by the Aboriginal people to profit from those wishing to exploit them. For example, in the same text, Edna sells her 'secret' frybread recipe twice. She performs the pedagogic strategically for a German tourist: she puts on "her Indian face" and "points with her

lips and makes elaborate signs like slapping her hands across one another and tracing a circle in the sky with her arm” (223). She “reaches down and comes up with a small drum and starts singing a round dance. The German guy is suddenly all smiles and he can’t get his hand into his pocket fast enough” (224). She repeatedly ‘sells’ her authentic recipe, and I argue that her awareness of the processes of proper placement ensure that she ‘sells’ a commodity without fully participating in MacCannell’s touristic system. She retains her pride, while practically unsettling the power relations this system.

Edna refers to her tourist-oriented performance as “fur trading” (223). I argue Edna’s fur trading, and Indian Days more generally, opens spaces in places, exposing the ambivalence of the utopian-progressive paradigm. Through her performance of the pedagogic, Edna represents static, indigenous culture while fitting into the progressive, capitalist, place of the Nation. Because she hides the fact that she sells her recipe twice, however, she foregrounds the primary level of production identified by de Certeau and hides the secondary level of performance. The resultant place remains ambivalent, as the space of strategic exoticism remains unsanctioned within neocolonial tourism. Like the “authentic trading post” of Old Fort William, the site of Edna’s performance must facilitate the tourist gaze and its vision of indigenous cultures coded by stasis, binarism, and atextuality. King focuses here on critical negation as a means of negotiation.

Grace, in contrast, tends to focus on imaginative affirmation in her texts. In Grace’s *Dogside Story*, the Māori community meets to consider hosting New Year’s celebrations as a way of raising money to refurbish their marae. Many Māori are

unsettled by the idea of Edna's sort of 'trading' and, at a meeting to discuss a plan to set up a campground for the event, Dion, a member of the Dogside community states,

All this 2000 business. What is it anyway? It's a Christian celebration, that's what. So why are we celebrating it. What's 'New Year' to us—nothing to do with our people, our culture. If we want to be celebrating then we should celebrate our own survival in our own Matariki star time. Never mind all this other rubbish dumped on us by missionaries and colonizers—all eyes to heaven while they take the land from under your feet. We got to decolonize ourselves, unpick our brains because they been stitched up too long. (146)

Although Dion wishes to valorize traditional Māori culture, his vision reflects the utopian- progressive paradigm. Reading King's *Indian Days* in counterpoint with the New Years celebration in Grace's text puts pressure on the reader to recognize indigenous cultures can buy into the utopian-progressive paradigm in various ways. Although Dion wants to ensure Māori worldviews continue to envision the present, here he advocates the containment of Māori culture by excluding neocolonial knowledge systems and thereby precluding Māori cultures from participating in the production of the contemporary Nation.

After much discussion, the community decides that the site of the marae is central to its decolonization and that, as long as the community maintained power over their land and the celebrations, it will not become 'stitched up' and contained within neocolonial tourism. Subsequently, with the money made the community

builds a new wharekai.²⁰ In doing so, they are not “celebrating the new year, or century, or millennium, [elder] Wai reminded them, only taking advantage of it. Year two thousand or year sixty thousand was irrelevant, and she didn’t care if it was a Christian festival, pompom girls or mice poop,” as long as the tourists came (148).

Through this New Year celebration, Grace demonstrates that indigenous cultures can create places for dominant cultures without giving up indigenous worldviews. This production relies on what Bhabha theorizes as a

subversive strategy of subaltern agency that negotiates its own authority through a process of an iterative ‘unpicking’ and relocating. Agency requires a grounding but it does not require a totalization of those grounds; it requires movement and manoeuvre but it does not require temporality of continuity or accumulation; it requires direction and contingent closure, but not teleology and holism. (“Spirit” 330)

The Dogside community creates its own place within the location of Aotearoa New Zealand in which it relocates agency. Originally, this begins in a liminal space between the utopian and progressive. The Māori community facilitates and participates in a Christian festival, but this process does not require them to adhere to Christian worldviews exclusively. Rather than requiring the Māori community to give up their culture, the festival allows them to produce a hybrid place: two worldviews are present in the New Year festival, as the Māori community chooses to host tourists so that they can strengthen their own community.

After the success of this initial foray into the tourist system, however, Wai is not interested in continuing the venture. “‘No way,’ Wai said, ‘It was a oncer. We

²⁰ A wharekai is a dining room, and can include kitchen facilities as well.

got our money, that's it'" (252). Grace here addresses how success within the touristic system can encourage indigenous peoples to continue to fulfill the desires of the tourist gaze. Babs and Amira, for example, argue that continuing to run the campground is "an opportunity to put their little settlement, their end of the beach and, most importantly, their side of the inlet, on the map" (252). Their focus shifts from 'taking advantage' to catering to the interests of tourists:

They had ideas, too, for additional activities that they knew would interest visitors, such as guided tours, bush treks, and boating activities. There could be social evenings with disco and karaoke or live bands, Although there'd been a few nick-nack stalls this time, these could be extended to stalls for more traditional crafts—along with demonstrations of carving and weaving. Another idea was to get some of the young girls to dress in piupiu, bodice and tipare and be available to have photographs taken with tourists. These tourists would then have something of the *genuine culture* to take home with them. (252)

Babs' and Amira's plans are designed to satisfy the tourist gaze; indeed, their list would satisfy all of Cohen's five categories of tourist. However, as Wai recognizes, there is danger in producing places for tourist consumption. The neocolonial 'map' integrating Dogside would perpetuate 'genuine culture' as 'authentic' through repetition within the touristic system. Dogside, as a place, would facilitate its own integration on the terms of dominant cultures. This Māori community would then be contained and further negotiations limited by its place as a performance site.

King, too, recognizes the dangers inherent in performing the pedagogic and, in

into the same can never be definitive or exhaustive [because binary relations between cultures are] continually refashioned, and the effects that collision produces may unsettle as much as reassure, dislodge, authority as much as reconfirm it. (Huggan *Postcolonial* 32)

In other words, exoticism relies on static representations of monolithic cultures and binary relationships between cultures. Critically negating touristic systems through reversing the value-coding inherent in the tourist gaze only goes part of the way to envisioning indigenous cultures from the inside-out. I will now discuss moving beyond ambivalent spaces into places that not only resist being coded within the touristic system, but also imaginatively affirm indigenous cultures as locations coded by process and relation.

Emplacing a Relational-processual paradigm: The Sun Dance and the Marae

In the works of King and Grace, the marae and the Sun Dance in particular represent places for the performance of indigenous ‘cultural difference,’ as they are sites envisioned with indigenous worldviews in mind. Indigenous peoples can act as ‘cultural agents,’ encoding these worldviews in both places as both the marae and the Sun Dance are continually produced and reproduced through experience. I contend that the marae and the Sun Dance enable indigenous productions of place. Unlike neocolonial tourist sites, which integrate indigenous cultures into the utopian-progressive paradigm through stasis, binarism, and atextuality, these places encode indigenous cultures through process, relation, and stories. The result is the creation of places as locations facilitating intercultural relations and connections with the land

that reflect All My Relations and whakapapa. These worldviews envision indigenous cultures from the inside-out, privileging a link between indigeneity and place while refusing to limit indigenous cultures to their placement as Others within Eurocentric discourses. After employing spiral reading strategies to read their works in relation to dominant neocolonial tourist sites and codes, I now read King and Grace in counterpoint with one another to tease out the different ways in which they locate Aboriginal and Māori cultural sites in relation to Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand.

According to Paul Tapsell (Ngāti Whakaue, Ngāti Raukawa), the marae is “a physically-bounded three-dimensional space, capable of spiritually joining Papatuanuku (land) with Ranginui (sky) into which *ira tangata* (the human principle) may enter and commune with the *ira atua* (the divine ancestors)” (141). The marae, and the whareniui in particular, connect Māori people with place in a context recognizing stories as discourses emerging in relation to both the past and present. In “physically representing ancestors to which all members of the *marae* community genealogically trace their origins,” the marae maps the concepts associated with whakapapa that centre relation between the self, the community, and the world (Tapsell 142). This relation is expressed through Māori stories, told both about the marae community and through its physical construction. At the outset of *Potiki*, Grace ties the carver explicitly to the role of storyteller reflecting this duality: “there was not one to match him in his skill, and many would have said also that there were none who could match him as a great storyteller and a teller of histories” (9). Thus, he establishes not only a physical, but also a metaphorical site in which Māori can pause to produce and reproduce places for their various negotiations of culture

and identity.

The marae resists being encoded as a static site. It reflects the history of a community, a history always in process. In *Dogside Story*, for example, “[e]very scrap and tatter [of a story] contributed and became part of a mass that sprouted whole in the end. (But what does ‘end’ mean where there is forever the potential to add or embellish and when rafters are such inclusionists?)” (239). This site of inclusion resists the utopian- progressive paradigm, as stories are not assimilated or integrated on the terms of the dominant, but accumulated over time and read in relation to one another as part of a relational-processual whole. This whole negates the ‘holism’ Bhabha identifies with colonial constructions of cultures, and indigenous stories resist atextuality and assert their power to participate in the production of place.

In *Green Grass, Running Water*, the Sun Dance provides a setting for relational stories premised on inclusion reflecting All My Relations. As Marlene Goldman notes, through the Sun Dance, “the novel inscribes an aboriginal conception of the world in which the individuals can locate themselves at the centre of a land-based, communal, and non- hierarchical spiritual practice that involves both body and soul” (20). The Sun Dance involves indigenous peoples from various places living together in one place for a period of time, ‘performing’ culture, and experiencing All My Relations. Although tourists do occasionally “wander into the camp” (138), this place resists the Eurocentric model of possession (Marchitello). No pictures can be taken at the Sun Dance, and the Aboriginal people in King’s text are quick to react when a “man climb[s] on top of the car and [begins] taking pictures” of the men

dancing (139). In demanding the film, Orville denies the power of outside-in perspectives and ‘possession’ when he tells the man: “my brother will get it developed. We’ll send you the pictures that are yours” (140). In insisting that the tourist cannot take pictures of the Sun Dance home, Orville not only rejects being the target-object of colonial governmentality, he also removes a potential marker from the touristic system. He ensures that the tourist will not be able to re-enact the tourist gaze and render culture static and knowable through photographs he can integrate into his photograph album upon his return home. This challenge critically negates outside-in perspectives and neocolonial power relations. In doing this, King tells his readers that Sun Dance is something that must be experienced while it is in process, from a perspective that recognizes and respects Aboriginal worldviews.

In comparison, in *Cousins*, Mata experiences the power of re-locating her own perspective in cultural place. Here, Grace enables her character to imaginatively affirm her own location within a culture with which she has limited experience. The place of the marae enables this affirmation. Despite her lack of familiarity with Māori tradition, Mata becomes a cultural agent with the authority to lead women onto the marae as tuakana.²¹ She “didn’t know how to do [things at Makareta’s funeral], but [she] wasn’t afraid” (255). Instead, she feels instinctively placed within the community, and she is able to cry the tears “from an unfound place” she produces through her relation to the people around her and their shared place on the marae (255). She connects not only to others, but also to her ancestral land.

Unlike Mata, in *Cousins*, Eli, in *Green Grass, Running Water*, does not feel immediately at home in his cultural place. Before entering his mother’s lodge at the

²¹ A tuakana is an elder sister of a female, one who usually acts as a mentor and teacher.

Sun Dance, he has “an overpowering urge to lower the flap, get into the DeSoto, and drive back to Toronto” (204). Through stories, Eli’s mother relates the place of the Sun Dance to Eli’s white partner Karen, an act that allows Karen herself to find “her voice” and share in the community (205). Eli, however, remains untouched by the place and the stories and, as a result, he “can’t say” that it changed his life (361). He realizes the importance of the place later in his life, however, and when his nephew cannot clearly answer the question “Where would you want to be?,” Eli takes him to the Sun Dance. When he is there this time, Eli participates in the production of place, dancing and drumming with his community. He is told he can dance with Camelot’s family, and that, at the Sun Dance, the community will “always have a place for [him]” (364).

Through these textual moments, King and Grace not only critically negate the reading codes of stasis, binarism and atextuality; they imaginatively affirm the Sun Dance and the marae as places enabling the imagination of communities in processual relation through stories. As will be discussed further in Chapter Five, I argue that reading codes enabling cultural difference—process, relation, and textuality—are central to the relational- processual paradigm I locate in King’s and Grace’s works. This paradigm unsettles the tourist gaze by challenging the authority of outside-in perspectives central to touristic systems and thereby challenges the gaze’s ability to exotify indigenous cultures. Reading King and Grace in counterpoint, in particular, enables a reader to envision a variety of ways in which one might critically negate dominant roles and reading codes within neocolonial tourism, as well as imaginatively affirm new sites within the contemporary discursive formations of

Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively. The resultant places are not static sites containing indigenous cultures, but cultural locations enabling multiple stories, multiple experiences.

Hirini Melbourne (Ngāi Tūhoe, Ngāti Kahungunu) insists that Māori writers must “build a *whare whakairo* where [their] links to the past, as well as the future, can be made certain” (140).²² Both Deloughrey and Orr posit that Grace answers this call through constructing her novels using the *whareniui* as a governing metaphor.

Through Roimata’s narrative voice in *Potiki*, Grace makes the metonymic connection between the *whareniui* and the places produced by stories: “our main book was the *whareniui* which itself is a story, a history, a gallery, a study, a design structure and a *taonga*. And we are part of that book along with family past and family yet to come” (104). In producing a place envisioning *whakapapa*, the *whareniui* gives form to Māori worldviews; it produces a place premised on relation and reflecting spiral time.

In “The Maori House of Fiction,” Orr asks the important question, “How does the figuring of the novel as *whareniui* position us as readers?” (92). She posits that

[f]or *tauiwi*, or strangers, the novel provides an educational introduction to crucial aspects of Maori life, past and present. Sometimes [...] the novel welcomes and informs cultural outsiders as *manuhiri*, or guests, directly communicating central aspects of its characters’ lives. (92)

The novel, figured as the *marae* or *whareniui*, advocates inside-out envisioning of culture, as the terms of engagement are determined through Māori worldviews.

Melbourne contends that textual place approached like a *marae* ensures a focus on Māori terms of cultural engagement. She argues that readers should approach the

²² A *whare whakairo* is a carved house.

indigenous text with respect and locate themselves in reciprocal relation with their hosts. As guests in the indigenous house of fiction, non-indigenous people should 'listen' to the stories that are being told from the inside-out (Melbourne).

Joanne Episkenew (Métis) positions non-indigenous readers in similar ways in relation to Aboriginal texts. She argues that non-indigenous critics should engage with these texts through "socially responsible criticism." This criticism requires an awareness of Aboriginal contexts. She states: "[t]hat is not to say that only Aboriginal people should be interpreting and critiquing Aboriginal literature. What I'm saying is that non-Aboriginal scholars need to be cognizant of the authority that society accords to their voices" (56-7). They need to be aware of the power of outside-in perspectives.

In *Green Grass, Running Water*, George Morningstar's arrival at the Sun Dance can be read as a similar call to engage with indigenous culture on the terms of the hosts. After attending the Sun Dance for the first time on his honeymoon with his Aboriginal Canadian wife Latisha, George returns as a photojournalist. When his now ex-wife Latisha reminds him that he cannot take pictures of the site, he refuses to give up the authority inherent in his tourist gaze. Initially, he tries to assimilate the Sun Dance into dominant religious constructions of knowledge: "It's almost the twenty-first century, Country. Look, they let you take pictures in church all the time. Hell, everything the pope does is on television. People are curious about these kinds of things" (380). From George's outside-in point of view, Latisha should satisfy his curiosity and fulfill her position as his 'host' at the 'traditional' Sun Dance. She should, like the Aboriginals performing the pedagogic at Old Fort William, help

others to ‘escape the rat race’ as he appropriates her cultural place for the American magazine, *New Age*.²³ Her refusal to allow him to take pictures does not fit into his construction of her—and her culture—as ‘target-object’ within the colonial field of operations. He attempts to highlight his dominant position as it relates to the legal discourses policing the discursive formation of the nation: “No harm in a couple of pictures. . . . No law against it” (385). When he realizes that she will not fulfill his desires, he rejects her as ‘host’ and attempts to place her in a more sinister binary relationship associated with colonialism—civilized/savage—by asking, “What are you going to do, scalp me?” (385).

According to George, “the more people know, the more they understand” (380). However, his ‘understanding’ is defined within a circular knowledge system premised Eurocentric Truth. His understanding necessarily allows him to integrate the Sun Dance into his world on his terms. In the process he excludes Aboriginal worldviews from having an impact on his system of knowledge: “you have your beliefs, and I have mine. Nothing wrong with that” (384). However, George soon concludes that there *is* something wrong when he is prevented full access to the Sun Dance as a tourist site.

You can’t believe in this shit! . . . This is ice age crap! . . . Come on!
 It’s the twentieth century. Nobody cares about your little powwow. A
 bunch of old people and drunks sitting around in tents in the middle of
 nowhere. Nobody cares about any of this. . . . You’re a joke! You all act
 like this is important, like it’s going to change your lives. Christ, you

²³ For an excellent discussion of the New Age movement and its attempted appropriation of the Sun Dance, see Aldred’s “Plastic Shamans.”

guys are born stupid and you die stupid. (386)

He attempts to contain Aboriginal cultures in the past, ultimately refusing to recognize Aboriginal peoples' ability to tell stories.

Latisha rejects his construction of her as 'host' to his 'traveler': "Go away, George. . . . Just go away" (386). She finds a place with "Lionel and Alberta and Latisha and Harley and the old Indians and Coyote" and, together they "stood their ground and watched George" leave the Sun Dance (387). I posit that the ground 'stood' here reflects the non- totalizing grounding for agency identified by Bhabha ("Spirit" 330). The Sun Dance is a relational-processual place from which Latisha negotiates both indigenous and Eurocentric worldviews. From her inside-out perspective, the Sun Dance allows Latisha to reformulate 'double-time' to ensure that her own performance of the pedagogic no longer facilitates George's tourist gaze. In the texts discussed in this section, the sites of the Sun Dance and the marae act as 'speaking places,' turangawaewae, that enable this reformulation of double-time. Here, Latisha and Mata are both able to negotiate their positions as both pedagogical objects and signifying subjects. Latisha critically negates George's presence and refuses to be objectified as a host, while Mata travels to the marae in order to imaginatively affirm her place as tuakana. From these sites, Latisha and Mata assert the relational-processual value-coding of both whakapapa and 'All My Relations' to envision cultural locations from the inside-out.

In this chapter I have argued that neocolonial tourist sites reproduce indigenous places through requiring indigenous peoples to perform the pedagogic so that their cultures can be integrated by the tourist gaze into the discursive formation

of the Nation as its history. According to Urry, “how social groups construct their tourist gaze is a good way of getting at just what is happening in the ‘normal’ society.” In both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand, this gaze produces neocolonial tourist sites foregrounding commodity fetishism. These sites can be read through the normalizing colonial reading codes of stasis, binarism, and atextuality, codes which, emerging from a singular archive, enable integration into neocolonial discursive formations. Travel, in this context, foregrounds travelers’ abilities to integrate the unknown into their own knowledge systems.

Rather than requiring indigenous cultures to assimilate into the ‘white’ place of the Nation, neocolonial tourism integrates the ‘Aboriginal’ into Canada and ‘Māori’ into Aotearoa New Zealand and limits cultural locations through integration. This inclusion, premised on Bhabha’s ‘cultural diversity,’ ensures that the Nation as a discursive formation contains objectified indigeneity while locating subjectivity in dominant systems of knowledge. The resulting processes of proper placement, evident through the objectification of indigeneity within neocolonial tourist sites, ensure that ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘Māori New Zealander’ remain catachreses. In Chapter Five, I discuss these catachrestic formations in greater depth, arguing that they continue to bring the Nation to crisis because the place for ‘culture’ in ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘biculturalism’ is linked to that produced in neocolonial tourism. I will turn now to these pluralist discursive systems, locating them within the utopian-progressive paradigm and teasing out the ambivalent spaces within. I will advocate new places locating indigenous cultures—*turangawaewae*, speaking places—from which to negotiate the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial

and promote catachrestic citizenship in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand.

CHAPTER FIVE

Integrating Cultures Within: Multiculturalism, Biculturalism, and the Possibilities of National Places

The value Canadians now place on mutual accommodation, respect for diversity and civility has its origin in part in the centuries of dialogue and negotiation between Canada's Aboriginal peoples, French and British Settlers, and the generations of settlers that followed. (Sheila Copps in "Interview: 'Minister of Canadian Heritage,' Canadian Diversity/Diversité Canadienne)

'Culture,' to white people, is about art galleries, opera, ballet, and not picking your nose. It's not about land alienation, cultural imperialism, trade unions, agriculture, voting, the alphabet, and sewage systems based on water. By denying they are a part of a culture, they can deny the destructive impact that culture has on others, such as the Maori. They can see this culture as being so normal and all other cultures as being so abnormal, less advanced, barbaric, that they cannot even begin to realize that it is their culture which in fact is savage, inhuman, and barbaric. (Donna Awatere in Maori Sovereignty)

Insider viewpoints are relevant and necessary in the examination of tribal literature. An unspoken code – or, at the very least, a state of affairs everyone has gotten far too used to – has emerged in our discipline: Indians write the stories, poems, plays, and non-Indians tell us what they mean. Claiming that Indians can do both, I hope to make the case that tribal experience can provide a useful foundation for effectively studying tribal literature. (Craig S. Womack in Reasoning Together).

In their discussion of Australian multiculturalism, Jon Stratton and Ien Ang contend that the “problem with official multiculturalism is that it tends precisely to freeze the fluidity of identity by the very fact that it is concerned with the synthesizing of unruly and unpredictable cultural identities and differences into a harmonious unity-in-diversity” (152-3). Both Canadian multiculturalism and New Zealand biculturalism exhibit this tendency. The ‘culture’ in both of these official

state-sanctioned pluralist discourses contains ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘Māori New Zealander’ as catachreses within the utopian- progressive discursive formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand, respectively. In the final chapter of this dissertation, I discuss how pluralist discourses continue to contain and limit indigenous cultures by defining them through what Bhabha calls ‘cultural diversity.’ Eurocentric cultures, rather than participating as cultures in this system, valorize cultural diversity while foreclosing Aboriginal access to ‘cultural difference,’ in which members of indigenous cultures act as agents on their own terms (Bhabha). That this foreclosure is happening continues to be erased by utopian-progressive archive because the discourse normalizes Eurocentric points of view within the hegemonic ‘inclusive society’ of the nation-state.

In this chapter I employ spiral reading strategies to unsettle Canadian multiculturalism’s and New Zealand biculturalism’s continuing emphases on cultural diversity and their related attempts to integrate indigeneity into a utopian-progressive paradigm. I discuss the catachreses ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Zealand Māori’ and, drawing in part on the works of Will Kymlicka and Charles Taylor, and the criticism of their work by Dene scholar Glen S. Coulthard, I illuminate the critical ambivalence within discourses of multiculturalism and biculturalism. This ambivalence opens up spaces for new negotiations that enable the ‘claiming’ of catachrestic identity formations. I will draw these ideas together to advance the premise that reading ‘cultures’ as locations within a relational-processual paradigm opens up sites for catachrestic citizenship.

As discussed in the Introduction, the governmental discourses of Canadian

multiculturalism and New Zealand biculturalism emerged, in part, as a response to Aboriginal Canadian and Māori resistance to integrationist governmental policies in the late 1960s and 1970s. These integrationist policies evolved from assimilationist ones.¹ This evolution continues into contemporary pluralist paradigms, as both multiculturalism and biculturalism rely on a conceptualization of culture that simultaneously supports and masks the assimilation and integration of indigeneity.

As a result, pluralism does not constitute a break from the colonial focus on assimilating indigenous peoples discussed in Chapters Two and Three, nor from the neocolonial focus on integration discussed in relation to tourism in Chapter Four. Rather, pluralist discourses perpetuate the utopian-progressive paradigm in contemporary systems of government, requiring indigenous cultures to act as containable, consumable, and timeless ‘utopian’ entities while indigenous peoples become citizens and join the ‘progressive’ place of a nation based on Eurocentric ideals of democracy. The ‘recognition’ required for full integration into the Nation engenders a politics that, as Coulthard notes, continues to “reproduce the very configurations of colonial power that indigenous peoples’ demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend” (438).

This reproduction occurs because the “politics of multiculturalism can be understood as coming from the same modernist ideological assumptions on which the notion of the homogeneous nation-state was based” (Stratton and Ang 153), ideological assumptions I link to a utopian-progressive paradigm emerging as early as the late-sixteenth- century. Tracing this evolution of early European imperialist

¹ For a comparative reading of assimilationist policies, see Armitage’s *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand*

philosophies into contemporary times renders Sheila Copps' statement that Canadian multiculturalism has its origins in early colonial social relations ironically true: the link she makes between past and present intercultural relations is certainly supported, but my examination reveals an historical and continuing lack of 'dialogue' and 'negotiation' between European and Aboriginal peoples (see epigraph). Both Canadian multiculturalism and New Zealand biculturalism continue to support the dominance of Eurocentric points of view, as the discursive formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand normalize Eurocentric homogeneity and continue to render indigenous cultures as exotic Other.

How, then, do governmental discourses of multiculturalism and biculturalism attempt to maintain homogeneity within the discursive formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand? Indigenous cultures are integrated into the place of the nation *as* exotic, while indigenous peoples are required to assimilate into the dominant Eurocentric culture in line with normalized conceptualizations of contemporary 'everyday life.' How can the normalization of the utopian-progressive paradigm be challenged? According to Foucault,

[t]o approach the theme of power by an analysis of 'how' is . . . to introduce several critical shifts in relation to the supposition of a fundamental power. It is to give as the object of analysis power relations and not power itself—power relations which are distinct from objective abilities as well as from relations of communication. This is as much as saying that power relations can be grasped in the diversity of their logical sequence, their abilities, and their interrelationships.

(Foucault “The Subject” 219)

Spiral reading strategies expose how discourses attempt to recast diversity, and also how their logic masks the resultant ambivalence created through “the impossible unity of the nation as a symbolic force” (Bhabha “Narrating” 1). The nations I discuss each act as “an institutional container of principles which are instrumental to the encouragement and management of cultural diversity [promoting] an *inclusive* particularism” (Stratton and Ang 150). The principles inherent in multiculturalism and biculturalism perpetuate the utopian- progressive paradigm: they include indigeneity on the terms of dominant discursive systems that support continuing neocolonialism while purporting to support liberal equality through democracy.

King and Grace address the interrelated issues of subjectivity and agency in their multicultural and bicultural contexts through characters that answer the questions ‘who am I?’ and ‘where is here?’. Their stories, read in counterpoint, show us alternative models of culture and relocate ‘Māori’ and ‘Aboriginal’ in relation to ‘Aotearoa New Zealand’ and ‘Canada’. They both imaginatively affirm their relational-processual paradigms and critically negate neocolonial discursive formations. Their characters demonstrate different levels of access to textual speaking places, or *turangawaewae*, and different applications of inside-out perspectives. King and Grace’s characters answer the question, ‘How might one navigate power relations?’ Their characters show the various ways to accommodate shifting Aboriginal and Māori codes *and* challenge Eurocentric discourses’ denial of indigenous agency within the place of the Nation.

Democracy is heralded as an enabling discourse for all within the discursive

formations of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand. Because its power structure necessarily privileges majority opinions, however, democracy does not promote equality for minority cultures because it does not always include them. In *Green Grass, Running Water*, King draws attention to this ambivalence located within the democratic ideal when he unsettles democracy's ability to produce a place empowering all. When Coyote is persistent in asking the storytelling character 'I' for his turn to participate in producing place by telling the story, the storyteller tells him that "'Coyotes don't get a turn.' 'In a democracy, everyone gets a turn,' says Coyote. 'Nonsense,' I says. 'In a democracy, only people who can afford it get a turn'" (327). 'Afford,' here, can be read in several ways: while disempowered peoples are often among the poorest, I would add that the utopian-progressive paradigm, and the denial of inside-out perspectives, also denies minority populations cultural currency by disempowering their catachrestic locations. King's story critically negates the universality of the democratic ideal, reminding his readers that Aboriginal peoples do not always 'get a turn.' If they look from an inside-out perspective they cannot envision their places in relation to the Nation.

According to Will Kymlicka, democracy itself is flawed because it does not answer Foucault's question: it does not outline *how* it will exist in application. He states, "the right to vote does not tell us how political boundaries should be drawn, or how powers should be distributed between levels of government" (5). Failures in democracy "render cultural minorities vulnerable to significant injustices at the hands of the majority" (5). Within liberal democracies, Kymlicka argues that this leads to the adoption of two potential 'models' for positive intercultural engagement: the

“anglo-comformity model” and “multicultural model.” These models work in very similar ways to assimilation and integration as discussed in this thesis respectively.

Cultural difference is cast within the utopian-progressive paradigm in both.

Indigenous peoples should either assimilate and conform to Eurocentric expectations *or* act as separate cultural entities in relation to the Nation.²

Charles Taylor also addresses the relationships between minority cultures and majority governments – and their relationship to historical philosophy and political theory – in “The Politics of Recognition.” He identifies the “need, sometimes the demand, for recognition”³ that occurs for members of cultural groups in relation to contemporary nations, arriving at a “politics of multiculturalism” (98). These politics are at odds, in some ways, with liberal democratic principles because of an internal inconsistency. First, these politics focus on the concept of citizenship, which is denoted “in terms of equal access... universal equality (Taylor 105). Second, they purport to enable a “politics of difference” that requires, according to Taylor that “we all recognize the equal value of different cultures. That we not only let them survive, but acknowledge their worth” (120).⁴ This worth is called into question when indigenous peoples fail to fit in perfectly with Eurocentric notions of progress.⁵

² For a book-length discussion of these notions of democracy in relation to various political contexts, see Kymlicka’s *Multicultural Citizenship*. For more on minority rights, in particular those of Aboriginal peoples in Canada, see Chapter 6 of that work.

³ According to Taylor, this need for recognition emerged as a result of the “collapse of social hierarchies” in the mid-nineteenth century (99). He links this, in turn, to the ideas of ‘nature’ advocated by Rousseau (100) which I discuss in Chapter Three and the concept of an ‘authentic’ individualized experience articulated by Herder through the concept that “each of us has an original way of being human” (101).

⁴ Taylor posits that this “preemptory demand for favourable judgements of worth is paradoxically – perhaps tragically – homogenizing” (125). My recognition of various inside-out perspectives precludes the notion that culture is homogenous, and that recognizing cultural difference relies on this homogeneity.

⁵ Audra Simpson argues that the critical engagements of both Charles Taylor and Will Kymlicka are problematic in their liberal focus because the “individualism inherent in the western liberal theory of

Coulthard takes issue with both Taylor and Kymlicka, arguing that both of their work falls into the pitfalls of “liberal pluralism”, because they “seek to reconcile Indigenous nationhood with Crown sovereignty via the accommodation of Indigenous identities in some form of renewed relationship with the institutions of the Canadian state” (438). Drawing largely on Fanon, and Fanon’s work on Hegel, Coulthard argues persuasively that

in actual contexts of domination (such as colonialism) not only are the terms of recognition usually determined by and in the interests of the master (the colonizer), but also over time slave populations (the colonized) tend to develop what [Fanon] called ‘psycho-affective’ attachments to these master-sanctioned forms of recognition, and that this attachment is essential in maintaining the economic and political structure of master/slave (colonizer/colonized) relations themselves” (439).

Coulthard contends that the terms of recognition must shift: rather than being a “gift” bestowed by the colonial state on the colonized, recognition – and its terms – should emerge from struggles by the colonized. These struggles, on the terms of the colonized, can enable “transformative praxis” and indigenous subjectivity (Coulthard 442-3).

According to Toon Van Meijl, “the disadvantaged situation in which most

Taylor and Kymlicka” precludes community-based cultural engagement. For more on this debate in relation to the tribe discussed by Simpson, see Dickson-Gilmore’s “*Iati-Onkwehonwe*”. For a more general overview of indigenous politics and liberalism, see Paine’s “Aboriginal Identity, Multiculturalism, and Liberal Rights Philosophy”. Because I am drawing on Taylor and Kymlicka to critique the very nature of Western liberal democracy, rather than looking to them for set answers to the problems they raise, I avoid such concerns.

indigenous minorities find themselves denied indigenous subjectivity because it exemplifies the potentiality for a ‘tyranny of the majority,’ which is latent in democracy” (390). The democratic ideals supporting pluralist paradigms enable cultural diversity and often deny cultural difference. As Van Meijl discusses, New Zealand biculturalism might initially appear to ensure Māori ‘citizens’ rights’ because official biculturalism includes Māori representations in government and law. However, Māori people are not experiencing the full partnership set up by the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840.⁶ As a result, from a “Maori perspective democracy is synonymous with colonization” (Van Meijl 399).

Grace, too, critically negates the democratic ideal and, her character Makareta, in *Cousins*, emphasizes the ‘disadvantaged situation’ of Māori peoples that Taylor links to both ‘lack of recognition’ and ‘misrecognition’ of minority cultures (98). From Makareta’s inside-out point of view, this situation is perpetuated through the stories told to Māori peoples through the dominant discourses of the nation. Makareta states:

For years my people had been told through statistics and through the media of our lowly position, our poverty, our bad health, our underachievement, our criminality. We didn’t need to have these things spelled out to us, because we were living them, or living next to them, every day” (208).

Here, Grace makes explicit the connection between the discursive formation of the nation- state and the barriers to Māori peoples’ participation in the Eurocentric

⁶ For a reading of the Treaty itself in relation to contemporary discourses of ‘cultural difference’ see J. G. A. Pocock’s “Waitangi as Mystery of State.”

narrative of progress. Makareta links a lack of recognition to disempowerment, a gesture that can be read in light of the problematics outlined by Taylor. Makareta asserts that misrecognition “can inflict a grievous wound, saddling its victims with a crippling self-hatred” (Taylor 99).

Taylor argues that “due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need” (99). What is most important about Makareta’s perspective in this situation is that she moves beyond Taylor’s Western liberal binary-based critique that advances the idea that minority populations require *only* the recognition of the majority. From her inside-out perspective, she recognizes not only Māori culture but the victimization Māori peoples have endured. She critically negates Māori ‘failure,’ pointing out that the stories recited as discourses set up expectations. Makareta challenges the concept of universal access to democracy specifically by questioning the continued exclusion of her peoples from the national discourse of ‘progress.’

Within colonial discourse, however, progress is defined from outside-in Eurocentric perspectives. Simultaneously, the utopian-progressive paradigm allows outside-in perspectives, such as those located in neocolonial tourist sites, to ‘fix’ indigenous culture in its diversity. This shuts down potential dialogue between cultures. Together, these processes can also lead to what Arjun Appardurai identifies as “metonymic freezing”, representational essentializing in which a limited – and limiting – number of characteristics stand in for the breadth of human experience (Clifford 24). In *Green Grass, Running Water*, King addresses how essentialized representations affect intercultural relations when he rewrites James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans*. Natty Bumppo – here *Nasty* Bumppo, Post-

Colonial Wilderness Guide and Outfitter – attempts to place Old Woman into his discursive system by marking her within cultural diversity: “Chingachgook is my friend. He’s an Indian. But he is my friend anyway. . . . I can tell an Indian when I see one. Chingachgook is an Indian. You’re an Indian. Case closed” (392). Thus, Nasty reads Old Woman as static and in binary relation to himself.

This process continues as Nasty begins to textualize Old Woman, assigning her a certain set of gifts due to her ‘Aboriginal nature.’ With these gifts, she will fulfill her position as Other to his ‘self,’ host to his traveler, subject to his colonial power. Nasty Bumppo insists,

Indians can run fast. Indians can endure pain. Indians have quick reflexes. Indians don’t talk much. Indians have good eyesight. Indians have agile bodies. These are all Indian gifts . . . Whites are patient. Whites are spiritual. Whites are cognitive. Whites are philosophical. Whites are sophisticated. Whites are sensitive. These are all white gifts (434-5).

Old Woman rejects her objectification as Other, however, stating, “I’m not Chingachgook” and maintaining that it must be “embarrassing” for him to have made this mistake (392). Old Woman recognizes the limits within which he attempts to contain her and points them out to him: “So, says Old Woman. Whites are superior, and Indians are inferior” (393). His colonial perspective forecloses Bhabha’s concept of cultural difference: although Nasty says, “Any questions?” (393), there is no opportunity to respond. Old Woman cannot tell her own story and, when Old Woman refuses to fit into his story, Nasty attempts to shoot her.

King places Old Woman's point of view in counterpoint with Nasty's Eurocentric one, a perspective that relies on white 'gifts' foundational to the Canadian values expressed through benevolent multiculturalism and liberal pluralist 'recognition'. Unlike Nasty's singular point of view, Old Woman's indigenous perspective engages with Nasty's position and worldview, highlighting his inability to fit into an Aboriginal worldview. Old Woman's perspective negotiates Nasty's subject position, while Nasty attempts to 'fix' the situation by shooting his uncompromising and alienated host. Nasty cannot force his utopian-progressive paradigm onto Old Woman's world; instead, the relationship between Nasty and Old Woman—through her negotiation of relations—opens up a space within this paradigm that both characters must negotiate. Nasty is unable to participate in an intercultural relationship, however, and ultimately his refusal of dialogue and desire to continue to fight for control ends with his death by his own hand.

King critically negates colonial representations of cultural diversity, whereas Grace focuses on neocolonial representations delineated through statistics and perpetuated by media. Reading King and Grace in counterpoint leads me to ask a key question: how have intercultural relations in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand evolved from colonial times to the present, and how do multiculturalism and biculturalism differ from colonialism itself? In fact, all three discourses perpetuate the utopian-progressive paradigm and, as a result, disempower indigenous peoples by attempting to control their access to subjectivity and agency within the place of the Nation.

In "DissemiNation," Bhabha asks, "[h]ow do we plot the narrative of the

nation that must mediate between the teleology of progress tipping over into the ‘timeless’ discourse of irrationality? How do we understand the ‘homogeneity’ of modernity?” (294). His answer is an important one to the settler-invaders societies of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand and central to my own reading of the novels of King and Grace: “[w]e may begin by questioning that progressive metaphor of modern social cohesion – the many as the one – shared by organic theories of the holism of culture and community” (294). The works of King and Grace led me to question this ‘progressive metaphor of cohesion’, or inclusion within the utopian-progressive paradigm. Spiral reading strategies lead me to ask how we might look to both indigenous and postcolonial theories in relation to the novels of King and Grace in order to rework the concepts of culture and community in relation to the place of the Nation.

Although neither King nor Grace mentions the abstract concept of the nation, or the pluralist discourses of multiculturalism or biculturalism by name in the novels I discuss, they address these paradigms by considering relations between cultures *within* the narrative of the nation.⁷ Stories like those of Makareta and Old Woman, above, demonstrate their approaches to geopolitics and cultural dynamics. These stories remind us that neither contemporary nor colonial conceptualizations of indigenous ‘cultures’ reflecting outside-in perspectives can be easily located in official Canadian multiculturalism or New Zealand biculturalism as discursive

⁷ The critical discourses available concerning the nation, pluralist discourses, and the relationships between these discourses and indigenous subjectivity is expansive. See Kymlicka for specific discussions on Canada as a ‘multination state’ containing multiple Aboriginal tribes. See Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras’ “Engaging with Indigeneity” for an excellent examination of Maori nationhood, particularly animated through the different conceptualizations of sovereignty illuminated by tino rangatiratanga.

systems that empower all systems.

King and Grace each resist the structures of ‘official’ pluralism in different and varied ways. As the stories discussed below indicate, they both critically negate colonial and neocolonial placements and imaginatively affirm engagements with the Nation. As a result, they participate in the ‘political empowerment’ Bhabha connects to the “multiculturalist cause, [power that] come[s] from posing questions of solidarity and community *from the interstitial perspective*” and recognizing that “social differences are not simply given to experience through an already authenticated cultural tradition” (*Location 3*). As the characters discussed below confirm, King and Grace promote indigenous worldviews from various interstitial points of view, and utilize the ambivalent space opened up through catachreses in order to unsettle national ideals of inclusion and equality. They relocate indigenous cultures in relation to dominant Eurocentric culture within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand both through negotiating ambivalent spaces and new places, and through encouraging readers to engage critically with the discourses imagining and governing Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand.

The ‘Official’ Discourses of Canadian Multiculturalism and New Zealand Biculturalism

Both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand constitute ‘imagined communities’ and, from their founding moments in 1867 and 1840 respectively, these nations have struggled to assert national identities that support the relationship between nation and state, between the imagined community of peoples living within the borders of each

of these countries and their bodies politic and structures of government.⁸ Historically, European nations were founded on shared experiences of race, language, material interest, religious affinities, geography, and military necessity. Those commonalities led to the normalization of homogeneous Eurocentrism within the place of the nation. However, as cracks in Empire compelled Ernest Renan to argue, the ‘modern’ nation came to be premised on “a soul, a spiritual principle ... [expressed through] possession in common of a rich legacy of memories [and] present-day consent” (19). Both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand are such ‘modern’ nations, and multiculturalism and biculturalism are contemporary expressions of these nations’ shared central principles of inclusion and equality.

Inclusion, whether painted as assimilation, integration or bi- or multi-culturalism, attempts to mask the ambivalence inherent in discourses of the Nation. Both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand share “pluralism of origin,” yet both continue to rely primarily on Eurocentric systems of government (Goodrich). In a pamphlet entitled “What is Multiculturalism?,” the Department of Canadian Heritage states that “[c]ultural differences make a large contribution to unity, and multiculturalism celebrates that contribution. Multiculturalism also ensures that all citizens can maintain their identities, take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging”. Because these cultural differences exhibit the characteristics of Bhabha’s cultural diversity, because differences are controlled to ensure that they contribute to unity, these differences are maintained through the structures

⁸ ‘Imagined communities,’ is a term developed by Benedict Anderson and discussed in the Introduction and throughout this thesis. For a compelling discussion of Anderson’s ‘imagined communities’ in light of contemporary Aboriginal citizenship and nationalism, see Audra Simpson’s “Paths Toward a Mohawk Nation,” particularly pages 120-22.

of the state itself. According to the official document, multiculturalism “supports the belief in Canada that all citizens are equal”. This equality among citizens is premised on their ability to embody containable culture while simultaneously fitting into the idea(l) of the ‘progressive’ citizen promoted within the discursive formation of Canada.

In recent contemporary times, both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand have distanced themselves from their colonial pasts and been recognized as independent commonwealth countries with mostly symbolic ties to Britain. Each has a Governor General and each retains systems of government reflecting the parliamentary systems of Great Britain. Although “the 1982 amendment to the Canadian Constitution and the 1986 amendment to the New Zealand Constitution were fundamental in severing the links with the Parliament of the United Kingdom,” these ties continue to influence both democracies (Joseph 4).⁹ Thus, the changes that can be made within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand are still enabled and constrained by parliamentary systems that have their roots in the British Empire, and continue to promote the central idea of democracy based on inclusion and equality.

As each nation has asserted its own identity, the inclusion of various cultures has emerged as a central theme. As Robert Joseph discusses in his draft paper on “Constitutional Provisions for Pluralism, Biculturalism, and Multiculturalism in Canada and New Zealand,”

[r]ecognition of and accommodation for the duality, multiplicity, and hybridity of national identities is necessary within the constitutional and

⁹ See Joseph’s article for an extensive discussion of Canadian multiculturalism and New Zealand biculturalism in relation to constitutional law.

political frameworks of nation-states because it is through constitutional reform that ‘others’ such as the Québécois and First Nations in Canada and Māori in New Zealand can establish socially inclusive laws and political and legal institutions that actualize their ‘distinct society’ and ‘partnership’ status. (2)

Although I will turn to further discussion of identity politics below, it is important to note here that, historically, constitutional reforms were precluded by Eurocentric discourses that include indigenous cultures on the terms of dominant systems of government. How, then, have the discourses of multiculturalism and biculturalism advocated the actualization of equality while also recognizing the ‘distinct’ positions of indigenous cultures within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand?

In Canada, official ‘distinct society’ status has been limited to the province of Quebec. As Joseph notes, “[h]istorically, the Québécois were granted special constitutional provisions for political and legal representation in Canada while the First Nations were marginalized” (2). While the rest of Canada adopted British legal systems, for example, the province of Quebec maintained French systems, and today the French language remains the only official provincial language within Quebec. By the mid-1940s, provisions for the protection of French language and law in Quebec had divided the nation, prompting Hugh MacLennan’s Governor General’s award-winning book, *Two Solitudes* (1945), which explores the ambivalent relationships between Anglophones and Francophones¹⁰ This book attempts to negotiate a hybrid

¹⁰ According to Smyth Groening, this novel encapsulates the “search for the perfect hybrid of French and English in the creation of the completely bicultural Paul Tallard” (121). However, Groening points out that this search remains unfulfilled, as “[t]here is little question in our minds which language McLennan’s bilingual Paul Tallard will choose for his novel”: English (121).

relationship within the binary relationship between the two ‘founding’ nations of Canada recognized in official government discourses of the time, discourses excluding the First Nations peoples, as well as countless immigrant groups, from partnership status in the nation.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the relationships between Quebec and the rest of Canada became a central concern for the national government, and various cultural groups—fearful that they would lose all recognition within a bilingual and potentially bicultural framework—began to fight for greater recognition. In response to these conditions, the word “multicultural came into general usage in the late 1950s in Canada. . . . [T]he first use of multiculturalism was in a Canadian government report, *The Preliminary Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, which came out in 1965” (Stratton and Ang 128). Canadian multiculturalism, then, has its roots in a “bilingual framework” discussed in relation to biculturalism (Goodrich). It emerged to accommodate cultures other than simply the Francophones largely located in Quebec and Anglophones in the rest of Canada, within governmental discourses. Government discourses accommodated linguistic minorities within ‘official’ bilingualism: they focused on simultaneously ensuring the survival of traditions and the integration of these traditions into (progressive) dominant systems supported by the nation-state.

The 1965 Commission’s findings fit into this utopian-progressive paradigm; they “challenged all Canadians to accept cultural pluralism, while encouraging them to participate fully and equally in Canadian society” (Goodrich). The Commission’s

members

urged a new model of citizen participation. . . . Unlike the melting pot model of the United States, they preferred the idea of a cultural mosaic—unique parts fitting together into a unified whole. Ethnicity, they argued, did not undermine Canadian identity. It was Canadian identity.

(Goodrich)

How, then, does culture function within the Canadian idea(l) of the mosaic? How is it written into, and out of, the Canadian story of multiculturalism?

The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism's final report (1967) defines culture as "a way of being, thinking, and feeling. A driving force animating a significant group of individuals united by a common tongue, and sharing the same customs, habits, and experiences" (qtd in Joseph 5). Cultures provide the individual pieces within the mosaic, never blending into one another but existing within a contained, utopian proper place. This place is envisioned from the outside-in, as an outside system determines how cultures must fit into the place of the nation. According to Goodrich, even early multicultural discourses proclaim that "Canada's future depends on the commitments of its citizens to a unified Canadian identity, while still taking pride in the uniqueness of their individual heritage." Early expressions of multiculturalism pushed for unity without indicating how it might function in relation to official plurality. Within this discourse, 'Canadian' unity took precedence over 'heritage' in daily living. Culture continued to function as a utopian entity located within the progressive story of unified, Canadian identity.

In the 1980s, Canadian multiculturalism became entrenched in law through the

Canada Act (1982), which allowed Canada to amend its own constitution, and the Constitution Act (1982), which further defined the constitution of Canada as separate from Britain. However, these acts maintained similar systems of government and did not represent a major break from historical attitudes towards indigenous peoples. Despite the fact that these acts included the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and its land claim agreements—“section 35 (1) of the Constitution Act 1982 . . . recognized and entrenched aboriginal rights in the Constitution” (Joseph 20)—they did not lead to large scale changes in the treatment of Aboriginal peoples demonstrating the recognition of their rights. Instead, these Acts, and other government discourses of the time, express a commitment to Canadian identity unified through multiculturalism. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988), the first legislation of its kind in the world, “recognize[s] and promote[s] the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage.” Focus on heritage here falls in line with cultural containment within the utopian-progressive paradigm. Another tenet of this act supports the progressive: to “promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to that participation.” Diversity continues to be celebrated as monumentally Canadian, while participation as a citizen takes place in accordance with national, neocolonial discursive systems. Cultural difference—the ability to define one’s self in relation to one’s place on one’s own terms— is thus denied.

While Canada is the first nation to develop official discourses and policies of multiculturalism, New Zealand, is one of the first officially ‘bicultural’ nations. Since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (1840), New Zealand has officially recognized two cultures through government: Māori and Pākehā. Unlike Canadian Aboriginal peoples, “Maori were guaranteed numerous rights under the *Treaty of Waitangi*, four Maori seats in the House of Representatives and a separate justice system pursuant to s. 71 of the *Constitution Act 1852* which was, to a lesser extent, similar to the representation, justice, and language rights of the Québécois” (Joseph 2). For more than a century, however, biculturalism retained little impact on the national culture of New Zealand. It was the Māori Renaissance, discussed in the Introduction, which “led to the emergence of bicultural ways of ‘doing and viewing’ in many areas of everyday life in Aotearoa New Zealand. Bicultural modes of thinking and acting, in fact, became so pronounced a feature of Aotearoa New Zealand life that by 1990 they had become incorporated into ‘official culture’” (M. King, Hill and Haas 7). This national recognition through culture is key to Māori, as Aotearoa New Zealand has an unwritten constitution; “[t]here is no entrenched constitutional recognition of Māori rights or of the Treaty within the unwritten constitution of New Zealand” (Joseph 12). Instead, cultural recognition, along with “common law has evolved in a manner that directly recognizes aboriginal rights” (Joseph 21).¹¹ As will be discussed further below, this legal recognition does not fully satisfy the ‘politics of recognition’ necessary for full access to citizens’ rights.

The evolution of New Zealand biculturalism can be traced back to the Treaty of Waitangi itself, and this document remains much debated today. The treaty is

¹¹ The State-owned Enterprises Act (1986) enshrined the Treaty of Waitangi into common law

written in both English and Māori, but there are some important differences in translation. In particular, the issue of governance remains unclear: the idea of Eurocentric sovereignty did not fit into Māori worldviews and was difficult to express in the Māori language. Representatives of the Crown, including Hobson, “stressed the Treaty’s benefits while playing down the effects of British sovereignty on rangatiratanga (often translated as chieftainship or authority, which was promised to the chiefs in Article II of the Māori Treaty text)” (“Story”). Contemporary government documents, including the “Story of the Treaty,” recognize explicitly the problematic nature and history of this founding government document. Although “Section 9 of the State-Owned Enterprises Act 1986 accorded statutory recognition to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and remains the strongest formulation of the Treaty principles in New Zealand legislation,” the nature of the “partnership” determined to be *the* “key concept defining the relationship between the parties to the Treaty,” remains in flux and, as a result, the nature of biculturalism within Aotearoa New Zealand continues to evolve over time (“Inquiry”).¹²

Māori indigeneity was recognized as central to Aotearoa New Zealand government itself in an important political way in 1867. In the same year that the British North America Act failed to recognize indigenous peoples as more than wards of the state, the New Zealand Parliament granted suffrage to Māori men over the age of twenty-one and agreed to set aside four seats in parliament specifically for Māori.

¹² According to the “Inquiry to Review New Zealand’s Constitutional Arrangements,” “the relationship created “responsibilities analogous to fiduciary duties” through which parties to the Treaty were to act towards each other “reasonably and in the utmost good faith.” The duty of the Crown was not “merely passive but extends to active protection of Māori people in the use of their lands and waters to the fullest extent practicable.”

The conditions of suffrage did recognize one aspect of Māori worldviews: Māori men were given suffrage regardless of land holdings, a concession granted in recognition of Māori communal land ownership. It is important to note, however, that “four seats was a fairly modest concession: on a per capita basis at that time, Maori deserved 14 to 16 members (Europeans then had 72)” (“Maori”). Members of parliament also expected it to be a temporary measure, as in five years time it was thought Māori would have assimilated into a Eurocentric land ownership system. However, in 1876—the same year Canada’s Indian Act was passed—the Māori seats were made permanent.

In some ways the Māori of Aotearoa New Zealand have been granted similar status to Quebec’s ‘distinct society’; for example, Māori became one of Aotearoa New Zealand’s official languages as a result of the Māori Language Act (1987). Language is one way in which it becomes possible to begin to define cultures on the terms of the minority. Biculturalism, expressed through official bilingualism, affords Māori an official full partnership status that Canadian official multiculturalism does not offer to Aboriginal Canadians: it theoretically places indigenous cultures on equal footing with European cultures within official government discourses. As Joseph discusses, in both Canada and New Zealand biculturalism indicates minority influence in law, politics, and national institutions. “Indeed, biculturalism refers to a process where two separate nations exist within the geo-political jurisdictions of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand with control over their own affairs. Furthermore, it is essential that both groups are recognized and defined in their terms” (Joseph 7). According to Joseph, this occurs for both Québécois in Canada and Māori in Aotearoa

New Zealand, but is denied to Aboriginal Canadians. As a result, Canada's multiculturalism exists in an ambivalent relationship with bicultural bilingualism.

However, the partnership status of Māori does not translate into a true bicultural polity in Aotearoa New Zealand, as New Zealand maintains Eurocentric systems of government and Māori participation within these systems remains limited. As will be discussed further below, Māori people remain socio-economically disadvantaged within Aotearoa New Zealand society, and Māori worldviews are largely unrecognized. In the 1980s and 1990s, however, the Crown

acknowledged that, as part of its own contribution to the bicultural polity, it needed to play a crucial role in accommodating Maori forms and aspirations. It had come to appreciate that these aspirations were generally couched in terms of demands that it meet the promises it had made to its Maori partners at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi; and that, therefore, improving its relationship with Maori meant officially elevating the Treaty to take into account its perennial and central significance to Maori. (M. King, Hill, and Haas 7)

This elevation included the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975, a court empowered to deal with emerging Māori grievances of the time. In 1985, this court's jurisdiction was extended to include grievances arising since the signing of the Treaty itself in 1840.

The Waitangi Tribunal, which attempts to recognize Māori worldviews within the legal system, does not represent so much an expression of biculturalism, but rather of what Rata refers to as bi-ethnicism. According to Rata, "[a]lthough the term

‘ethnicity’ replaced ‘race’ in the 1970s, ethnicity retains the idea that socio-cultural differences are linked to genetic/biological origins” (6). Both the establishment of Māori electorates and the Tribunal represent attempts to integrate Māori into Aotearoa New Zealand in the long term, while both often pit Māori against European systems of land ownership and law. Although official discourses of biculturalism support the empowerment of Māori culture, they do not always support the establishment of relations between cultures, and the result is an ambivalent relationship between Māori and Pākehā perpetuating the utopian-progressive paradigm. Māori are expected to fulfill their binary position in relation to Pākehā dominance, maintaining a degree of separation from Pākehā systems while participating—albeit not always successfully—in those systems as citizens.

In a different way, official multiculturalism collapses the distinctions between various minority cultures in Canada, as this pluralist discourse can “have a leveling effect by classifying differences equally [and] . . . neutraliz[ing] the special status of . . . ‘founding nations’” (Joseph 29). Whereas biculturalism represents a discursive system enabling Māori culture through granting it ‘official’ partnership within national culture, Canadian multiculturalism often downplays autochthonous privilege in favour of the shared circumstances of multiple cultures as minorities.

In addition to failing to address the complexity of the minority populations’ subject positions within these pluralist discourses, contemporary Canadian multiculturalism and New Zealand biculturalism also fail to negotiate the complexity of indigeneity within the larger historical and contemporary discourses concerning intercultural relations within these nation-states. Canadian multiculturalism exists in

an ambivalent relationship with bicultural bilingualism, while New Zealand biculturalism does not address the multicultural realities of that nation. Because both systems exist within the utopian-progressive paradigm, these complexities are erased; minority cultures are contained, while members of these cultural groups are expected to progressively assimilate into the contemporary culture of the nation as citizens.

As part of this process, indigenous cultures are required to function as the history of the nation while Aboriginal and Māori people are encouraged to fit into the progressive place of the nation. What neither system does is enable the establishment of processual relations between cultures within the national culture, because “Anglo-European values and culture continues to dominate [both] societies, [their] constitutional frameworks, and public institutions” (Joseph 8). As Joseph states, “Biculturalism indicates two styles of living that are distinct, even though they obviously have much in common. Cultural duality cannot be taken to mean a mixture of the two cultures . . . [as] each has its own existence” (Joseph 7). Multiculturalism, too, encourages this separation. I contend that official discourses of both multiculturalism and biculturalism contain indigenous cultures within the utopian-progressive paradigm by erasing the ambivalence of the utopian-progressive paradigm.

In other words, both discursive systems set up relations among cultures and between cultures and the nation premised on the utopian-progressive paradigm. The results include two pluralist systems focusing on integration that each properly place indigenous cultures as utopian, and indigenous peoples as striving—and often failing—to fit into the progressive place of the nation. I will turn now to a discussion

of pluralist integration instigated by King. I will draw on the critical theories of Lefebvre to interrogate the reliance of official multiculturalism and biculturalism on Karamcheti's reading codes of stasis, binarism, and atextuality discussed in Chapter Four. This spiral reading disrupts the processes integration enacted and recognizes the ambivalence these discursive systems inhabit within the contemporary place of the nation.

Pluralist Integration: Containing Culture within the Utopian-Progressive State

King critically negates the pluralist integration set up through historical discourses by setting up a problematic intercultural relationship between Latisha, a Blackfoot, and her white American husband George Morningstar. King's story enables questioning of the concept of binary power relations between members of minority and majority cultures, as he sets initially sets up this relationship on George's terms. Examining intercultural relations through a contemporary married couple enables the critical negation of discourses that fix indigenous cultures in the past and those that attempt to 'fix' Aboriginal people by requiring that they fit into Eurocentric notions of progress.

From the outset of his relationship with his Aboriginal partner, George attempts to fix Latisha from his dominant point of view. At the tourist-oriented Indian Days, her affirmative answer to his initial question – whether she was born on the reserve – pleases him because her connection to Aboriginal place allows him to cast her as “a real Indian” (133). He “takes a fix” on Latisha, blurring the traditional traveler/host binary addressed in Chapter Four by using what she acknowledges as his

“one great quality”: he “made you believe that he was listening, made you believe that what you had to say was important, made you believe that he was interested” (133). Through this emphasis on inclusion, he reflects the benevolent nature of pluralist discourses empowering all.

George builds similarities in what appears to be an effort to include Latisha in his world. This inclusion reflects the neocolonial desire for accessible, objectified cultural diversity. It expresses a desire Bhabha locates at the heart of intercultural relations set up on dominant terms, a “desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*” (*Location 86*, original emphasis). George takes Latisha to the Blossom library for the first time, where he leads her to classical music (134) and, for their anniversary, he gives her his copy of *The Prophet*. In this book, the “chosen and beloved” hero, Almustafa, mirrors George’s subject position. As a traveler, Almustafa must move on, “for to stay . . . is to freeze and crystallize and be bound in a mould.” (Gibran) George’s philosophy of life – “You’ve got to move with the times, Country Things that stand still, die” (190) – does not, however, prevent him from continually ‘fixing’ Latisha in the past as Aboriginal.

Morningstar’s need to cast Latisha within the utopian-progressive paradigm leads him to encourage the establishment of a binary relationship between them. Latisha chooses the object position closest to George’s subject, becoming his wife in a partnership in which she is always ‘almost the same but not quite’ and, indeed, “*almost the same but not white*” (Bhabha *Location 89*). George seeks to control the differences between them through ‘fixing’ Latisha in place—as *his* Canadian, who he

renames 'Country'. Binary "comparisons [were] a trademark of his conversations," (157), and his series of dichotomies based on his constructions of 'American' and 'Canadian' pit him as a Euro-American against his Aboriginal Canadian wife.¹³

George continually attempts to control Latisha's subjectivity from his dominant perspective, using discursive systems to argue that "Americans were modern, poised to take advantage of the future, to move ahead. Canadians were traditionalists, stuck in the past and unwilling to take chances" (158). George moves into, and out of, Latisha's cultural location on his own terms. As a member of dominant white culture, George determines what things from 'the other side' are worth keeping. When he discovers a fringed leather jacket that used to belong to a relative, he states that "It's history . . . Most old things are worthless. This is history" (192). King demonstrates here that his stories are particularly open to spiral reading strategies, as he locates history in his stories, questioning who has the authority to legitimate what constitutes that discourse.

When Latisha critically negates his authority, stating cynically "guess you got to know which is which" (192), she begins the process of envisioning her own world from the inside-out. However, without imaginative affirmation, her emergent perspective brings her harm: she is beaten for not knowing her position as Other. Latisha is not meant to develop alternative points of view; within the utopian-progressive paradigm she is meant to enact cultural diversity, primarily for George's

¹³ Much should be said about this complex relationship between George as an American male and Latisha as an Aboriginal Canadian female. I choose to focus here on the 'race relations' inherent in their partnership, as this is key to my examination of intercultural relations between dominant and minority cultures within multiculturalism. However, this is not to deny the additional complexity of this case; anything beyond the cursory examination of the 'American'-'Canadian' binary presented here, as well as issues of gender, is beyond the scope of my focus in this thesis and will be the subject of further work.

entertainment, as well as improve herself through his ‘cultured’ teachings.

By critically negating George’s perspective and negotiating its relationship with her own, Latisha develops an interstitial perspective. She critically negates George’s definition of an Aboriginal artifact from her position as both an Aboriginal woman and his wife. As Bhabha contends, the interstitial space opened up within binary relationships offers a site from which to seize the ambivalence inherent in representations of power relationships. Through the story of Latisha and George, King unsettles the power relations inherent in the binary relationship between colonizer and colonized which continues to impact Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand in the form of relationships between (Eurocentric) majority cultures and (indigenous) minority cultures. Instead, he casts this binary as in process, enabling the negotiation of relations between cultures and the catachrestic identities of indigenous peoples within the place of the nation. The place he creates for this intercultural relationship mirrors the systems of control enabled by multicultural discourses within the place of the nation. How, then, do other critics write of this place and unsettle the power structures King identifies?

‘L’espace Homogéné-brisé: Critiquing Containment Strategies

According to Ang and Stratton, state-sanctioned multiculturalism is “a top-bottom political strategy implemented by the state to accommodate the inclusion of ethnic minorities within the national culture and to ‘manage cultural diversity’” (95). Lefebvre discusses this containment strategy in terms of ‘l’espace homogéné-brisé,’ a theorization of the state that I argue spatializes the utopian-progressive paradigm.

The space of the nation- state enables cultural diversity within a larger national culture, and thus appears to accommodate both homogeneity and fracture, while the third term allowing this accommodation—hierarchization—remains under erasure. Applying Lefebvre’s ‘l’espace homogéné-brisé’ to both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand makes apparent their shared— and continuing—reliance on masking catachreses through illusions.

L’espace homogéné-brisé—through statism—emerges as an ‘ideal,’ indeed ‘natural,’ state through the joint ‘realistic illusion’ and ‘illusion of transparency’ discussed in Chapter One. The illusion of transparency allows space to be seen as a container for the common sense values supported by the ‘realistic illusion,’ so that what *is* ‘known’ within the nation appears to be the sole possibility for what can be known.¹⁴ State space thus becomes ‘dominant space’, which can be “characterized by the following two elements: it imposes itself upon those who threaten to pulverize the conditions for social life; and it forbids the transgressions that tend to produce a different space (whatever that might be)”(Lefebvre “Space” 92). Place (in Tuan’s terms) seeks to fuse l’espace homogéné-brisé. What emerges is a utopian discourse that attempts to manipulate place not only as natural, but also as an ideal.¹⁵ Because the State desires that this appear timeless, “the state crushes time by reducing differences to repetitions or circularities”. Unlike the centre-margin dialectic of colonialism and the linear narrative of progress, the State “imposes itself as the stable centre”(Lefebvre *Production* 23). Reading codes foregrounding stasis prevail within

¹⁴ See Lefebvre’s *Production of Space* (28).

¹⁵ Lefebvre writes, “[s]ome people—most, in fact—define [the nation-state] as a sort of substance which has sprung up from nature (or more specifically from a territory with ‘natural’ borders and grown to maturity with historical time” (*Production* 111). King in particular challenges the ‘natural’ presence and nature of borders. See Chapter Two of this thesis.

discourses supporting the conceptualization of nations in this way.

However, in attempting to constitute a perfect, utopian place, the State must contain indigenous cultures, while also seeking to assimilate and integrate indigenous peoples progressively. The result is a static place Lefebvre contends leads to catastrophic rupture:

The catastrophe consists in the fact that state space hinders the transformation that would lead to the production of a differential space. State space subordinates both chaos and difference to its implacable logistics. It does not eliminate the chaos, but manages it.

. . . We know too well that this logic is empty only in appearance.

(Lefebvre “Space” 99)

There is no room in this place for more than a singular archive and Eurocentric points of view. However, according to Lefebvre, the fracture inherent in national homogeneity will eventually show through the illusion of transparency, exposing the state’s visual logic and its promotion of “a moral and political order . . . [which only] seems to flow directly from the Logos—that is, from a ‘consensual’ embrace of the rational” (Lefebvre *Production* 317).

Nation-states’ inability to spatialize difference relates to their inability to sanction cultural difference. This, in turn, prevents both Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand from enabling active democratic citizenship for all members of their societies. Lefebvre contends, “throughout the history of the so-called ‘modern’ world (the word often referring to only one of its aspects, technology), the gap between human rights and citizens’ rights has widened” (Lefebvre “Social Pact” 249).

According to Lefebvre, the rights of the citizen include not only voting, but also information, free expression, culture¹⁶, identity within difference (and equality), self-management, and services (including travel without difficulty) (Lefebvre “Social Pact” 250-3). Because many of these remain inaccessible to a significant proportion of Aboriginal and Māori peoples, ‘indigenous citizenship’ emerges as a catachresis, as the minority status of indigenous cultures ensures that the dominant culture can continue to (mis)manage their proper placement, while Aboriginal and Māori are denied these “rights of the citizen” within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively.¹⁷

Because the governments of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand are founded on Eurocentric discourses, they continue to envision their respective nations within the utopian-progressive paradigm. For example, official government discourses proclaim Canadian multiculturalism is “fundamental to our belief that all citizens are equal” (www.canadianheritage.gc.ca); but this hides the containment agenda. The Canadian Heritage website goes on to assert that multiculturalism not only allows all citizens to “keep their identities, take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging” but also maintains that “through multiculturalism Canada recognizes the potential of all Canadians, encouraging them to integrate into their society.” Thus,

¹⁶ ‘Culture’ here is described as not only tourism, but “explor[ation of] the world... connot[ing] a horizon and a path, rather than steps taken along it.” (*Production* 252). Lefebvre’s conceptualization of culture fits with my own advocacy of culture as a location promoting a relational-processual paradigm. Culture, here, enables differential worldviews.

¹⁷ An extended engagement with indigenous population’s access to “citizen’s rights” in both Canada and New Zealand is beyond the scope of this thesis. For an interesting discussion of contemporary access and the specifics of Aboriginal rights legislation in Canada, see editor Raymond Samuells’ *Toward a Native-Canadian Equal Rights Amendment: Replacing the Current Official Languages and Indian Acts in Favour of a Rejuvenated Constitutional Framework for the Preservation and Promotion of Aboriginal Languages and Cultures*. For an excellent discussion of this theme in the Aotearoa New Zealand context, see Ranginui Walker’s *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without End*.

‘official’ multiculturalism advocates for indigenous cultural rights while subsuming these rights under Eurocentric, citizens’ rights. Pluralism is key to multiculturalism, but the underlying agenda inherent in such discourses remains utopian-progressive integration.

Sneja Gunew outlines several ways in which pluralist politics (she refers here to Australian multiculturalism) participate in the continuing colonization of indigenous peoples. Pluralist politics solidify the binary relationship between Europeans and settler- invaders, and the reading codes—stasis, binarism, and atextuality—emerging from discourses of pluralism reflect this. However, the emphasis on integration and inclusion of indigenous cultures as central to the story of the nation ensures that their ‘cultural survival’ is placed on the nation’s agenda. The nation becomes involved in the process of “rescuing what they can of their own cultural history” (Gunew “Denaturalizing” 104). As a result of this focus,

[m]ulticulturalism becomes too often an effective process of recuperation whereby diverse cultures are returned homogenized as folkloric spectacle. The recuperation serves to legitimate a European charter myth of origins which, in the name of civilization and progress, condones those 200 years of colonial rule. . . . In this formation, multiculturalism functions to amalgamate and spuriously to unify nationalism and culture into a depoliticised multi-media event. (Gunew “Denaturalizing” 12)

Continued emphasis on folklorization of difference and inclusion, then, ensures that pluralist discourses promote equality cast within discourses promoting cultural diversity, rather than cultural difference.

Himani Bannerji sees this emphasis as culminating specifically in a containment strategy that functions to control proper placement of minority cultures from Eurocentric points of view. To her, “Multiculturalism is a way of managing the seepage of persistent subjectivity of people . . . that are seen as undesirable because they have once been colonized, now neo-colonized” (146-7). Managed in this way, Aboriginal Canadian and Aotearoa New Zealand Māori subjectivity, in their positive forms, involve the ability to seep into the fabric of the nation-state by fitting into its progressive framework. This involves having been colonized historically and subsequently being able to embody the story of that colonization as a utopian element of the national story. Aboriginal and Māori people become ‘undesirable’ when this colonization is read in counterpoint with contemporary (neo)colonization: identifying tourist sites as problematically neocolonial reflects a failure of full colonial assimilation. Full assimilation would render such limited representations unproblematic.

Integration fulfills this desire by requiring indigenous cultures to assimilate into the ‘white’ place of the Nation. Neocolonial tourism provides one series of sites perpetuating the integration of the ‘Aboriginal’ into Canada and ‘Māori’ into Aotearoa New Zealand, as it limits cultural locations through proper placement in the past. These cultures are included, but on the terms of the Eurocentric dominant culture. This inclusion, supporting Bhabha’s ‘cultural diversity,’ ensures that, by relegating them to the past, indigenous worldviews are located in the discursive formations of these contemporary nations but cannot be equal. Equality—given form through subjectivity—is denied when objectified indigeneity is forced into a

controlled relationship with dominant systems of knowledge.

As a result, ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Zealand Māori’ remain catachreses.

Proper Placement: Managing the ‘Aboriginal’ in Canada and ‘Māori’ in New Zealand

I have traced the evolution of the catachrestic locations of the indigenous cultures of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand within the assimilative and integrationist discourses of these places as colonies and nations. In both of these nations, indigenous cultures continue to make up a minority of the population: in Canada, indigenous peoples make up four percent of the population and, in Aotearoa New Zealand, members of other cultures outnumber Māori by a ratio of four to one. This factor perpetuates binary relationships between the Eurocentric majority and its Others, as well as the atextual reading of minority cultures as static entities. An examination of the resulting catachreses of ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Zealand Māori’ unsettles the values promoted within these two nation- states in contemporary times.

Minority status exists in an ambivalent relationship to the core values associated with pluralist discourses premised on utopian equality and progressive inclusion. In an interview with *Diversity* magazine, Sheila Copps, then Minister of Canadian Heritage, draws on government research done for the *Citizens Dialogue on Canada’s Future: A 21st Century Social Contract* in order to encode

six core Canadian values: shared community—i.e. despite their differences, Canadians have a unique bond; equity and justice—i.e. each person is respected, valued, and treated the same; respect for diversity—

i.e. we value the contributions of all Canada's cultures and traditions; mutual responsibility—i.e. with rights, each citizen has responsibilities; accountability; and democracy—i.e. citizens take ownership of government (4).

The values coded by Copps here can be traced in the stories of assimilation and integration discussed throughout this project. Indigenous cultures are included within the national community on Eurocentric terms promoting utopian concepts of equity and justice that can be traced back to the colonizers' cultures. This inclusion archives citizens' proper places within discourses promoting a shared responsibility to be accountable within the national democratic discursive system.

How do King and Grace respond to the management strategies of pluralist discourses? How do they promote new places locating indigenous cultures—*turangawaewae*, speaking places—from which to negotiate the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial and promote catachrestic citizenship in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand?

Both King and Grace critically negate neocolonial discourses and intercultural relations that can be linked to pluralist paradigms. However, in order for equality and inclusion to apply to indigenous cultures within these pluralist systems, both 'culture' and 'place' must be cast within a relational-processual paradigm and envisioned from inside-out perspectives. Subjectivity and agency emerge as interdependent in King's and Grace's stories in different ways: one's identity is negotiated in relationship to one's location. In creating characters that foreground this interdependent relationship between self and place, King and Grace turn the management strategies of pluralist

discourses on their head. They demonstrate that, rather than including indigenous peoples, national places can leave people lost. Rather than sharing in ‘community,’ ‘equity,’ and ‘justice,’ some characters are excluded and rendered incapable of fulfilling progressive notions of national ‘responsibility.’

At the opening of *Cousins*, Mata wanders through the streets without direction; she had “[w]alked enough, and didn’t know how she had come to be in the middle of the road” (11). She is completely disconnected from place, even from the dust created from her own footsteps, which ceases to be hers as soon as she moves forward. It is “[h]ers, not hers. . . . Unowned. Nothing owned nothing owed as she’d made her way, spoken to only by signs” (11). Mata embodies a sense of brokenness. She is incapable of negotiating a sense of self in relation to place because of her inability to engage with the discourses of the nation. She symbolizes what Makareta defines as Māori ‘truth’: “[o]ur truth does not appear on pages of books unless it is there between the lines. Our truths need to be revealed. On the faces the truth is written, on the scarred and broken faces, in the sick, disabled bodies, in the dreamless frightened eyes” (210). Despite her ‘bicultural’ hybrid subject position – she had a Māori mother and a Pākehā father – Mata is incapable of negotiating subjectivity and agency in her location.

Mata’s vision demonstrates her failure to negotiate her own relationship to a disconnected world. The signs Mata encounters appear random, but they are all in English and reflect Aotearoa New Zealand usage specifically:

Cross, Wait, Switch, Go Slow, Keep Clear, King Bun, Red Hot Specials,
Neon Tops, Book Exchange, Open, Natural Health, Sticky Filth,

Vacancy, Family Planning, Showing Daily 6 and 8p.m., Travel
 Rarotonga Hawaii, Apply Within, Way Down Sale, Sorry We Are
 Closed, Stow It Don't Throw It, Greenstone, Shark Teeth, To Clear,
 Paradiso, B. Y. O., One Hour Photos, Conjugal Rights, Unauthorized
 Vehicles will be Towed Away. (12)

Mata is moving through Aotearoa New Zealand, but there is no connection between her and this place. In fact, she expressly avoids making this connection, refusing to ask “Where? Didn't want to ask where or why, or to have thoughts that lead to thinking” (13). Her inability to connect to place is directly related to her inability—and her desire—to assert her identity. Mata “[o]nly wanted hands in shoes in pockets and just herself, her own ugly self, with her own big feet and big hands, her own wide face, her own bad hair, which was turning white, springing out round her big head” (14). The things she clings to, including “a photo [of her mother] in a frame, and her name. . . . Just herself and her name, Mata Pairama” (14) demonstrate her awareness that her connection with her familial history and Māori culture are key to survival.

Her assertion of this name is significant, as Mata was raised in an orphanage where her name was changed to Mae and she was encouraged to desire a Pākehā home and progressive way of life, fully assimilated into dominant society. Her rejection of the progressive societal norms—she walks out of her home and leaves all she owns—reflects her rejection of ‘progressive biculturalism.’ What she keeps is a monocultural notion of self—a picture of her Māori mother, ownership of the ‘bad hair’ she'd been forced to control and cut at the orphanage, and her Māori name. Rejection of her bicultural reality does not lead her to a viable sense of self, however;

the answers to all of her emerging questions are ‘Nowhere’ ‘No reason’ ‘Nothing’ ‘No one’ (14).

Especially important here is Mata’s simultaneous inability and unwillingness to relate to others. She is detached not only from Aotearoa New Zealand, the place, but also from the community of Aotearoa New Zealanders she moves through:

Joggers emerged in clothing that said Bali, Hawaii, Love Your Heart, U.S.A , Rhenneck, Nike, Tauranga, Canada, Lion Brown, Petone, Poneke, Italia, Masterton, Sydney, New York, Rage Without Alcohol, Kiwi, Ultra, Railways, Don’t Worry Be Happy, Aotearoa. She’d gathered the words to her to keep thoughts and thinking away, walking on to early afternoon, to late afternoon, to evening, to night, to the middle of the night, to the middle of the road, going nowhere
—until her feet had stopped” (25).

Here, Mata expressly refuses the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial: she is attempting to shut down the reality that she must live in a place, must interact with place, and with community. She embodies the catachresis of New Zealand Māori; indeed, she is disembodied by this subject position.

Makareta, in contrast, negotiates the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial and the utopian-progressive paradigm to live in a bicultural world. She draws on her relationship with Kui Hinemate, her deceased elder, in her early nursing career. “When there were things that felt wrong for [her]—touching the dead who were not [her] own dead to touch . . . —[Kui] helped [her] to have the right karakia to

say and to do [her] own cleansing” (204).¹⁸ Makareta also accompanied her Pākehā husband Mick “to the right social occasions and knew all the right things to do and say. [She] organized dinner parties and felt at ease in any company” (205). Makareta embodies the utopian progressive paradigm of biculturalism, but although she negotiates the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial, she still maintains the catachrestic relationship between Aotearoa New Zealand and Māori. Hers “was a double life, as [her] life always had been in the city, but it became less difficult as [she] understood it more” (204).¹⁹

Part of this understanding involved accepting that she was considered “an oddity in the various circles. Exotica of a sort.” (204). In her bicultural world, Makareta becomes conscious of the fact that “[p]eople were careful, or careless, when they spoke to [her], but the careful and careless alike had an awareness of [her], a certain wariness, because there was a whole otherness to [her] that was beyond their comprehension” (204). This lack of comprehension about utopian Māori culture extends, Makareta notes, to a lack of knowledge concerning historical and contemporary Māori colonization that is masked within contemporary discourses of biculturalism.

People need to know that there has been a massive robbery. There’s been treachery, and they, the victims, are receiving the punishment day by day. Loser pays. If they have not fought bravely, or at all, it is because theft has been complete and includes theft of will to fight, theft of will to

¹⁸ A karakia is an “incantation; spell; (modern use) worship” (Reed 16).

¹⁹ Makareta has been read as embodying urban Māori politics. See Serge A. Marek’s dissertation – “Maori urban geographies of whakamanatanga: Empowered Maori urbanism, space/place-based social movements and practices of everyday life” – for further discussion of urban Māori politics of location.

survive. (215)

Grace here exposes the theft of cultural identity as a violent act of colonization. She also insists on reading history in relation to stories, making sure that colonial stories are read in relation to contemporary stories of inclusion.

Spivak argues the violence of colonial discourse is inherent in binary relations between ‘the West’ and ‘the Rest.’ According to Spivak,

the so-called non-West’s turn toward the West is a command. That turn was not in order to fulfill some longing to consolidate a pure space for ourselves, that turn was a command. . . . One has to reverse the binary opposition, and today of course, since there is now a longing once again for the pure Other of the West, we post-colonial intellectuals are told that we are too Western, and what goes completely unnoticed is that our turn to the West is in response to a command, whereas the other is to an extent a desire marking the place of the management of crisis.

(“Criticism” 8)

These binary relations and the resulting catachrestic identity formations, integral to this dissertation, reflect the end result of crisis (mis)management through the utopian-progressive paradigm: the catastrophic rupture theorized by Lefebvre which results in an identity crisis. Discourses of multiculturalism and biculturalism systematically erase their shared command that minority cultures integrate and assimilate into the place of the nation on the terms of dominant, Eurocentric culture.

In her response to power relations, however, Makareta acknowledges the problematic dialogical nature of recognition itself. Taylor argues that the “crucial

feature of human life is its fundamentally dialogical character. We become fully human agents, capable of understanding ourselves and hence of defining our identity, through our acquisition of rich human language of expression” (102).²⁰ Taylor’s ideas here appear to be, at first, an easy fit with the indigenous relational worldviews discussed throughout this dissertation. However, Makareta challenges the terms of this dialogue and the ways in which the ‘language of stories’ of neocolonial discourses has disempowered her peoples. In *Cousins* Makareta demonstrates, as do many characters in Grace’s texts, that the ‘language of stories’ is alive and well in Māori culture.

As a result, Makareta enacts Coulthard’s ‘transformative praxis’: she “begin[s] to critically reclaim and reevaluate the worth of [*her*] *own* histories, traditions, cultures, and identities against the subjectifying gaze and assimilative pull of colonial recognition” (Coulthard 453). She negotiates catachrestic identity formations common in King’s and Grace’s work, subjectivities that appear to be the negative result of a national identity crisis, in that members of indigenous cultures are often cast as being lost as a result of ambivalent relationships to national narratives foregrounding both utopian inclusion and progressive equality. However, an examination of the ‘how’ of power relations—the archive and discourses of pluralism—reveals that the neocolonial ‘command’ identified by Spivak relies on specific perspectives and reading codes for its maintenance.

As Spivak discusses, however, the ambivalence inherent in catachrestic identity formations should be recognized as not only bringing the place of the nation

²⁰ Here Taylor’s use of languages is in a “broad sense, covering not only the words we speak, but also other modes of expression whereby we define ourselves, include the ‘languages’ of art, of gesture, of love and the like” (102).

to crisis; catachreses must also ‘claimed’ as capable of opening spaces within the place of the nation itself in which minority cultures can negotiate the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial. King and Grace utilize inside-out perspectives in their negotiation of discursive formations, insisting on the recognition of relational-processual places. They do this on their terms, demonstrating “anti-colonial empowerment’ that refuses both the “reformist politics of recognition and the revolutionary models of social change” discussed by Coulthard.²¹

This negotiation of subjectivity, and the related recognition of place, emerges as central in the novels of King and Grace. Both of these authors recognize and challenge binary cultural relationships supporting catachrestic identity formations, re-visioning the concept of culture from the inside-out. As a result, a redefined concept of ‘culture’ itself emerges in the ambivalent spaces opened up between ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Canadian,’ ‘New Zealand, and ‘Māori’: culture is a shifting, relational entity that enables the establishment of speaking places, *turangawaewae*. Cultural engagements reflect relational-processual paradigms and open up sites for ongoing negotiations of catachrestic citizenship. These engagements can take place anywhere but, for those negotiating the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial, they must negotiate the nation.

The characters discussed in this chapter find different ways to engage with the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial, and their abilities to enact subjectivity and demonstrate agency vary. Through their stories, King and Grace demonstrate, then, that there are many answers to Foucault’s question, how do power relations

²¹ Coulthard’s article, “Subjects of Empire,” is incredibly thorough in its engagement with the politics of recognition and postcolonial responses to these concepts. I hope to address these issues in greater depth and detail in my own further research.

operate in ‘the diversity of their logical sequence, their abilities, and their interrelationships?’ (Foucault “The Subject” 219). In *Green Grass, Running Water*, Coyote continues to question things and play with the world, possibly fathering a child in the process. Latisha opens a diner called ‘Dead Dog Café’ where she plays with historical stereotypes by offering tourists a constructed ‘authentic’ indigenous culture based on a myth: that Aboriginal people eat dog meat. Old Woman goes on to join three other ‘Old Indians’ who, like tricksters, ‘fix up the world.’ In *Cousins*, Makareta becomes a central figure in her urban Maori community, eventually returning to the marae only for her own funeral. Her cousin Mata returns with her, leading the women onto the marae as the recognized tuakana despite her lack of experience with Māori culture.²²

Each of these characters’ stories is different, but they share a commonality: through intercultural relations that were first controlled from the outside-in, these characters came to envision their own subjectivity from the inside-out. Cultural diversity evolved into cultural difference as they, in different ways, negotiated relationships not only with the people around them, but the places in which they lived. Reading King and Grace in counterpoint not only enables one to see multiple ways in which indigenous people might engage with the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial, it also enables a commonality to emerge. The resulting turangawaewae, or speaking places, in which each character locates him or herself share an important quality: they all reflect a relational- processual paradigm. Notions of culture, too, operate in relation and are always in process.

Stratton and Ang’s critique of “multiculturalism’s conservative vision of a

²² As the “elder sibling of the same sex” (Reed 63), Mata leads her ‘sisters’ onto the marae.

unity-in- diversity” ends with their recognition of a potential within pluralism that is relational and processual: “[t]o seize on multiculturalism’s more radical potential is to give up the ideal of national unity itself without doing away with the promise of a flexible, porous, and open- ended national culture” (156). Simpson argues that when one discusses Aboriginal cultures in relation to the ‘contemporary nation’, one must negotiate this potential. She states, “*contemporary* among Mohawks is conjoined to the postmodern, the colonial and pre- colonial – to an indigenous Iroquois past and present” (118), while “*nation*, similarly is a collectively self-conscious, deliberate, and politically expedient formulation and a lived phenomenon” (118). The radical potential of multiculturalism and biculturalism is premised on hybrid relationships between cultures within a relational-processual place.

Spiral reading strategies can activate this potential as I have through reading the novels of King and Grace, indigenous and postcolonial theories, and official pluralist discourses of Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand together and in relation. Spiral reading strategies support what Bhabha terms ‘the multiculturalist cause’: examining community “from the interstitial perspective” (Bhabha *Location* 3). For indigenous peoples, like members of the tribe discussed by Simpson, the contemporary nation “constitute[s] a terrain of consensus, negotiation, disagreement, discord, and hopeful contemplation that connects the categorical ‘Mohawk’ to the individual, their family and the extension of their family to a living entity: their nation” (118).

If culture itself is cast, with ‘contemporary nation’ within the relational-

processual paradigm, the interstitial perspective reminds us that culture itself always exists in relation. In their discourses, King and Grace remind us that, for both Aboriginal and Māori peoples, inside-out perspectives are particular to individuals and always changing, so that indigenous cultures themselves exist in relation and are always in process. King's and Grace's stories, read in counterpoint, show us alternative models of culture and relocate 'Māori' and 'Aboriginal' in relation to 'Aotearoa New Zealand' and 'Canada'. They both imaginatively affirm their relational-processual paradigms and critically negate (neo)colonial discursive formations. Spiral reading strategies enable critics to participate in this process. Together, we can recognize, unsettle, and create anew codes that challenge Eurocentric discourses' denial of indigenous agency within the place of the Nation.

CONCLUSION

Spiral Reading Strategies:

Reading Indigenous Cultures and the Nation

*A recited society . . . [is] defined by stories . . . by citations of stories, and by the interminable recitation of stories. (Michel de Certeau in *The Practice of Everyday Life*)*

*This train of stories defined our lives, curving out from points on the spiral in ever-widening circles from which neither beginnings nor endings could be defined. (Roimata in Patricia Grace's *Potiki*)*

*The truth about stories is that's all we are. (Thomas King in *The Truth about Stories*)*

I began this project with the assertion that colonial and neocolonial stories place 'Aboriginal' in Canada and 'Maori' in New Zealand from Eurocentric points of view and that both Canada and New Zealand are 'recited societies,' discursive formations limiting the conceptualization of culture. I have argued that these discursive formations share similar archives that give form to a utopian-progressive paradigm reflected in discourses of cartography, geography, neocolonial tourism, and multiculturalism and biculturalism. This process involved not only linking the construction of place to utopian cultural containment and Eurocentric progress, but also interrogating key discourses of assimilation and integration central to the construction and reconstruction of the idea(l) of the colony and the Nation. A spiral reading of these discourses with a contrapuntal reading of selections from King and Grace as well as indigenous and postcolonial theories exposed a structural ambivalence that, in turn, led to re/placing indigeneity in processual relationships

within the discursive formations of Canada and New Zealand.

Following the spiral, I began with the Introduction, situating my arguments and my own cultural and theoretical locations as a critic in the contemporary moment. In Chapter One, I began with the worlds created by King and Grace through creation stories. I discussed the ways they critically negate biblical and Eurocentric stories and imaginatively affirm a relational-processual paradigm. I read Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516) as a discourse promoting early colonial worldviews at odds with that paradigm, particularly as a result of the ways in which it valorized outside-in perspectives. In Chapters Two and Three, I engaged with discourses mapping colonial assimilationist space and progress before engaging specifically with neocolonial tourism in Chapter Four. In Chapter Five I focused on the pluralist discourses of multiculturalism and biculturalism within Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand respectively.

To conclude a project promoting spiral reading strategies is, at once, antithetical and necessary. Inasmuch as it is important to recognize that these strategies involve continual engagement with historical and contemporary discourses, it is also important to note that these strategies enable specific critical engagements at—and with—interrelated historical and textual moments.¹ Such reading strategies cannot lead to a singular answer, or a simple conclusion, particularly when applied to cultural concerns. This is because, as Hall notes, “[i]dentity is always an open,

¹ New contexts continue to be addressed in current and ongoing research. Interestingly, Anne Katherine Pistacchi's PhD dissertation, “Spiralling Subversions: The Politics of Maori Cultural Survivance in the Recent Critical Fictions of Patricia Grace, Paula Morris, and Kelly Ana Morey” engages with the work of Patricia Grace published between 2001 and 2005, directly following the time period addressed here.

complex, unfinished game—always under construction. . . . [It] moves through into the future by means of a symbolic detour through the past . . . [and] produces new subjects who bear the traces of the specific discourses which not only formed them but enable them to produce themselves anew and differently” (43). This project, then, participates in the game of identity politics. Spiral reading strategies include all the players and ensure that, in each new moment, those with inside-out perspectives participate in making the rules for cultural engagement.

Questions concerning culture and citizenship are not new; however, they have often been raised within debates imbedded in the utopian-progressive paradigm central to the discourses of the colony and Nation. Postcolonial criticism has often been accused of supporting a colonizing critique. Moving beyond a utopian-progressive paradigm involves mobilizing inside-out perspectives that draw on both “*critical negation* (shedding a mentality bred under conditions of colonialism) and *imaginative affirmation* (redefining ‘cultural identities’)” (Wilson 3-4). This creative dialectic enables the envisioning of cultures relationally and in process, while ensuring movement beyond what Foucault recognizes as Eurocentric Truth: a set of beliefs archived within “a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it” (*Power/Knowledge* 133). When I look to the novels of King and Grace as a place to begin, I see sites enabling movement beyond Eurocentric truth that support King’s assertion—through the voice of his narrator in *Green Grass, Running Water*—that “[t]here are no truths. . . . Only stories” (432).

I have been careful, in this dissertation, not to set up a binary opposition between Truth and stories. Eurocentric discursive systems set up this dichotomy, privileging (neo)colonial Truth—in all of its manifestations here discussed—over indigenous stories.

As these Eurocentric systems break down in contemporary times, there is a tendency to valorize indigenous stories as expressions of another Truth. As Laura Smyth Groening points out,

it is time to address what is considered alterNative in a settler colony, to stop using ‘alterNative’ as a synonym for the word ‘Native’ [because] . . . it is to First Nations writing that we must turn if we wish to find an alterNative to the stereotypical images of Aboriginal people that dominate Euro-Canadian literature. (27)

This ‘turn’ to indigenous texts must locate itself within the spiral reading strategies, lest it emerge as supporting new singular conceptions of indigenous culture.

The stories of King and Grace, constituting expressions of indigenous worldviews, never present themselves as singular. They critically negate Eurocentric discursive formations and imaginatively affirm a relational-processual (Foucauldian) governmentality, in that they “structure the possible field of action” (Foucault “Afterword” 95). These stories demonstrate the relationship between government and culture recognized by Brydon in her assertion that the “political will and imagination necessary to diagnose and remedy [many societal problems], as well as the obstacles preventing such action, [are] partly, if not largely, cultural in their formation” (Brydon “Canada” 69). Cultures, then, not only enable subjectivity, but agency. The ability to imagine new spaces and create new places requires negotiations of culture.

The indigenous writers and critics I discuss share Brydon’s view. They assert that indigenous writers and critics participate in creating a ‘new order’ and ‘new form’ through discourse, the relational ‘amalgam of centre and margin’ capable of

moving discourses themselves beyond ‘colonial thought and practice’ and ‘postcolonial and postmodern models’ (see epigraphs, Introduction). The resultant ‘new order of culturalism’ supports speaking places, and *turangawaewae*, as culture—envisioned from the inside-out—supports a place to ‘stand’ and a space from which to ‘travel’ into the unknown.

Such locations are linked in a spiral fashion to the history and traditions of the indigenous cultures I discuss; they remain true to All My Relations and *whakapapa*. As the Māori narrator in *Potiki* states, “what we value doesn’t change just because we look at ourselves and at the future. What we came from doesn’t change. It’s your jumping-off place that tells you where you’ll land. The past is the future” (94). Because the site of enunciation remains true to the relational-processual paradigm, those occupying such ‘Aboriginal’ or ‘Maori’ places can negotiate the spaces inherent within the nations of ‘Canada’ and ‘New Zealand.’

These places are shifting and people must negotiate their relations to them in various ways in the contemporary moment. In *Dogside Story*, Grace is careful not to conflate the physical site of the *marae* with the location of culture itself. Although only fifty people or so live in Dogside, “there were those from elsewhere to whom Dogside was *turangawaewae*, and who had the same rights as those in residence. Dogside was their place to stand, their place to speak and give voice” (139). Through *whakapapa*, they claim land ownership in perpetuity. Although King, too, makes much of connections to specific places in his story, it is the ever-changing cultural *community*—at the Sun Dance and elsewhere—that is key to establishing and maintaining the connection between indigeneity and place. This connection is

ultimately a fluid one; indigenous cultures foreground relationships to place enabling contemporary enunciations of culture.

This act of speaking in the present—of *storytelling*—enacts “the disruptive temporality of enunciation” that Bhabha suggests “displaces the narrative of the Western nation” (“Cultural” 208). Recognizing culture as a location unsettles utopian-progressive Eurocentrism and “the position of enunciation and the relations of address within it; not only what is said but from where it is said; not simply the logic of articulation, but the *topos* of enunciation” (Bhabha “DissemiNation” 312). The ‘common places’ of Canada and New Zealand, then, emerge through spiral reading strategies engaging the stories told by King and Grace, the histories sanctioned by the nation, and the places critiqued by cultural theorists. Culture, viewed as reflecting an “uneven, incomplete production of meaning and value, often composed of incommensurable demands and practices, produced in the act of social survival” (Bhabha “Postcolonial” 190), gives rise to a national space in which members of multiple cultures can create places for themselves. Storytelling thus resists the cultural containment and enables inside-out perspectives.

Redefining culture as relational necessarily leads to its redefinition *in relation to* the Nation, and I argue that this process supports reconceptualizations of subjectivity and agency premised on hybrid relationships between cultures. According to Bhabha, the theorization of cultures as hybrid is necessarily related to the active experience of the nation, as “it is in the emergence of the interstices—the overlap and displacement of domains of difference—that the intersubjective and collective experiences of *nationness*, community interest, or cultural value are

negotiated” (2). As I have outlined, for indigenous peoples discussed here, this liminal space emerges as the space negotiated between ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Canadian,’ ‘New Zealand’ and Māori,’ an interstitial space enabling inside-out perspectives.

Rather than containing the catachreses of ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Zealand Māori,’ a relational-processual paradigm requires the continual renegotiation of both the space between ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Canada,’ ‘New Zealand’ and ‘Maori’ *and* the locations of indigenous cultures within the discursive systems of these nations. Spiral reading strategies create the conditions—the ‘possible field of action’—for reading indigenous stories in relation to multiple stories central to the discursive formations of the nation-spaces they inhabit. The discourses arising out of this archive participate in restructuring governmentality and create new conditions under which to envision catachrestic citizenship.

Citizenship ultimately delineates the relationship between an individual and his or her nation; for Aboriginal and Māori people, this relationship has been dictated by Eurocentric systems based on the utopian-progressive paradigm. Recasting the ‘citizen’ as one with the capacity to place one’s self in relation to the discourses of the nation moves beyond the legal definition of the term. Placement requires both subjectivity, the ability to define one’s self, and agency, the ability to act on one’s world. Within the relational- processual paradigm, this concept of citizenship has the potential to reformulate the relationship between indigenous cultures and the nation beyond (neo)colonial assimilation and integration.

Currently, the ability to construct relationships between cultures and places through discourse belongs to those with access to power reflecting utopian-

progressive paradigms. European travel writers, writing within the contexts created by the Eurocentric archive, have “made it their purpose to take a fix on and thereby fix the world in which they found themselves [by focusing on] representations [that] are always concerned with the question of place and of placing, of situating oneself once and for all vis-à-vis an Other or others” (Porter 20-1). National discursive formations today attempt to ‘fix’ indigenous cultures and indigenous peoples within contemporary systems arising out of such constructed worlds. Like George in his treatment of Latisha in *Green Grass, Running Water*, the Nation attempts to ‘fix’ indigenous peoples through utopian cultural containment, while ‘fixing’ perceived lack of ‘progress’ through insistence on assimilation into dominant political, economic, and social systems.

Both King and Grace critically negate cultural containment, engaging with the perceived transparency of discourses relating culture and place as they are taught in school. Roimata’s son James, for example, learns that

Some of the people in some of the school countries lived in eggshells on paper snow, some lived in matchstick villages by a paint sea crowded with dot-eyed fish. Others sat by cellophane fires with silver chocolate-wrap feathers in their hair, and others had cardboard homes behind a paper wall that could not be climbed by the sea. (*Potiki* 40)

Grace highlights the overly simplistic, constructed nature of these discourses by linking them to the childlike, static (re)production of stereotypes regarding indigenous peoples, including the Inuit tenuously living in eggshells and the Aboriginal peoples forever limited to sitting by fires with feathers in their hair. Such representations of

the proper placement of indigenous peoples are not simply innocent, however. They reflect colonial contact zones and provide settings for the stories of ‘progress’ and ‘civilization’ discussed in Chapter Three. Grace recognizes the powerful role played by the relationship between geographic discourses and these assimilationist stories in constructing knowledge and determining indigenous realities: James’ schooling teaches him that the constructed realities reflected in his geographical studies “told people what their lives would be” (40).

The stories of King and Grace do not stop at critically negating utopian constructions of culture that fix identity and define citizenship; they also imaginatively affirm connections to place. Thus, they tell their readers a different story of ‘what their lives could be.’ The ‘old Indians’ in *Green Grass, Running Water* resist being ‘fixed’ by the traditional boundaries of both space and time, as they participate in their ongoing group project of ‘fixing up the world.’ They play with age, gender, and travel, and—in their relationships with one another and to those around them—they enact All My Relations through demonstrating that “[a]ll kinds of differences [are] interconnected, rather than opposed to each other. And it is through storied dialogues that they reveal their connections” (Chester 52). Through the stories of *Green Grass, Running Water*, these “four, five hundred” year old female/male characters resist mapped colonial spaces and create new stories. They escape the American old age home in which they live for the thirty-seventh recorded time in order to travel in(to) past and present worlds in need of ‘fixing up’.

Unlike George, they do not recognize the border between Canada and the United States—a border central to contemporary conceptualization of citizenship for

North Americans—as overly important, as their mistaken arrival there is shrugged off and simply labeled “a good idea” (22). They are not looking for a ‘host’ from which they can, as travelers, gain power or freedom. Rather, their travel involves facilitating the freedom of people like Lionel, as they seek to decolonize various world spaces through disrupting static, binary relations. When they realize that their positions as Others might prevent them from traveling, the Indians ‘unfix’ racial identity and appropriate the names of four colonial figures: Hawkeye, Robinson Crusoe, Ishmael and the Lone Ranger. Old Woman, Thought Woman, Changing Woman, and First Woman end up imprisoned, charged with various crimes against the nation including impersonating a white man (Old Woman), and for “Being Indian” (First Woman) (72).

The Lone Ranger is quick to point out to Lionel that the “messed up” world is “too big a job to fix ... all at once” (134). Relationships with the nation premised on postcolonial citizenship, albeit a goal, are far from reality. Traveling with King and Grace, then, involves engaging with the place of the Nation to find spaces in which to move through colonial discourses concerning culture, cartography, geography, history, anthropology, and literature. In these shifting spaces, cultures enable positions from which to travel, to narrate experience from the inside-out, and to return—again and again—to the site of the nation to recast one’s self in relation to members of other cultures and to the land.

Does the nation, at this moment, become the empty vessel that can enable subjectivity and agency? Does it emerge as a utopian site, one cast within the relational- processual paradigm? In *The Quest for Postcolonial Utopia*, Ralph Pordzick distinguishes between ‘classical utopias’ and ‘postmodernist heterotopias,’

locating them both within the utopian genre. More's *Utopia*, with its "sequential and logical narration" (3), fulfills the first categorization. The second category requires a "heterogeneous set of modes and discourses drawn from a whole variety of sources" (3). Although their works exhibit this heterogeneity at the discursive level, King's and Grace's novels cannot be easily classed as "go[ing] far beyond the received idea of perfection, unity, and rational control" (30), unless what is 'received' is limited to what can be perceived within the limits of a Eurocentric discourses.² In other words, to say they go 'beyond' received notions of perfection fails to recognize indigenous cultures as sites from which to access and develop ideas. Drawing from relational worldviews and their locations in indigenous cultural communities, King and Grace negotiate dominant value systems encoding Eurocentric discourses.

The new codes that emerge are fluid and do not 'fix' the notion of indigenous cultures in the past or in the contemporary moment. Lefebvre argues that increased globalization and decreased reliance on static national models provide a more utopian space than the logic of the State can, for these conditions allow the emergence of 'becoming' and "the very concrete and positive concept of a history at last oriented, directed and controlled by knowledge and will" ("Elucidations" 86).³ Here, the

² Pordzik discusses the postcolonial literatures of New Zealand and Canada, but he does not engage specifically with any works by Canadian Native or Māori writers. He conceptually maps the genre as unfolding in "a gradual transition in utopian writing from a 'colonial' phase in which the future was usually described through the filter of European perceptions and attitudes, through a post-colonial phase in which writers began to redefine their utopian standards in more localized and transformational terms but often still adhered to realistic modes of representation, to the more recent 'postmodern' phase in which writers have self-consciously revised or disrupted those previous patterns, modes and demarcations, and in so doing, have presented radical alternatives both to prevailing literary conventions and to their cultural and political biases" (169). There is work to be done in theorizing the relationship between Canadian Native and Aotearoa New Zealand Māori worldviews and the transitions Pordzik discusses, as this remains a blind spot in his text. Although I do allude to the presence of the 'utopian impulse' in this conclusion, unfortunately a larger engagement with indigenous novels and the utopian genre is beyond the scope of my thesis.

³ The State is not to give way completely to another space, but is already evolving into something

utopian is no longer the Eurocentric e/utopian idea(1) I critically engage with in Chapter One, but an exploration of the ‘possible-impossible’ conceived dialectically. Unlike explorers’ dis/coveries or tourists’ escapes into the ‘known,’ Lefebvre’s ‘utopian’ “discoverer does not turn away his [sic] gaze from obstacles, especially if he wishes to circumvent them. This consciousness of the possible-impossible replaces consciousness of the past... No topia without u-topia. No topology without imaginary” (“Time” 186).

Lefebvre’s emergent definition of utopia, “explores the possible-impossible and declares that ‘one must’ (theoretical imperative and non-ethical) want the impossible to realize the possible. . . . Utopia therefore takes on the character of urgency. *Urgent utopia* defines a style of thinking turned toward the possible in all areas” (Lefebvre “Worldwide” 205). Lefebvre’s theoretical positioning of utopia in this way can be linked to Spivak’s insistence that cultural critics—with whom I include writers like King and Grace—must use their positions to ‘speak predictively’:

institutionally placed cultural workers have the obligation to speak predictively. These scrupulous interventions are in fact our only contribution to the project of remaking history or sustaining ever-shifting voices with an alternative edge. In a sense our task is to make people ready to listen, and that is not determined by argument.

(“Claims” 280)

Spiral reading strategies open up spaces in which those with access to inside-out perspectives can enunciate urgent utopian thinking, as they open up and play with the

different. “It is no longer dominant, but in decline, but not without having supplied the conditions of its overcoming” (Lefebvre “Time and History” 184).

possible to predict relations between and among cultures. They dare us to imagine how citizenship might function in the future.

This future will not constitute a circular return to the past, but a spiral movement negotiating historical realities. In *Green Grass, Running Water*, the story of Portland Looking Bear demonstrates not only how Eurocentric histories limit indigenous peoples, but also why an uncomplicated return to the past is impossible. At the height of the popularity of the Western movie, Portland is a movie star. It is a time “back before they had any Indian heroes,” however, and he is prevented from playing empowered roles (150). In the resultant binary system, Portland could not be a “lawyer or policeman or a cowboy,” but he achieves the highest status available to him as a Aboriginal actor: he “made a very good Indian” (151).

Portland can only maintain his status as a ‘good Indian’ through willingness to conform to dominant systems of representation; his unwillingness to wear a fake nose in *The Sand Creek Massacre* leads to him losing the part. This is the beginning of the end of his career, for—even when he decides to wear the nose and he gets more work as a result—he is unable to breathe; it changes his voice, takes over his facial features, and eventually smells of rotting potatoes (154). The suffocating nature of Eurocentric representations leads to Portland’s inability to speak in his own voice: “instead of the rich, deep, breathy baritone, his voice sounded pinched and full of tin” (154). This reflects his inability to reach ‘hero’ status and critically negates the subject position ascribed to him within colonial discourse.

Reading King’s critical negation in counterpoint with Grace’s *Potiki* highlights her imaginative affirmation of the necessary ability to breathe and to

enunciate. From within the void discussed in Chapter One, a void which contains the seeds of possibility,

There comes
An intake Of
breath – Tihei
Mauriora.

With the breath, or sneeze, of life, comes Te Ao Marama, the World of Being, which grows to include the entire “train of stories [that] defined [their] lives, curving out from points on the spiral in ever-widening circles from which neither beginnings nor endings could be defined” (41). These stories define not only divisions, but also affinities; they not only limit moulds, but also enable spaces of enunciation. In amalgamating centre and margin and insisting on the right to breathe, to enunciate subjectivity and locate agency, King and Grace fold their own stories onto a spiral ready to engage the contemporary critic.

These spiral reading strategies require that we recognize a certain relationship between stories, utopian spaces, and progress supporting discourses of the colony/nation. These reading strategies require that Aboriginal and Māori stories be read in relation to Canada and New Zealand respectively. Although they resist neocolonial placement, many of the Māori characters in Grace’s stories join *Potiki*’s Hemi to assert emphatically that “Everything we need is here” (*Potiki* 69). Similarly, in the worlds created by King, there is a fluid yet powerful relationship to place. At the outset of *Medicine River*, for example, Harlen stops the van and makes his basketball team get out to give them a ‘coach’s talk’: ‘You boys look around you,’

Harlen shouted, ignoring Floyd and the wind. ‘What do you see? Go on, look around. Where are you? What are you standing on?’” He attributes their inability to win basketball games to their inability to answer this question, stating “‘That’s why we lost those games when we should be winning... cause you don’t know where you are.’ . . . ‘You’re standing on Mother Earth’” (15). This is the site from which to begin negotiating All My Relations. ‘Here’ is the place in which whakapapa is located. This is citizenship as it exists in relation to the spiral of stories in this thesis: spiral strategies locate a flexible and always-evolving relationship with one’s place in the world.⁴

According to Turner, much work needs to be done in the near future to negotiate the relationships between indigenous peoples and the Nation. He argues that the people who are best suited to do this work are cultural facilitators who must act as “word warriors”:

An Aboriginal mediator – a word warrior—is an indigenous person who engages the imposed legal and political discourse of the state guided by the belief that the knowledge and skills to be gained by engaging in such discourses are necessary for the survival of all indigenous peoples. (92)

Patricia Grace and Thomas King are ‘word warriors’. Their novels facilitate critical negation of imposed discourses and imaginative affirmation of indigenous

⁴ Important new work is being done on the ways in which indigenous literatures facilitate ethical understandings of the political – and revitalizing – relationships between people and their physical world. Although this is beyond the scope of this project, it represents a related area for further research. For examples of recent research in this area that draws on the works of King or Grace specifically, see Claudie Duppe’s “Asset or Home? Ecopolitical Ethics in Patricia Grace’s *Potiki*”, Cheryl Lousley’s “‘Hosanna Da, Our Home on Natives’ Land’: Environmental Justice and Democracy in Thomas King’s *Green Grass, Running Water*” and Michele Canfield’s PhD dissertation, “Renewing Maoritanga: Ecological healing for a postcolonial world.”

cultures within the locations of New Zealand and Canada.

In order to continue these negotiations of the colonial and national discourses of assimilation and integration and imaginative affirmations of ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Māori New Zealander’, ‘word warriors’ will require evolving conceptualizations of knowledge that reflect the spiral motif. *Potiki*’s Toko possesses this knowledge; he states, “my knowing, my knowingness, is different. It is a before, and a now and an after-knowing, and not like the knowing that other people have. It is a now knowing as if everything is now” (52). For ‘Aboriginal Canadian’ and ‘New Zealand Māori’ people negotiating the discursive formations of the Nation, colonization has not ended nor will it ever cease to exist. Nor should our spiral strategies signal an ‘end’, for stories are never an end in themselves, and critical discourses should never cease to act on the ways in which people imagine themselves.

Works Cited

- “Aboriginal Peoples of Canada: A Demographic Profile.” *2001 Census: analysis series*. 10 December 2004. <www12.statscan.ca>
- Acoose, Janice. “Post-Halfbreed: Indigenous Writers as Authors of their own Realities.” *Looking at the Words of Our People: First Nations Analysis of Literature*. Ed. Jeannette Armstrong. Penticton, BC: Theytus Books, 1993. 27-44.
- Ahearne, Jeremy. *Michel de Certeau: Interpretation and its Other*. Oxford: Blackwell P, 1995.
- Albanese, Denise. “The New Atlantis and the Uses of Utopia.” *ELH* 57.3 (Autumn 1990): 503-28.
- Aldred, Lisa. “Plastic Shamans and Astroturf Sun Dances: New Age Commercialization of Native American Spirituality.” *American Indian Quarterly* (Summer 2000): 329-48.
- Allen, Chadwick. *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*. Durham: Duke U P, 2002.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 1984. London: Verso, 1991.
- Armitage, Andrew. *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand*. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 1995.
- Armstrong, Jeannette. “The Disempowerment of First North American Native Peoples and the Empowerment through their Writing.” *An Anthology of Canadian Native Literature in English*. 2nd ed. Ed. Daniel David Moses and Terry Goldie. Toronto: Oxford U P, 1998. 239-42.
- . “Editor’s Note.” *Looking at the Words of our People: First Nations Analysis of Literature*. Ed. Jeanette Armstrong. Penticton, BC: Theytus Books, 1993. 7-8.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literatures*. New York and London: Routledge, 1989.
- , eds. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.

- Awatere, Donna. *Maori Sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet, 1984.
- Ballinger, Franchot and Brian Swann. "A MELUS Interview: Paula Gunn Allen." *Melus*.10.2 (Summer, 1983): 3-25.
- Baker, John. "Travel Images: Small-group photo travel with John Baker." 11 March 2003. <www.travelimages.com/brochurenzs.html>
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Epic and Novel: Toward a Methodology of the Study of the Novel." *Modern Genre Theory*. Ed. David Duff. Harlow, England: Longman, 1999. 68-81.
- Bannerji, Himani. *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism, and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' P, 2000.
- Barker, Clare. "'Bionic Waewae' and 'Iron Crutches': Turangawaewae, Disability, and Prosthesis in Patricia Grace's *Dogside Story*." *Moving Worlds: A Journal of Transcultural Writings*. 8.2 (2008): 120-33.
- . "From Narrative of Prosthesis to Disability Counternarrative: Reading the Politics of Difference in *Potiki* and *The Bone People*." *Journal of New Zealand Literature*. 24.1 (2006): 130-47.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. "The Quest for Order." *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge: Ponty P, 1991. 1-18.
- Battiste, Marie. "Unfolding the Lessons of Colonization." Introduction. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Ed. Marie Battiste. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 2000. xvi-xxx.
- Bell, Avril. "'Half-castes' and 'White Natives': The Politics of Māori-Pākehā Hybrid Identities". *Cultural Studies in Aotearoa New Zealand: Identity, Space and Place*. Ed. Claudia Bell and Steve Matthewman. Melbourne: Oxford U P, 2004. 121-38.
- Bellich, James. *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. Auckland: Auckland U P, 1986.
- Bender, Barbara. "Time and Landscape." *Current Anthropology*. 43 (August-October 2002). 103-12.
- Bentley, Jerry. *Traditions and Encounters: Revolutions and National States in the Atlantic World*. 2nd ed. Ed. Jerry Bentley and Herbert F Ziegler. Boston: McGraw- Hill, 2003.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Border Lives: The Art of the Present." *Defining Travel: Diverse Visions*. Ed. Susan L. Roberson. Jackson: U of Mississippi P, 2001. 157-66.

- . "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences." *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Ed. Bill Aschcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 206-9.
- . "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 291-322.
- . *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- . "Narrating the Nation." Introduction. *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 1-7.
- . "The Postcolonial and the Postmodern: The Question of Agency." *The Cultural Studies Reader*. 2nd ed. Ed. Simon During. London: Routledge, 1993. 190-208.
- . "In a Spirit of Calm Violence." *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*. Ed. Gyan Prakash. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1995. 326-43.
- Binney, Judith. "Ancestral Voices: Māori Prophet Leaders." *The Oxford Illustrated History of New Zealand*. Ed. Keith Sinclair. Auckland: Oxford UP, 1990. 153-84.
- Blaeser, Kimberly M. "Native Literature: Seeking a Critical Center." *Looking at the Words of Our People: First Nations Analysis of Literature*. Ed. Jeannette Armstrong. Penticton, BC: Theytus Books, 1993. 51-62.
- Blair, Jennifer, Daniel Coleman, Kate Higginson, and Lorraine York. "Introduction." *ReCalling Early Canada: Reading the Political in Literary and Cultural Production*. Ed. Jennifer Blair, Daniel Coleman, Kate Higginson, and Lorraine York. Edmonton: U Calgary P, 2005. xiii-xlvi.
- Brennan, Timothy. "The National Longing for Form." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 44-70.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S. – Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 2007.
- Brydon, Diana. "Canada and Postcolonialism: Questions, Inventories, and Futures." *Is Canada Postcolonial? Unsettling Canadian Literature*. Ed. Laura Moss. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2003. 49-77.

- Buchanan, Ian. "Extraordinary Spaces in Ordinary Places: De Certeau and the space of postcolonialism." *SPAN* 36 (1993). 11 March 2003.
<<http://www.mcc.murdoch.edu.au/ReadingRoom>>.
- Butler, Samuel. *Erewhon*. Ed. Peter Mudford. (1872). London: Penguin, 2006.
- Cajete, Gregory. "Indigenous Knowledge: The Pueblo Metaphor of Indigenous Education." *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Ed. Marie Battiste. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 2000 181-91.
- Calleja, Paloma Fresno. "An Interview with Patricia Grace." *Atlantis*. 25.1 (June 2003): 109-20.
- Canfield, Michele. "Renewing Maoritanga: Ecological Healing for a postcolonial world in Keri Hulme's 'The Bone People,' Witi Ihimaera's 'The Whale Rider,' and Patricia Grace's 'Potiki'." Diss. East Carolina University, 2011.
- Carter, Paul. "Footings: the Mythopoeic Foundations of Imperial Time." *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Sydney: UNSW P, 1999. 56-77.
- Sarah Carter, *Aboriginal People and Colonizers of Western Canada to 1900*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1999.
- Certeau, Michel de. *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*. Transl. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986.
- . *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.
- . *The Writing of History: European Perspectives*. New York: Columbia UP, 1988.
- Chester, Bianca. "Green Grass, Running Water: Theorizing the World of the Novel." Spec. Issue of *Canadian Literature/Littérature canadienne: A Quarterly of Criticism and Review* 161-62 (Summer/Autumn 1999): 44-64.
- Clark, John P. "The Dialectical Social Geography of Elisée Réclus." 12 August 2005.
<www.melior.univ-montp3.fr/ra_forum/en/people/clark_john/reclus_geography/reclus.geography.html>
- Clifford, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1997.

- Cohen, Erik. "Phenomenology and Tourist Experiences." *Defining Travel: Diverse Visions*. Ed. Susan L. Roberson. Jackson: U of Mississippi P, 2001. 29-55.
- Colenso, William. *On the Vegetable Food of the Ancient New Zealanders*. Transactions of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 1880. 388.
- Coltelli, Laura. "Almanac of the Dead: An Interview with Leslie Marmon Silko." *Conversations with Leslie Marmon Silko*. Ed. Ellen R. Arnold. Mississippi: U of Mississippi P, 2000. 119-34.
- Copps, Sheila. "Interview with the Minister of Canadian Heritage." *Canadian Diversity/Diversité Canadienne*. Ed. Will Kymlicka. 4-7.
- Coulthard, Glen S. "Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada." *Contemporary Political Theory*. 6 (2007): 437-60.
- Crawford, Jen. "Spaze: Void States and the Mother-Child Relationship in *The Matriarch, The Dream Swimmer, Cousins, and Baby No-Eyes*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*. 27.2 (2005): 26-75.
- Crick, Malcolm. "Tourists, Locals and Anthropologists: Quizzical Reflections on 'Otherness' in Tourist Encounters and in Tourism Research." *Travellers, Journeys, Tourists*. Spec. Issue of *Australian Cultural History* 10 (1991): 6-18.
- "Custer's Last Stand," *The Western Sets*. 18 April 2004.
<www.shop.store.yahoo.com>
- Damm, Kateri. "Dispelling and Telling: Speaking Native Realities in Maria Campbell's *Halfbreed* and Beatrice Culleton's *In Search of April Raintree*." *Looking at the Words of Our People: First Nations Analysis of Literature*. Ed. Jeannette Armstrong. Penticton, BC: Theytus Books, 1993. 93-113.
- Davidson, Arnold E., Priscilla L. Watson and Jennifer Andrews. *Border Crossings: Thomas King's Cultural Inversions*. Toronto: U Toronto P, 2003.
- Della Valle, Paola. "The Wider Family: Patricia Grace interviewed." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 42.1 (2007): 131-141.
- Deloria, Vine Jr. *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum P, 1994.
- Deloughrey, Elizabeth. "The Spiral Temporality of Patricia Grace's *Potiki*." *Ariel* 30.1 (January 1999): 59-83.

- Derry, Ken. "Uncomfortable Mirrors: Religion and Mimetic Violence in Contemporary Canadian Literature." Diss. University of Toronto, 2009.
- Dickson-Gilmour. "Iati-Ohkwehonwe: Blood Quantum, Membership and the Politics of Exclusion in Kahnawake." *Citizenship Studies*. 3.1 (1999): 27-44.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1982.
- Duchemin, Parker. "'A Parcel of Whelps': Alexander Mackenzie among the Indians." *Native Writers and Canadian Writing*. Ed. WH New. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 1990. 49-74.
- Dumont, Marilyn. "Popular Images of Nativeness." *Looking at the Words of our People: First Nations Analysis of Literature*. Ed. Jeannette Armstrong. Penticton, BC: Theytus Books, 1993. 45-50.
- Duppé, Claudia. "Asset or Home?: Ecopolitical Ethics in Patricia Grace's *Potiki*. *Local Natures, Global Responsibilities: Ecocritical Perspectives on the New English Literatures*. Ed. Laurenz Volkmann, Nancy Detmers, and Thomson Ines. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010. 121-35.
- Durie, Edward Taihakurei. Transcript. "Will the Settlers Settle? Cultural Conciliation and the Law." F.W. Guest Memorial Lecture, 1996. University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Dvorak, Marta. "The Discursive Strategies of Native Literature: Thomas King's shift from Adversarial to Interfusional." *ARIEL: A review of International English Literature*. 33.3-4 (2002 July-Oct): 213-30.
- Eagleton, Terry. *The Idea of Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell P, 2000.
- Ellis, Juniper. "'The Singing Word': Interview with Witi Ihimaera." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*. 34.1 (1999): 169-82.
- Elsmore, Bronwyn. *Mana from Heaven: A Century of Maori Prophets in New Zealand*. Tauranga: Moana P, 1989.
- Emberley, Julia. *Defamiliarizing the Aboriginal: Cultural Practices and Decolonization in Canada*. Toronto: U Toronto P, 2007.
- . *Thresholds of Difference: Feminist Critique, Native Women's Writings, Postcolonial Theory*. Toronto: U Toronto P, 1993.

- Episkenew, Jo-Ann. "Socially Responsible Criticism: Aboriginal Literature, Ideology, and the Literary Canon." *Creating Community: A Roundtable on Canadian Aboriginal Literature*. Ed. Renate Eigenbrod and Jo-Ann Episkenew. Brandon, MA: Bearpaw Publishing, 2002. 51-68.
- Escobar, Marcelo. "Exploration, Cartography and the Modernization of State Power." *State and Space, a Reader*. Ed. Neil Brenner, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon Macleod. Malden, MA: Blackwell P, 2003. 29-52.
- Evans, Julie et al., *Equal Subjects, Unequal Rights: Indigenous Peoples in British Settler Colonies, 1830-1910* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Fee, Margery, and Jane Flick. "Coyote Pedagogy: Knowing Where the Borders are in Thomas King's *Green Grass, Running Water*." Spec. Issue of *Canadian Literature/Littérature canadienne: A Quarterly of Criticism and Review*. 161-62 (Summer/Autumn 1999): 131-39.
- Fielder, John. "Sacred Sites and the City: Urban Aboriginality, Ambivalence, and Modernity." *Asia/Pacific as Space of Cultural Production*. Ed. Rob Wilson and Arif Dirlik. Durham: Duke UP, 1995. 101-19.
- Filipcsak, Dorota. "Paradise Revisited: Images of First Woman in the Poetry of Joy Kogawa and the Fiction of Thomas King." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia: An International Review of English Studies*. 43 (2007): 291-303.
- Fisher, Robin. Review: Claudia Orange. *The Treaty of Waitangi*. *The International History Review*. 11.1 (1989): 141-5.
- Fleras, Augie, and Jean Leonard Elliott. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race, Ethnic and Aboriginal Dynamics in Canada*. 2nd ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- Flick, Jane. "Reading Notes for Thomas King's *Green Grass, Running Water*." Spec. Issue of *Canadian Literature/Littérature canadienne: A Quarterly of Criticism and Review* 161-62 (Summer/Autumn 1999): 140-72.
- Foucault, Michel. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Transl. A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Routledge, 2002.
- . *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Transl. Alan Sheridan Smith. New York, Vintage Books, 1995.
- . "Politics and the study of discourse." *Ideology and Consciousness*, 1978: 7-26.
- . *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. Transl. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and

- Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
- . "The Subject and Power." Afterword. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1982. 208-226.
- Frances, R. Douglas, Richard Jones, and Donald B. Smith. *Origins: Canadian History to Confederation*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Harcourt-Brace, 1992.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination*. n.p.: House of Anansi P, 1971.
- Giard, Luce. "Opening the Possible." Introduction. *Culture in the Plural*. Ed. Michel de Certeau and Luce Giard. Transl. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1997. ix-xv.
- Gibran, Kahlil. "The Coming of the Ship." *The Prophet*. 3 September 2003. <<http://www.columbia.edu/~gm84/gibran1.html>>
- Gibson, Ross. "Camera Natura: Landscape in Australian feature films." *Australian Cultural Studies: A Reader*. Ed. John Frow and Meaghan Morris. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993. 209-21.
- Goldberg, David Theo. "Racial Rule." *Relocating Postcolonialism*. Ed. David Theo Goldberg and Ato Quayson. Oxford: Blackwell P, 2002. 82-102.
- Goldman, Marlene. "Mapping and Dreaming: Native Resistance in *Green Grass, Running Water*." Spec. Issue of *Canadian Literature/Littérature canadienne: A Quarterly of Criticism and Review* 161-62 (Summer/Autumn 1999): 18-41.
- Goodrich, Joanne (ed). "Multiculturalism in Canada." *About Canada: Canadian Studies at Mount Alison University*. 30 August 2004. <www.mta.ca/faculty/arts/canadian_studies/english/about/multi>
- Government of Canada. Department of Canadian Heritage. *Multiculturalism. Multiculturalism: Now More Than Ever*. nd. 10 June 2005. <www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/reports>
- . Department of Canadian Heritage. *What is Multiculturalism?* (Pamphlet). nd.
- . Ministry of Canadian Heritage. *An Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada* (Canadian Multiculturalism Act). Assented to 21 July 1988. <http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/policy/act_e.cfm>

- Government of New Zealand. The committee to undertake a review of New Zealand's existing constitutional arrangements: 47th Parliament of New Zealand "Inquiry to Review New Zealand's Constitutional Arrangements." 20 September 2005.
<<http://www.constitutional.parliament.govt.nz/templates/Page.aspx?id=243>>
- . Elections New Zealand. "Maori and the Vote." 20 September 2005.
<<http://www.elections.org.nz/study/history/maori-vote.html>>
- . State Services Commission/To Konihanga O Nga Tari Kawanatanga. "The Story of the Treaty." *Made in New Zealand: The Treaty of Waitangi*. 20 September 2005.
<<http://www.treatyofwaitangi.govt.nz/story/>>
- Grace, Patricia. *Baby No Eyes*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1998.
- . *Cousins*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1992.
- . *The Dream Sleepers*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1980.
- . *Dogside Story*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2001.
- . *Electric City and Other Stories*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1989.
- . "Influences on Writing." *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*. Ed. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999. 65-73.
- . *The Kuia and the Spider/Te Kuia me te Pungawerewere*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1982.
- . *Maraea and the Albatrosses*. North Shore, NZ: Puffin, 2008.
- . *Mutuwhenua: The Moon Sleeps*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1978.
- . *Ned and Katina: A True Love Story*. North Shore, New Zealand: Penguin, 2009.
- . *Potiki*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1986.
- . *Selected Stories*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1991.
- . *The Sky People*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1994.
- . *Small Holes in the Silence*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2006.
- . *Tu: A Novel*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2004.

- . *Waiariki*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1975.
- . *Watercress Tuna and the Children of Champion Street/ Te Tuna Wakirihiri me Nga Tamariki o te Tiriti O*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1984.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvellous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1991.
- Grewal, Inderpal. *Home and Harem: Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Culture of Travel*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.
- Groening, Laura Smyth. *Listening to Old Woman Speak: Natives and alterNatives in Canadian Literature*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 2004.
- Gunew, Sneja. "Denaturalizing Cultural Nationalisms: Multicultural Readings of 'Australia'." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 99-120.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993. 392-403.
- Harjo, Joy. *The Spiral of Memory: Interviews*. Ed. Laura Coltelli. Michigan: U Michigan P, 1996.
- Harris, Leonard. "Postmodernism and Utopia, an Unholy Alliance." *Racism, the City and the State*. Ed. Malcolm Cross and Michael Keith. London: Routledge, 1993. 31-44.
- Harris, R. Cole. *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia*. Vancouver: U British Columbia P, 2002.
- . *The Reluctant Land Society, Space, and Environment in Canada before Confederation*. Vancouver: U British Columbia P, 2008.
- Harley, J.B. "Maps, Knowledge, and Power." *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*. Ed. Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988. 277-312.
- Heath, Joseph. *Efficient Society: Why Canada is as close to Utopia as it gets*. Toronto: Penguin, 2001.
- Henderson, James (Sákēj) Youngblood. "Ayukpachi: Empowering Aboriginal Thought." *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Ed. Marie Battiste.

- Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 2000. 248-78.
- . "Postcolonial Ghost Dancing: Diagnosing European Colonialism." *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Ed. Marie Battiste. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 2000. 57-76.
- Hereniko, Vilsoni. "An Interview with Patricia Grace." *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*. Ed. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999. 75-83.
- Herman, Peter C. "Who's That in the Mirror? Thomas More's *Utopia* and the Problematic of the New World." *Opening the Borders: Inclusivity in Early Modern Studies*. Ed. Peter C. Herman. Newark: U Delaware P, 1999. 109-32.
- Hoey, Douglas. "There Will Always be a Taupo: Some Reflections on Pakeha Culture." *Cultural Studies in Aotearoa New Zealand: Identity, Space and Place*. Ed. Claudia Bell and Steve Matthewman. Victoria: Oxford UP, 2004. 188-202.
- Huggan, Graham. "Decolonizing the Map: Post-Colonialism, Post-Structuralism and the Cartographic Connection." *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-colonialism and Post-modernism*. Ed. Ian Adam and Helen Tiffin. Calgary: U of Calgary P, 1990. 115-31.
- . *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- . *Territorial Disputes: Maps and Mapping Strategies in Contemporary Canadian and Australian Fiction*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994.
- Ihimaera, Witi. "A Maori Perspective." *Journal of New Zealand Literature* 9 (1991): 53-54.
- Ihimaera, Witi, and D.S. Long. "Contemporary Maori Writing: A Context." Introduction. *Into the World of Light: An Anthology of Maori Writing*. Ed. Witi Ihimaera and D.S. Long. Auckland: Heinemann Publishers, 1982. 1-6.
- Ihimaera, Witi et al. "Kaupapa." *Te Ao Marama*. Vol. 3. Wellington: Reed, 1994. 15-17.
- Ihimaera, Witi and Patricia Grace. "The Maori in Literature. *Tihe Mauri Ora: Aspects of Maoritanga*. Ed. Michael King. Auckland: Methuen, 1978.
- "Indian Memorial at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument," *The National Park Service*. 18 April 2004. <www.nps.gov/libi/indmem.htm>

- Irwin, Kathie. "Maori Research Methodologies and Practices." *Sites*. 28 (1994) 25-43.
- Joseph, Robert. "Constitutional Provisions for Pluralism, Biculturalism, and Multiculturalism in Canada and New Zealand: Perspectives from the Quebecois, First Nations, and Maori." Draft paper. *Laws and Institutions for Aotearoa/New Zealand: Te Matahauariki Research Institute*. February 2000. 1-33. 10 June 2005. <<http://lianz.waikato.ac.nz/PAPERS/Rob/CanNZ.frameworks.pdf>>
- Justice, Daniel Heath. *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P. 2006.
- Kalant, Amelia. *National Identity and the Conflict at Oka: Native Belonging and the Myths of Postcolonial Nationhood in Canada*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Kaplan, Caren. *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.
- Karamcheti, Indira. "The Geographics of Marginality: Place and Textuality in Simone Schwartz-Bart and Anita Desai." *Feminist Explorations of Literary Space*. Ed. Margaret R. Higonnet and Joan Templeton. Amherst, MA: U Massachusetts P, 125-46.
- Kempf, Wolfgang. "Cosmologies, Cities, and Cultural Constructions of Space: Oceanic Enlargements of the World." *Pacific Studies* 22.2 (June 1999): 97-114.
- Kensett, John Frederick. *Autumnal River Landscape*. (1853). 25 April 2007. <<http://www.valpo.edu/artmuseum/permanent/19cen.php>>
- Keown, Michelle. "Maori or English? The Politics of Language in Patricia Grace's *Baby No-Eyes*." *The Politics of English as a World Language: New Horizons in Postcolonial Cultural Studies*. Ed. Christian Mair. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003. 419-29.
- . "'Sister Seen': Art, Mythology, and the Semiotic in Patricia Grace's *Baby No-Eyes*." *New Literatures Review*. 38 (Winter 2002): 87-100.
- King, Michael, Anthony Haas and Richard S. Hill. "Reconciling Biculturalism and Multiculturalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand." *e-Future Times* 12 (June 2004). 8 May 2005. <www.futuretrust.org.nz/Michael%20King%20Tribute.pdf>
- King, Ross. *Emancipating Space: Geography, Architecture, and Urban Design*. New York: Guilford P, 1996.

- King, Thomas. *A Coyote Columbus Story*. Toronto: Groundwood Books, 2007.
- . *Coyote Sings to the Moon*. Bolton, ON: Key Porter Books, 2005.
- . *A Coyote Solstice Tale*. Toronto: Groundwood Books, 2009.
- . *Coyote's New Suit*. Bolton, ON: Key Porter Books, 2009.
- . *DreadfulWater Shows Up*. By Hartley Goodweather. Toronto: HarperCollins, 2002.
- . "Godzilla vs. the Postcolonial." *New Contexts of Canadian Criticism*. Ed. Ajay Heble, Donna Palmateer Pennee, and J.R. (Tim) Struthers. Peterborough: Broadview P, 1997. 241-48.
- . *Green Grass, Running Water*. Toronto: HarperCollins, 1993.
- . Introduction. *All My Relations: An Anthology of Contemporary Canadian Native Fiction*. Ed. Thomas King. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1990. ix-xvi.
- . *Medicine River*. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1989.
- . "Native Literature in Canada," *Dictionary of Native American literature*. Ed. Andrew Wiget, New York, Garland, 1994. 358-64.
- . *One Good Story, That One*. Toronto: HarperCollins, 1999.
- . *Red Power Murders: A DreadfulWater Mystery*. By Hartley Goodweather. Toronto: HarperCollins, 1999.
- . *A Short History of Indians in Canada*. Toronto: HarperCollins, 2005.
- . *The Truth About Stories: A Native Narrative*. *The Massey Lecture Series*. Toronto: Anansi P, 2003.
- . *Truth and Bright Water*. Toronto: HarperCollins, 1999.
- Kirby, Kathleen M. *Indifferent Boundaries: Spatial Concepts of Human Subjectivity*. New York: Guilford P, 1996.
- Knudsen, Eva Rask. *The Circle and the Spiral: A Study of Australian Aboriginal and New Zealand Maori Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 1995.

- Lamb, Jonathan. "The Idea of Utopia in the European Settlement of New Zealand." *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Ed. Klaus Neumann, Nicholas Thomas and Hilary Ericksen. Sydney: U of New South Wales P, 1999. 79-97.
- Lefebvre, Henri. "Elucidations." *Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings*. Ed. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas, and Eleonore Kofman. New York: Continuum, 2003. 84-87.
- . "From the Social Pact to the Contract of Citizenship." *Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings*. Ed. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas, and Eleonore Kofman. New York: Continuum, 2003. 238-54.
- . "Preface to the New Edition: The Production of Space." *Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings*. Ed. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas, and Eleonore Kofman. New York: Continuum, 2003. 206-13.
- . *The Production of Space*. Transl. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell P, 1991.
- . "Space and the State." *State/Space: A Reader*. Ed. Neil Brenner, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon MacLeod. Malden: Blackwell P, 2003. 84-100.
- . "State." *Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings*. Ed. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas, and Eleonore Kofman. New York: Continuum, 2003. 61-64.
- . "Time and History." *Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings*. Ed. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas, and Eleonore Kofman. New York: Continuum, 2003. 184-189.
- . "The Worldwide Experience." *Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings*. Ed. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas, and Eleonore Kofman. New York: Continuum, 2003. 199-206.
- Leggatt, Judith. "Native Writing, Academic Theory: Postcolonialism Across the Cultural Divide." *Is Canada Postcolonial? Unsettling Canadian Literature*. Ed. Laura Moss. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2003.
- Leslie, Marina. *Renaissance Utopias and the Problem of History*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.
- Lousley, Cheryl. "'Hosanna Da, Our Home on Natives' Land': Environmental Justice and Democracy in Thomas King's *Green Grass, Running Water*." *Essays on Canadian Writing*. 81 (Winter 2004): 17-44.
- Lutz, Harmut. *Contemporary Challenges: Conversations with Canadian Native Authors*. Saskatoon, SK: Fifth House, 1991.

- Maaka, Roger and Augie Fleras. "Engaging with Indigeneity: Tino Rangatiratanga in Aotearoa." *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Ed. Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2000. 89-110.
- MacCannell, Dean. *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- . "Sightseeing and Social Structure." *Defining Travel: Diverse Visions*. Ed. Susan L. Roberson. Jackson: U of Mississippi P, 2001. 13-28.
- Maracle, Lee. "The 'Post-Colonial' Imagination." *Fuse* 16.1 (1992): 12-15.
- Marchitello, Howard. "Processing the New World: Historicism and the Story of the Anecdote." *Narrative and Meaning in Early Modern England*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP. 92-124.
- Marek, Serge A. "Maori urban geographies of whakamanatanga: Empowered Maori urbanism, space/place-based social movements and practices of everyday life in Auckland, New Zealand. Diss. University of Hawai'i at Manoa, 2010.
- McDowell, Linda. *Undoing Place? A Geographical Reader*. London: Arnold, 1997.
- McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. New York: New York UP, 1997.
- McRae, Jane. "Patricia Grace and Complete Communication." *Opening The Book: New Essays on New Zealand Writing*. Ed. Mark Williams and Michele Leggott. Auckland: Auckland UP, 1995. 188-208.
- Melbourne, Hirini. "Whare Whakairo: Maori Literary Traditions." *Dirty Silence: Aspects of Language and Literature in New Zealand*. Ed. Graham McGregor and Mark Williams. Auckland: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Menhart, Rebecca Ann. "Weaving the Literary Quilt: The layering of narrative in Thomas King's 'Truth and Bright Water'." Diss. Lakehead University, 2004.
- Meredith, Paul. "Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-cultural Politics in Aotearoa and New Zealand." *Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research Development Conference*. 1-7. 7-9 July 1998. February 5 2005. <lianz/waikato.ac.nz/PAPERS/paul/hybridity.pdf>
- Miller, J. R. *Compact, Contract, Covenant: Aboriginal Treaty-Making in Canada*. Toronto: Toronto U P, 2009.

- . *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991.
- Mita, Mareta. "Trick or Treat?: Issues of feminism and post-colonialism in relation to the Arts." *Te Pua 3 – The Journal of Puawaitanga*. Auckland: Education Department. 37-41.
- Moerman, Daniel E. *Native American Ethnobotany*. Portland: Timber P, 1998.
- Mohamed, Nizar and Kevin Clark. "Forestry on Customary-owned Land: Some Experiences from the South Pacific," *Network Papers* 19a (Summer 1996). 25 February 2005.
<<http://www.odifpeg.org.uk/rdfn/englishfiles/englishrdfnpdffiles/19aeng.pdf>>
- Monahan, Patrick. *The Meech Lake Accord: An Inside Perspective*. Toronto: U Toronto P, 1991.
- More, Thomas. *Utopia. Ideal Commonwealths; Comprising More's Utopia, Bacon's New Atlantis, Campanella's City of the Sun, and Harrington's Oceana*. Ed. Henry Morely. New York: The Colonial P, 1901. 1-99.
- Morrison, Gwen. "The Aftermath of September 11: Is the Travel Industry on the Mend?" *Traveling Today: Your Destination for Family Travel*. 2 November 2004.
<travelingtoday.com/resources/artices/aftermath.htm>
- Moss, Laura. "Is Canada Postcolonial? Introducing the Question." *Is Canada Postcolonial? Unsettling Canadian Literature*. Ed. Laura Moss. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2003. 1-23.
- Neuman, Klaus, Nicholas Thomas, and Hilary Ericksen. "Conclusion." *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Sydney: UNSW P, 1999. 238-42.
- New, W.H. "Learning to Listen." Editorial. *Native Writers and Canadian Writing*. 3rd ed. Ed. W.H. New. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 1992. 4-8.
- The New Geneva Study Bible*. Ed. R. C. Sproul. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1995.
- O'Callaghan, Marion. "Continuities in Imagination." *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power*. Ed. Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh. London: Zed Books, 1995.

- O'Connor, Briar. "The Dilemma of Souvenirs." *Cultural Studies in Aotearoa New Zealand: Identity, Space and Place*. Ed. Claudia Bell and Steve Matthewman. Melbourne: Oxford U P, 2004. 161-74.
- Orange, Claudia. *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1987.
- Orr, Bridget. "The Maori House of Fiction." *Cultural Institutions of the Novel*. Ed. Deidre Lynch and William B. Warner. Durham: Duke U P, 1996. 73-95.
- Paine, R. "Aboriginality, Multiculturalism, and the Liberal Rights Philosophy." *Ethnos*. 64.3 (1999): 325-49.
- Parekh, Bhiku. "Liberalism and Colonialism: A Critique of Locke and Mill." *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power*. Ed. Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh. London: Zed Books, 1995. 81-98.
- Parker, Kenneth. "To Travel... Hopefully?/!" *Being/s in Transit: Traveling, Migration, Dislocation*. Ed. Liselotte Glage. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000. 16-35.
- Paterson, John L. *David Harvey's Geography*. London: Croom Helm, 1984. Pearson,
- David. *The Politics of Ethnicity in Settler Societies: States of Unease*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Pennee, Donna Pamateer. "Après Frye, Rien? Pas de Tout! From Contexts to New Contexts." *New Contexts of Canadian Criticism*. Ed. Ajay Heble, Donna Palmateer Pennee, and J.R. Struthers. Peterborough, ON: Broadview P, 1997. 202-19.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen and Bhikhu Parekh. Introduction. "Shifting Imaginaries: Decolonization, Internal Decolonization, Postcoloniality." *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power*. Ed. Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh. London: Zed Books, 1995.
- Pihama, Leonie. "Ko Taranaki Te Maunga: Challenging Post-Colonial Disturbances and Post-Modern Fragmentation." *He Pukenga Kōrero: A Journal of Māori Studies*. 2.2 (1997): 8-15.
- Piper, Karen. *Cartographic Fictions: Maps, Race, and Identity*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2002.
- Pistacchi, Anne Katherine. "Spiralling Subversions: The Politics of Maori Cultural Survivance in the Recent Critical Fictions of Patricia Grace, Paula Morris, and Kelly Ana Morey." Diss. University of Auckland, 2009.

- . "Te Whare Tapa Wha: The Four Cornerstones of Maori Health and Patricia Grace's *Dogside Story*." *Journal of New Zealand Literature*. 26 (2008): 136-52.
- Pocock, J. G. A. "Waitangi as Mystery of State: Consequences of the Ascription of Federative Capacity to the Māori." *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Ed. Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2000. 25-35.
- Pordzik, Ralph. *The Quest for Postcolonial Utopia: A Comparative Introduction to the Utopian Novel in the New English Literatures*. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Porter, Dennis. *Haunted Journeys: Desire and Transgression in European Travel Writing*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Prentice, Chris. "From Visibility to Visuality: Patricia Grace's *Baby No-Eyes* and the Cultural Politics of Decolonization." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 55.2 (Summer 2009): 321-48.
- Pulitano, Elvira. "Writing in the Oral Tradition: Reflections on the Indigenous Literatures of Australia, New Zealand, and North America." *Teaching World Literature*. Ed. David Damrosch. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2009. 216-31.
- Ramsden, Irihapeti. "Doing it for the Mokopuna." *Vision Aotearoa: Kaupapa New Zealand*. Ed. Witi Ihimaera. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1994. 254-62.
- Rapira, Donna. "Who am I?" *Te Ao Marama*. Vol. 3. Wellington: Reed, 1994. 15-17.
- Rata, Elizabeth. "The Failure of Biculturalism: Implications for New Zealand Education." Draft. 2003. 10 June 2005.
<<http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/rat03232.pdf>>
- Reece, Bob. "Visitors of Another Kind." *The Friends of Little Bighorn*. 10 June 2005.
<www.friendslittlebighorn.com/ghosts-along-the-little-bighorn.htm>
- The Reed Concise Maori Dictionary*. Comp. A.W. Reed. Rev. Timoti Karetu and Ross Callman. Auckland: Reed Books, 2001.

- Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. Transl. Martin Thom. London: Routledge, 1990. 8-22.
- "Research builds business case for tourism investment," *re:think: Waitkato's Management School's Newspaper for Business*. 23 May 2004. August 18, 2005. <wmsoros.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/NR/rethink/shownews_public.asp?SelectedShowArchive=&SelectedNewsTypeID=7&SelectedNewsGroup=&SelectedNewsID=1096>
- Rewi, Poia. *Whaikōrero: The World of Māori Oratory*. Auckland: Auckland U P, 2010.
- Rich, Adrienne. "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Revision." *College English*. 34.1 (October 1972). 18-30.
- Roberson, Susan L. Introduction. *Defining Travel: Diverse Visions*. Ed. Susan L. Roberson. Jackson: U of Mississippi P, 2001. xi-xxvi.
- Rooke, Constance. "Interview with Thomas King." *World Literature Written in English* 30.2 (Autumn 1990): 62-76.
- Rose, Gillian. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993.
- Ross, Kristen. "Rimband and Spatial History." *Space and Place: Theories of Identity and Location*. Ed. Erica Carter, James Donald, and Judith Squires. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1993. 357-77.
- Ruffo, Armand Garnet. "Inside Looking Out." *Looking at the Words of Our People*. Ed. Jeanette Armstrong. Penticton BC: Theytus Books, 1993. 161-76.
- Ryan, P.M. *The Reed Dictionary of Modern Maori*. Wellington: Reed, 2001.
- Ryan, Simon. "Inscribing the Emptiness: Cartography, Exploration, and the Construction of Australia." *De-scribing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*. Ed. Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson. London: Routledge, 1994. 115-30.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.
- . "Figures, Configurations, Transfigurations." *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial*. Ed. Anne Rutherford. Sydney: Dungaroo P, 1992. 3-17.

- . "In Conversation with Neeladri Bhattacharya, Suvir Kaul, and Ania Loomba." *Relocating Postcolonialism*. Ed. David Theo Goldberg and Ato Quayson. Oxford: Blackwell P, 2002. 1-14.
- . *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- . "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry*. 12.1 (Autumn 1985): 144-65.
- Samuells, Raymond II., ed. *Toward a Native-Canadian Equal Rights Amendment: Replacing the Current Official Languages and Indian Acts in Favour of a Rejuvenated Constitutional Framework for the Preservation and Promotion of Aboriginal Languages and Cultures*. Toronto: Agora, 2004.
- Sarkowsky, Katja. "Beyond Margins and Centres: First Nations Literature and the Challenge to Postcolonial Theory." *Crabtracks: Progress and Process in Teaching the New Literatures in English*. Ed. Gordon Collier and Frank Schulz-Engler. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002. 85-109.
- Sayre, Gordon M. *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Resistance and the Literature of North America from Moctezuma to Tecumseh*. Np: U of North Carolina P, 2005.
- Scott, David. "Colonial Governmentality." *Social Text*. 43 (1995): 191-220.
- Schwimmer, E. "The local and the universal: reflections on contemporary Maori Literature in response to *Blood Narrative* by Chadwick Allen." *Journal of Polynesian Society*. 1.113 (March 2004): 7-36.
- Sharp, Andrew. *Justice and the Maori: The philosophy and practice of Maori claims in New Zealand since the 1970s*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford U P, 1997.
- Shohat, Ella. "Notes on the Post-Colonial." *Social Text* 31.32. (1992): 99-113.
- Simpson, Audra. "Paths Toward a Mohawk Nation: Narratives of Citizenship and Nationhood in Kahnawake." *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Ed. Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2000. 113-135.
- Sloan, Junius. *Cool Morning on the Prairie*. (1866). 25 April 2007.
<<http://www.valpo.edu/artmuseum/permanent/19cen.php>>
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai Te Rina. "Kaupapa Maori Research." *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Ed. Marie Battiste. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 2000. 225-47.

- Snead, James. "European Pedigrees/African Contagions: Nationality, Narrative, Communitarity in Tutuola, Achebe, and Reed." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990.231-49.
- Snowden, Kim and Evgenia Todorova. "An Interview with Thomas King." Int. Margery Fee and Sneja Gunew. *Canadian Literature*. August 1999. Web.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Criticism, Feminism, and the Institution." Interview with Elizabeth Grosz. *The Post-colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. Ed. Sarah Harasym. New York: Routledge, 1990. 1-16.
- . *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999.
- . *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen, 1987.
- . "Marginality in the Teaching Machine." *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge, 1993. 53-76.
- . "Neocolonialism and the Secret Agent of Knowledge". Interview with Robert Young *The Oxford Literary Review*. 13.1-2 (1991): 230-51.
- . "The Post-modern Condition: The End of Politics?." Interview with Geoffrey Hawthorne, Ron Aronson, and John Dunn. *The Post-colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. Ed. Sarah Harasym. New York: Routledge, 1990. 17-34.
- . "Who Claims Alterity?." *Remaking History*. Dia Art Foundation: Discussions in Contemporary Culture 4. Ed. Barbara Kruger and Phil Mariani. New York: New P, 1989. 269-92.
- Stratton, Florence. "Cartographic Lessons: Susanna Moodie's *Roughing it in the Bush* and Thomas King's *Green Grass, Running Water*." Spec. Issue of *Canadian Literature/Litterature Canadienne: A Quarterly of Criticism and Review* 161-62 (Summer/Autumn 1999): 82-102.
- Stratton, Jon and Ien Ang. "Multicultural Imagined Communities: Cultural Difference And National Identity in Australia and the USA." *Continuum*. 8.2 (1994): 124-58.
- "Tamaki Maori Village." *New Zealand Tourism Online*. 18 August 2005. <www.tourism.net.nz/new-zealand/attractions/sightseeing-and-leisure/theme-and-leisure-parks/rotorua/tamaki-maori-village>

- Tapsell, Paul. "Marae and Tribal Identity in Urban Aotearoa/New Zealand." *Journal of Pacific Studies*. 25.1-2. (March/June 2002): 141-71.
- Taylor, Charles. "Politics of Recognition." *New Contexts of Canadian Criticism*. Ed. Ajay Heble, Donna Palmateer Pennee, and J.R. (Tim) Struthers. Peterborough: Broadview P, 1997. 98-131.
- Te Punga Somerville, Alice. "Nau te Rourou, Nau te Rakau: the Oceanic, Indigenous, Postcolonial, and New Zealand Comparative Contexts of Maori Writing in English." Diss. Cornell University, 2006.
- Tiffin, Chris, and Alan Lawson. "The Textuality of Empire." Introduction. *Describing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*. Ed. Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson. London: Routledge, 1994. 1-11.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1977.
- Turner, Dale. *This is Not a Peace Pipe: Toward a Critical Indigenous Philosophy*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2006.
- Urry, John. "The Tourist Gaze," *The Tourist Gaze*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications, 2002. 10 June 2005.
<www.sagepub.co.uk/pdf/books/019292ch1.pdf>
- Van Meijl, Toon. "Culture and Democracy Among the Maori." *Pacific Answers to Western Hegemony: cultural practices of identity construction*. Ed. Jürg Wassman. Oxford; New York: Berg, 1998. 388-402.
- Van Toorn, Penny. "Stories to Live In: Discursive Regimes and Indigenous Canadian and Australian Historiography." *Canadian Literature/Littérature Canadienne: A Quarterly of Criticism and Review* 158. (Autumn 1998): 42-63.
- Walker, Holly. "Developing Difference: Attitudes towards Maori 'Development' in Patricia Grace's *Potiki* and *Dogside Story*." *Kunapipi: Journal of Postcolonial Writing*. 27.2 (2005): 215-230.
- Walker, Michael. "Science and Maori Development: a Scientist's View." *He Pukenga Rorero: A Journal of Maori Studies* 3.2 (Nolāhuru Autumn 1998): 15-21.
- Walker, Ranginui. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without End*. Auckland: Penguin, 1990.

- Warrior, Robert Allen. *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis, MA: U Minnesota P, 1995.
- Wegner, Phillip E. *Imaginary Communities: Utopia, the Nation, and the Spatial Histories of Modernity*. Berkley: U of California P, 2002.
- “Welcome to Old Fort William.” 18 January 2005.
<www.fwhp.ca>
- Wells, Herbert George. “Utopias.” *Science Fiction Studies* 9.2. 117-21.
- Wendt, Albert. Introduction. *Nuanua: Pacific Writing in English since 1980*. Honolulu: U of Hawai’i P, 1995. 1-9.
- Wilkinson, Todd. “At Custer’s Last Stand: A First Stand for Indians.” *The Christian Science Monitor*. 24 June 2003. 18 April 2004.
<www.csmonitor.com/2003/0624/p01s01-ussc.html>
- Williams, H.W. *A Dictionary of the Maori Language*. 7th ed. Wellington: G.P. Publications, 1971.
- Williams, Mark. “Witi Ihimaera and Patricia Grace: The Maori Renaissance.” *Studies In International Literature*, U of Calgary. 5 June 2005.
<<http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/eng1392/492/williams.html>>
- Wohlfart, Irmengard. “Investigating a Double Translation of Culture: The English-Maori Classic Postcolonial Text Potiki and Its German Translation.” *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*. 21.2 (2009): 265-88.
- Zichy, Francis. “‘There Isn’t a Mr. Heavyman’: Will’s Negatives in *Medicine River*.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures*. 21.2 (Summer 2009): 25-49.