David Garneau

(transcript)

2nd Annual Symposium on the Future Imaginary

hosted by

University of British Columbia Okanagan

&

Initiative for Indigenous Futures

5 August 2016
Kelowna, British Colombia

video available at

http://abtec.org/iif/symposia/2nd-annual-symposium-on-the-future-imaginary/

info@abtec.org

[pause]

00:30 Speaker 1: So I need to apologize. I know I've got 20 minutes, but this is a condensed version of the keynote talk I gave recently at Auckland, New Zealand. And I tried to condense it as much as I can, so I've taken out all the funny bits. [laughter] But I should be able to do it. So I wanted to recognize the sovereignty of the Syilx people, as if they need my acknowledgement. But I also wanna acknowledge the ancestors, elders, knowledge keepers and cultural producers of this remarkable place. And thank you for the welcome, Jordan, who just left. I am a grateful guest. Thank you Jason and Skawennati for the invitation to speak at this symposium, and Ashok and Steven, UBCO, and the Okanagan residency, for bringing me here for these past, very exciting and productive five weeks, and one more week to go. I'm honored to be here.

01:22 S1: My father, Richard Garneau, loved history and science, and often took us five kids to museums. In 1972, when I was 10, an unusual object appeared near the entrance of the Royal Alberta Museum. We marvelled, and ran fingers over its undulant surface. Appearing to be a 145 kilogram slab of hammered iron, the enigmatic form was actually not human-made, but a 4.5 billion-year-old meteorite. Visiting often, as it was free back then, I always stole a touch from this sublime entity, reached to the stars, and considered my fleeting existence. At first he was excited, but then my dad's face flared, then darkened with recognition. He said that the thing was not what it seemed. Guess it was what it was, but it was also something else. A Métis historian and genealogist who recognized this as a [02:18] ____... Is there any Cree speakers? I can't say it properly. But it's in English, "The Manitou Stone". It was sacred to the Cree, the Dene, Blackfoot, and Métis.

02:35 S1: To have it in the museum and classified as a geological specimen was not just an error, but a provocation to Aboriginal people. And it worked. He was upset. Legal scholar and philosopher Leroy Little Bear explains that in the Blackfoot world view, everything, from rotating galaxies to vibrating atoms, is in motion, animated. Plains people have a respect for rocks, called "Grandfathers". He says, "Because, while everything is in flux, time and motion relative, these relatives are more stable, less mutable than, say, plants, animals and people." You can imagine the significance then, of a Grandfather this old, and who actually descended from the stars. The full meaning and use of the Manitou Stone is not mine to share but it was common knowledge to those in the region prior to the mid-19th Century, that if looked at from the right angle, you could see the face of the Creator. Any aboriginal person who trekked near paid it homage. And a prophecy claimed that if something were to happen to the stone, disaster would befall the territory's First Nations.

03:42 S1: Knowing its importance, some time in the 1860s, George McDougall, a Methodist minister, abducted the stone and calamity ensued. The railroad, waves of smallpox, settlers, alcohol, wage labor and the cash economy all swept in. The bison, the center of Plains livelihood and spirituality, were hunted to near extinction. Then came the Northwest resistances, and military invasions, hangings, land dispossession, internment on reserves, the Pass System, Colonial law, disproportionate incarceration, dishonoured treaties, legislated starvation, bans on ceremony and regalia, Indian residential schools, adopting out of children to white families, the relentless campaign to annihilate the language, culture, sovereignty, and bodies of First People.

04:34 S1: The story of the Manitou Stone, and there's more, is the story of museums as they transitioned from colonial trophy cases, to the non-colonial keeping houses. What do settlers do with heritage museums once they lose faith in the narratives that established them? What do you do

with Aboriginal belongings, when the reasons for collecting and displaying them are [04:56] ____? Beyond the binary of holding fast to colonial tradition, or just giving everything back, non-colonial heritage museums are co-managed spaces of collaboration and conciliation, in which the things of the past are employed to understand the present, and figure the future. They are indigenized, insomuch as they prioritize the needs of living people, over the desires of the dead. They are post-necropolis, post-hoarding living rooms, where the Aboriginals not just displayed, but performed, lived live, where First Peoples are collaborators, rather than clients. Before considering this possible future, we need to examine past and existing museums from an indigenous point of view. We need to feel the colonial shell, to be truly discontent with how it deforms its contents, before we can consider shedding it for something better.

05:53 S1: Canadian colonial museums are among the places our recent ancestors went to learn how to be cowboys and Indians, settlers and Aboriginals. Evolving from curio cabinets to nation building education centers, they were designed to perpetuate Euro-Canadian world views at the expense of the ways of knowing and being that are indigenous to the territories they occupy. They did this, not by ignoring First Nations in [06:17] ____ but by sublimating them with Canadian and humanist narratives. It's a terrific word. Sublimate is to change the form, but not the essence. Psychologically it means changing the means of expression from something base and inappropriate, to something more positive and acceptable. The word sublimate comes from the Latin verb sublimare, to lift up and raise.

06:43 S1: To Freud, civilization is sublimation. For civilizing institutions such as Indian residential schools, churches and museums, the Aboriginal was raw material needing refinement. To be made less coarse, more socially acceptable. But as we become increasingly discontent with this civilization, that is the patriarchal, racist, capitalist version, which is ill-suited to most people, and devastating to all ecosystems. And come to recognize the indigenous way of knowing and being offer more holistic civility, museums struggle to free themselves from their colonial carapace and cautiously approach indigeneity.

07:27 S1: Among the ways that museums sublimate First Nations, was by collecting their most beautiful and interesting things, freeze drying and editing them, colonial curators cured. They made cultural preserves. They exhibited a select, authentic and dead Indian-ness in order to delegitimize and eventually repress the possibilities of contemporary indigeneity. The colonial purpose of displays of First Nation's glory prior to catastrophic contact, was first to establish settlement as total, and second to demonstrate that the survivors are not what they once were. The implied story goes, deluded by European blood and especially by modernity, Indians are not really Aboriginal anymore, and unreal Aboriginals are not really entitled to treaty, land and sovereignty. Not quite Aboriginals are just another minority group, more colour tiles in our cultural mosaic. That's kind of funny. Colonialism always comes back to the land.

[laughter]

08:29 S1: Sorry. So [08:31] ____. I'm trying to get it done in 20 minutes. Colonialism always comes back to the land. The conversion of native territory into settler property. For decorum's sake, the shift from materialism to settler colonialism necessitated finer forms of state violence. Outright murder, internment and starvation were out of vogue by the 20th Century. More discreet forms of aggressive assimilation were needed, so as not to upset the finer settlers as they went about their settling. Indian residential schools did their part by separating children from their families,

language, culture, parenting skills and land knowledge, and returning them to community as traumatized strangers. While imperial collection seized, hoarded and displayed indigenous belongings as the spoils of invasion, settler museums preferred to humiliate, confuse, and quell to keep us from active dissent, from remembering and resisting dispossession. Okay, I am exaggerating a little. And this is actually part two of a paper I gave in Canberra earlier this year. So things that aren't clear are clear in that other one.

09:39 S1: It's important to have some sense of how native people experience museums, not just as complicit with settler colonial hegemony, but one of its finest instruments. In fact, I know that museums are underfunded, messy, anxious places offering exceptions and resistances to that all that I've said. There was and is for example more admiration for Indians than I am so far permitting. A fascination really, which routinely [10:04] ____ at hegemonic displays. This desire leads to contacts, even partnerships, especially the museum's recent discovery of the indigenous as contemporary, which necessitates the reforms we now strive to achieve. You probably hear when I am saying 'Museums' also universities and art galleries. Nevertheless, we need to acknowledge, understand and exercise colonialism's hungry ghosts, [10:36] ____ that crave and keep us from this possible future.

10:41 S1: A primary method for the cultural and intellectual disenfranchisement of Aboriginal peoples, was the training of Indian experts. Not Indians as experts, but settlers who became experts in Indians. Before invasion of course, we were our own authors and authorities. The rise of the White Indian expert required not only the separation of Aboriginal people from their better belongings, but also the transfer of knowledge from brown bodies to white. Experts of these new resources mind meaning from Aboriginal makers and keepers, they hunted for stories, the remaining property these people had to trade for their very survival. Indian experts then set these edited things and meanings within their own worldview, casting them as either a kin or alien in relation to their center. Colonial museums established White European masculine values and bodies at the hub of the new entity called human, or just man. And the Aboriginal, among many others, were placed in relative orbit, depending on how much humanity they had, as determined by these central experts. As a man of the cloth, George McDougall knew what he was doing. He was waging spiritual war, saving souls for their imperfect cages and erroneous face.

12:00 S1: He wanted to break the people by desecrating and vanishing one of their sacred objects. He sent the Manitou Stone thousands of kilometres east to Toronto's Royal Ontario museum. Removing the stone from the site of meaning was devastating, but McDougall's ontological transformation of the object from the sacred to the scientific, from stone to a rock, was diabolical. To geologists, a rock is a mineral aggregate existing in nature. Stones are the same material, but altered by people, either by use or by concept. Stonewalls are made from rocks. Stones are rocks altered by human hands and attention. We've referred to the Stone Age, rather than the Rock Age, as a way of indicating tool making. Rocks pressed into human service become Stonehenge rather than Rock-henge, and a Rock Garden is an arrangement of stones, trying to pass for nature.

[laughter]

13:00 S1: So Asini stone indicates a difference from mere rocks, but unusually this one also has a name, Manitou. Naming is the most significant thing... Symbolic acts we engage in. Names confer or recognize special status. Philosopher Arthur Danto explains, for example, that one of the few things that separate works of art from mere real things, is the fact of a title. Art works are entitled to

titles, mere real things are not. Names also often suggest metaphysical qualities. We name our pets, but the same animal in a lab gets a number. Animals we eat also go unnamed and unstoried. That this inter-galactic grandfather has a name, the highest name, Manitou, means that it ranks very high in Aboriginal ontology. By spiriting away the Manitou Stone to a museum, to a secular site McDougall wanted to strip it of its context, name and meanings, desacralize it, convert it to a scientific object, an exceptional, but mere real thing. And this is a routine thing on the plains anyways. Every culture circulates around a set of objects and spaces that are beyond property and trade. These are national treasures, sacred sites and texts, tactile symbols that are community's gravitational centre.

14:26 S1: The objects, their protection and amplification through story and ritual define the society, and hold both its large and infinitesimal fragments in orbit. The colonial attitude, the state of mind required to assume control over the space, bodies, objects, trade, and imaginary of others, begins by refusing the living relational value of these entities. This is done in one of two ways, either the colonist refuses the sacred character of the thing or site, because it derives from a metaphysical system that it rejects in favor of its own cosmology, or in a recent more sensitive version, materialist scholars reckon the semiotic value of sacred entities, but fail to experience their symbolic value. That is they recognize the object's value for believers, but not for themselves. Because of their objectivist creed and position as outsiders, materialist scholars do not know the essential sacred qualities of these entities from within the believer's lived experience. I can't go on and describe this great object.

15:37 S1: You can, for instance, read books about Aboriginal art by indigenous writers, and receive anthropological insights, learn about the history, sociology, economics, political meanings and occasionally the aesthetics of these works. But it's very rare for academic writers to include, for example, subjective engagement with these objects. Narratives about how one feels with these things, how was, as Bell Hooks says, was moved, touched, taken to another place, momentarily "born-again". This is what Bell Hooks says when describing the aesthetic experiences, that are neither not included because not experienced, or more likely excluded, because such confessions lie outside of the objectivist discourse of these disciplined texts. Such writings keep the first person, the author, at a distance from the First Nation's art work. Hooks considers the failure of white critics to appreciate Jean-Michel Basquiat's art, and says that if they are unmoved, they are unable to speak meaningfully about the work. The elusive meanings she alludes to are those "felt" values, communal affects and metaphysical knowing that lie beyond objectivist discourse. When the metaphysical qualities of sacred objects are actively unrecognized as essential properties, they suddenly become mere things and are then available for appropriation.

16:57 S1: In the case of the Manitou Stone, the indigenous spiritual narrative is degraded, and another one, science takes over, re-storying the "being" as "thing". De-sacralizing the medicine bundle, masks, songs, stories, sacred stone, territory, all become mere things that have ascertainable market value or academic worth. Through the alchimy of the Colonial imagination, combined with the threat of brute force, sacred and cultural objects become transmogrified into commodities. They become in the capitalist materialist ontology and economy, raw materials whose particular characters are sublimated into a higher refined form, called Capital, for the academic paper. This is the narrative that allowed, for example, sacred Incan objects to be melted for their gold value.

17:51 S1: So colonialism includes the idea of art and artifact. By art and artifact, I mean the modernist sense of objects having universal values that eclipse the local value. The story is that

some handmade things exceed the tribe, and people who made them. They are expressions of human genius, and therefore belong to all of humankind. These things must be liberated from their original makers and keepers, because those people don't recognize their full value. They are collected, administrated only by experts properly trained in the correct huminus tradition. The desire of the colonist is directed, not just at appropriating these material things, but to displacing their local symbolic value, and displacing living Aboriginal indigenous people as the experts and keepers of their own culture. This de-contextualization of [18:50] ____ native cultures by moving sites of aboriginal creativity and authentication into the colonial museum, university, book, internet, and non-native body.

19:01 S1: The return of the Manitou Stone to its homeland in 1972, not to the Caravit's original keepers as a sacred object, but to the custody of the Providential Museum and as a geological specimen, was a provocation. If no one complained, it meant that the work of erasure and reeducation was effective. People had forgotten their history. And if Aboriginal people did know what the stone was, they also knew what the gesture meant. It was a dare to complain, to risk exposure and rebuke. So my dad remained subdued, but discontent by his sublimation. Of course things are different now. We are, I hope, in the sticky transition between the colonial and non-colonial eras. I use the term non-colonial to distinguish our work from the logical impossibility that is de-colonialism or post-colonialism into territories in which the descendants of non-aboriginal invaders still rule over natives. De-colonial theory makes sense in places that have actually shed their colonizers, but if in New Zealand, Australia, Canada and the United States, what is done in the name of decolonization and reconciliation is not premised on restoration of native land and sovereignty, these words and activities are clearly smoke screens concealing the machinery of assimilation. They are an effort to make settlers more comfortable with their inherited crimes and privileges. To re-purpose Richard Bell, decolonization is a white-thing, reconciliation is also a white-thing.

20:43 S1: The children of colonizers, now settler colonials, need new stories in order to live with themselves and to land our territories. They cannot be like the old stories which were laid like blankets on the blood-stained earth. Science stories, anthropology, ethnology all constituted a seemingly humane but pernicious form of invasion, slow, controlled, and less visible than the bloody violence of the great-grandfathers. You can read the giddy excitement in the written voices of settlers when individual First Peoples adopted western clothing, words, and religions, and the sadness when they did it imperfectly. And the incredulity when they would not take the European yoke, and did not become bettered in the proper way, when education did not entirely kill the Indian and the man. Aboriginals who did not assimilate, who remained too dark, became scape-goats, the foils of civilization.

21:40 S1: Settlers need narratives that acknowledge their ancestor's crimes, apologize for their horrible histories if they are to make their presence ethically tolerable. You can't look your grandchildren in the eye and enjoy the land and its spoils without a good story. But we need something more. We're all stirring to the complexity of our inheritances, feel the blood seep through the blankets, it's time to try something new. Narratives and relationships that understand aboriginals as hosts and settlers as guests. Non-colonial action means learning and using, but not getting subsumed by anti-colonial critique. Non-colonial action is productive work, the recovery and restoration of native languages and territories, modes of knowing and being prior to contact. However, it also recognizes adaptation as a fundamental quality of being native. We have the right to be contemporary, to adapt, to be indigenous without sacrificing our heritage and country.

22:38 S1: Non-colonial activity is centered on First Nation separatism. However, it can include shared spaces in which the indigenous is centered. Such spaces are possible when the narratives, the sustained settler colonialism are recognized, felt, known to be incredible and unsustainable. I take as axiomatic that the patriarchal capitalist and racist histories, habits, and ideas we clot under the words "Western" and "Colonial" has the nature of an illness, and that the native ways of knowing and being are medicines, antidotes for this disorder. We, native and not, are compelled to center the Aboriginal Indigenous, not out of guilt, deference or an expression of multicultural inclusion, and not only because it is the just thing to do, but because we recognize it as a better way of knowing and being in these territories, more healthful than dominant culture habits that humiliate the native, dehumanize the majority, and degrade the ecosphere. And I just wanna to look at one symptom. Colonial museums are hoards, and I'm not just talking about the 3% that's shown and displayed, but the 97% that's in the back rooms. And I was showing this talk to a group of 600 museum professionals in Auckland, and they all gasp when they see the flooding.

[laughter]

23:58 S1: But they love the idea of the hoard. A hoard is a mass of things collected and secreted away by people who feel the objects are valuable. They get a feeling of power from the piles, even when the hoard has little meaning or value for others. Eventually, the stacks have lives of their own. I'm saying that they actually become an entity. They become pernicious beings that distorts the hoarders' lives, and the lives of the hoard's inheritors. Problems arise when the reason for collecting and the precipitating ontology take second place to maintaining the hoard. Or trouble grows in the other direction when the will that directs the collecting and collection become compulsive, and moribund, and overwhelms the needs of the living. Finally, the cancerous collection puts so much stress on its container, such that few new things can be added. Such a hoard embodies the will of an ancestor, and chokes the lives of the living. Such a museum is an acropolis, a city for the dead.

25:01 S1: Non-colonial museums are based on indigenous ontologies. They respect the ancestors, the healthy ones that guide us but we do not suffer the dead weight of the ill ones who desire corporeal immortality. The happy dead want to be remembered, wish their collective wisdom and stories to live, but they do not mean to burden us with their things, their individual desires may concentrate. So wonderful, everything Jordan said agrees, I think, with what I'm trying to get across here. And think about... It might seem like a release this vast space of digital storage. But there's a problem with that, too, because a digital object of a real thing becomes a similar ghost. While the imperial museum collects to prove domination, colonial museums, that is museums on indigenous territory made by settlers for settlers, accumulate their hoard of symbolic things as proof of presence. These piles offer a feeling of weight, making rootless people, ungrounded people, feel more substantial in their contingent occupation. Indigenous people who are at home with the land, are in less need of such piles, property, and proofs. They traverse lightly. Their presence is storied in and with country, our reservoir of being and meaning.

26:27 S1: Hoarding is an unhealthy emotional attachment to material things. It is an illness of colonial capitalism. Perhaps settler psychology is such that people project onto things as if they were empty vessels, and then cannot let them go because they identify with them in a noncritical and non-relational way. Indigenous people of plains did not hoard because they were mobile, and were mobile because they did not hoard. Because plains people know everything as animate, the relation is not to inanimate things, but with animate things... Animate relations. People in the

indigenous mode recognize things as animate relations, rather than possessions. Not possessing and not possessed by. Museums that are non-colonial are indigenized when they place the needs of living people before preserving possessions. When they recognize their inherited hoards are not inanimate things but desires made firm and some of those desires are healthier than others. Some need curatorial care, others need to be released. As Jordan said, some things need to be buried or burned.

27:34 S1: My final point is that non-colonial collaboration is a partnership in which both parties and systems they represent are disturbed by the encounter. Most indigenous settler encounters are characterized by unequal power relations and results. Too often non-aboriginal experts consult with aboriginals as subjects rather than as indigenous peers. To be non-colonial is to defer to living aboriginal people and tribal matters. However, to be indigenous is to consider non-aboriginal molds and tools to see if it might be made indigenous. Non-colonial collaborations are characterized by respectful trying. Under paradigms still entangled in colonial habits, museums thought they were catalysts. A catalyst precipitates a reaction, a change, but is itself unchanged. Non-colonialism requires better metaphors to inspire better behaviors. Almost done.

28:31 S1: The Manitou Stone was was never owned or kept by anyone. Like the land it rested on, all shared it. It just lay in a field where it fell. People visited it. No one conceived the stone as property and so could not imagine its theft. It took a different imaginary, an alien narrative, to re-conceive the stone as geology and abduct it with a clear conscience. Today things are different. The museum recognizes that their foundational narratives regarding First Nations' Inuit and Métis people are incredible, and need revision. In 1997, the Royal Aboriginal Museum listened, and moved the Manitou Stone from their geological display, to their Aboriginal gallery. This dramatic change in imaginary signalled to native people that the museum was no longer under the thrall of its colonial ancestors. Those like my father who were silenced, saw that they could now be heard in these spaces.

29:24 S1: And as soon as that recognition was made, people demanded the stone be returned. But to which nation? Chris Robinson, executive director of the museum, recently explained, "We recognize that it certainly isn't ours." So he consulted 30 First Nations, most objected that it would go to any one nation. Vincent Steinhauer, the president of the Blue Quill First Nation's College in St. Paul of Alberta said, "One thing the elders in consultation were very clear, was that the stone belongs to all First Nations, not to one. That's why there has been no resolution about who it would be returned to. And they also agreed that it shouldn't be sort of on tour. It needs to rest somewhere, and be visited. So the museum is closed, and will reopen in a new location downtown next year. All the displays are being rethought. And I'm told the indigenous display will reflect the knowledge and needs of a powerful Indigenous Curatorial and Community Consultation Committee.

30:24 S1: The best option so far, has been an idea that has come from the consultations that the stone should remain in the museum, and be housed in a special room suitable for ceremonies. Most indigenous people involved in repatriation agree that bodies and recognized sacred objects should be returned to the community, and sometimes to the earth. But many also agree that some things are best cared for in museums, especially when it includes indigenous stewardship. While I'm most interested in sovereign indigenous display territories, there are objects, relations and moments such as these where the international collaboration is the best solution. I just wanna close by... I was looking online, you could find this wonderful video, Rob Cardinal is a [31:10] ____ astronomer. This is awesome, and he's addressing for the museum in this promo video, he is talking about the

history of this rock. But doesn't talk about, even though it's his [31:19] ____, he doesn't talk about the indigenous story at all. But then at the end of the video, he turns to the rock and starts talking to it. It was pretty awesome, and that's the end of my talk.

[applause]

31:39 S1: Is there any time for questions?

31:40 Speaker 2: Yes. Just one.

31:46 Speaker 3: Hi Dave, thank you for that once again amazing presentation. You said at the beginning this was condensed from a keynote in Australia. I know that this past year, you've probably a couple of times in the past you've done international exchanges with indigenous artists in Australia. And I wonder if you could speak a little bit to how that has changed your thinking about indigeneity in general?

32:06 S1: Yeah so, part of that I took out was a long description of trying to explain what I see as these three tiers of native-ness. So Indigeneity is a new thing and it constitutes us differently. Every native person in this room at this moment of sharing is indigenous. Right? We're not speaking from our local spaces. We come to this space to share where we're from with people from other places. So that's indigenous. The indigenous is recognized by the UN as being people who have, are native to certain territories, who have more in common with each other than they do with the colonizers who share the space with them or have occupied this space.

32:45 S1: So I see you're local my way of being Métis is different than the way I'm being indigenous or something else. But there's Métis-ness or Cree-ness or [32:54] ____. Then there's the aboriginal. When people got together to become political, represent themselves, and became Indian so to speak, but represent themselves in a different way. So that political identity is the aboriginal.

33:07 S1: But the indigenous-ness is this new thing. We're starting, just trying to figure it out. What happens when we travel around so much and we don't root ourselves back and keep this knowledge going back through these different ways of being. We can be disconnected, become academics or artists and think that we're free from these things. And if we are then we're merely academics and artisans and no longer indigenous artists, or well, we're indigenous artists but no longer Métis. I'm not expressing my Métis-ness say. That's a real challenge. That's one of the things I was talking about.

33:40 S1: But they were very interested in, they were all museum people so they're interested in physical things. Problems of repatriation. Problems of things that were recognized as just objects and they shouldn't go back to the community. We don't know what that is. That came up over and over again so that was very interesting. There's so many interesting things.

34:00 S3: Dave, I'm wondering whether through that process of the Manitou Stone being brought into the museum whether it's acquired a monetary value and whether that complicates the issues around repatriation.

34:14 S1: To me that's a real interesting thing about the museum space, right? The museum space, whether it's an art museum or an object museum is supposed to be a space free from capital.

Capital's required to get it in there but suddenly free and no one talks about its value as dollars. And you're supposed to suspend that when you're having that aesthetic or whatever experience with the object. To me that's interesting. It's interesting. Is it true? I think it's mostly true. It's our desire that it be true and so sometimes you can make it true.

34:45 S1: Similarly, when I'm in a space like this, class doesn't matter when we're in this space, right? Except for the people who can't get here. [chuckle] So we suspend it while we're in here in order to have these lofty thoughts. So I think that's what happens in space and museum, is meant to happen in space and museum or the university, or the book, or whatever. And I think we need these spaces. This is the third space for me. It's supposed to be free. It's not, but if we don't have a space for free thought for this base of possibility then we've seen that these hierarchies that control us absolutely control us. So that's why we need this space of the Indigenous.

35:24 S1: Candice Hopkins and I did a meeting, a set of workshops in Banff earlier this year and indigenous people were coming from all over the country, and from Fiji, and Australia, and New Zealand. And there one woman Solatae said, a Fijian said she was so relieved to be in this space where she didn't have to worry about political community concerns. But also she wished that we should be, she said we should be having these conversations back home, but you can't. You can only have them in certain spaces, so we need to make these spaces. So monetary value, yeah, but we have to try to suspend that.

[pause]

36:04 S?: How does the stone feel?

36:08 S1: It's bumpy, it's amazing. And that's the thing, as a kid, I didn't know what it was or what does a meteor mean to a 12 year-old to get some sense, but when you touch it and those are [36:16] ____ as it's entering the atmosphere, it doesn't look like something you... It looks like it's got some intention and [36:22] ____ to it. You know what I'm saying. So you can measure people finding it the first time, it doesn't look like anything else, but sort of like something. So that's a work or art, right? It's kind of like something, it represents something, but it's not like something you ever saw before. So that's that again, the special space of these things that are not quite knowable. You could really feel that. And there's very few classes of objects that are like that.

36:46 S2: One last question?

[pause]

36:55 S3: Thanks, David. In the world of physiology, sort of critical physiology, how would you say Canada's doing?

37:09 S1: I don't know, this is a field that I rolled into like a bison in the china shop.

[laughter]

37:14 S1: And so people there were saying, there's so many fresh thoughts... They were so excited because I wasn't going through any of the protocols or that I don't have to know the histories, I don't have to be responsible for those authors or anything, just trying to see things as they were. And it

began by looking at that shield that I showed in an exhibition in a previous paper that I was writing about. Yeah, I'm seeing it through the eyes of an artist or a curator, I think, which is a little bit different. But they do look at Canadian practices, museum pieces that thought as getting big play down there. It's just like we always idolize Australian indigenous women's theories about community and relations. And they do it down there, that great book... What? What? They don't know. [chuckle] So always the thing that's over there is better than the thing over here. Otherwise I wouldn't be invited there.

[laughter]