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Abstract

This dissertation, a companion to the documentary film *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities*, explores how film can be used to transmit information generated by an Indigenous community during research and return it in a manner that most closely approximates the multi-sensorial scope of the oral tradition. Of all modern forms of communication, I argue that film is the medium that lies closest to the mode of Indigenous storytelling. My dissertation explores film as a means of reporting findings back to the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation, whose members played key roles in the history of Native Studies in Ontario – hitherto the focus of my MA research. Throughout, the most pertinent question has remained: What are the “best practices” – under the current circumstances – that can be put in place to ensure that colonial approaches, imposition of harmful outside authority foremost of all, are not perpetuated?

Bridging the gulf between my Indigenous and European ancestry requires a leap of faith from both sides. Lee Maracle, a writer of the Stó:lō Nation, describes the dilemma as “a basket in the middle of the bridge into which each side can contribute their accumulated light and teachings” (SAGE Writing Retreat, February 22, 2014). My contribution to the basket, I trust, is acceptance of a number of best practices revealed through collaborative research, which might contribute to increased transmission of academic findings to Indigenous communities.

Procedures rooted in community-based participatory research (CBPR) offer an array of best practices that proved pivotal to maintaining a balanced relationship between the researcher and those who are researched, ensuring that (as much as possible) control of the process rests with the community. Members of Six Nations expressed their opinions on camera in (i) a Community Circle and (ii) interviews with the key subjects. Subsequently, we collaborated to create a film to tell their story. “Best practices,” therefore, highlight ways in which film as a
means of pedagogy can be used to transmit information to Indigenous communities in a manner that resembles and echoes the oral tradition.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

My decision to pursue a doctorate in geography was predicated on the understanding that a documentary film and script would be the centrepiece of my dissertation, complemented by a substantive critical text. Such was the understanding reached in July 2011 with Dr. Audrey Kobayashi in her role as Graduate Coordinator, when I was in year one of my doctoral program. The opportunity to diverge somewhat from doctoral convention is one that I have relished, but one that has not been without considerable challenge.

1.1 The Dilemma

We live in times of famine. Barren are the rich landscapes, where gnarled Elders once told delicious stories sprouted from the land. Now, the living stories plucked from the speaker’s moist tongue languish in dry silent tomes. Uprooted stories abandoned in the wake of manufactured migrations turn to dust. The trudging convoys of dispossessed raise the dust of these stories; from the liminal margins withering orators desperately gesture songs once sung and stories once told.

Academic findings do not flow naturally to Indigenous communities. Until this challenge is faced and surmounted, much crucial information about the culture of Indigenous peoples will remain sequestered in the inner sanctum of academia. The findings of my MA thesis offer a perfect example. The research, which addresses the history and present status of Native Studies in Ontario high schools, is presently available online at QSpace in the form of a PDF in the English language (Chaput 2012).
Unfortunately, the combination of the current format and the language of my MA thesis constitutes an inadequate, and culturally inappropriate, vehicle for conveying pertinent data to the majority of Ontario’s Indigenous population. In order for my Master’s work to be more accessible to Indigenous peoples and to resonate among the Native community, I felt all along that it must be “translated” into a more accessible and engaging format.

Can landless peoples’ burning thirst for rootedness invoke the rains, sprout the seeds, and replenish the lands? Can the very tools (books, images, and films) that have often served to divorce narrative from place serve to reunite them? Can the comparatively bland simulacra of film and books serve to resurrect the original artefact? Can research methodologies be designed to measure meaningfully the effectiveness of film and image-based approaches in reviving the awareness of the forgotten relationship between narrative and place, discussed so incisively by Marlene Brant Castellano in her *Updating Aboriginal Traditions of Knowledge* (2000)? “My people will sleep for one hundred years,” Métis leader Louis Riel declared on July 4, 1885, “but when they awake, it will be the artists who give them their spirit back” (Wyman 2004, 85).

1.2 Métis Positionality

My Métis essence is best rendered as a poem, one I call “Rivière Rouge”:

*From the wound flow*
*Red encoded drops of identity.*
*From which mountain did they originate, Aboriginate?*
*As they pass through this valley of open flesh*
*The eyes, transfixed by the colour of the loss, Forget the Source.*
I am Métis. My mother, Elmire Delorme, gave birth to me at the St. Boniface Hospital, situated on the east bank of the Red River across from The Forks where the Assiniboine and Red Rivers converge in Manitoba, Canada. I am the son of a brown-eyed sauvagesse mother and a blue-eyed French Canadian father, André Joseph Chaput, both with deep Métis ancestry. Thirty-three kilometres south of the hospital in the tiny Métis village of St. Adolphe, my feet first touched the earth. Nestled on a curve of the serpentine Red River, this village was to be my home for my first eight years. My maternal grandfather, Edouard Delorme, transformed the black clay of countless floods into fertile fruit and vegetable gardens.

The land has always woven itself into our stories. Like The Forks of my birthplace in St. Boniface, I embody the convergence of separate streams. My body is the blending of two multifaceted ancestral streams – the confluence of my Cree, Ojibway, Chippewa, and Métis Indigenous ancestries, and those of my Irish, French, and German European ancestries. Over the years, when grappling with the challenge of conveying the complexities of my Métis perspective within Canadian society, I have often resorted to the metaphor of “having a foot in each canoe.” The metaphor is not only awkward but
also conveys the riskiness of an untenable undertaking: inevitably the paddlers are bound
to go their separate ways, forcing a straddling Métis to choose one craft or to swim for
shore. In an attempt to create a more promising scenario, I have turned to the metaphor of
a bridge whose structure invites the integration of the Western and Indigenous
worldviews in a mutually beneficial fashion.

The opportunity and challenge of attending Queen’s University over the past six
years has gifted me with the time and support to acquire and hone academic tools that aid
in contextualizing and theorizing issues common to the Métis, as well to our First
Nations and Inuit kin. An issue unique to the Métis is that our ancestors were neither
European nor First Nations but a mix of both. In Cree we are the Otipemisiwak – the
people who govern themselves. The Métis are also referred to as the first or original
Canadians. Our culture evolved distinct from its two ancestral streams, yet embodies
both. To return to my canoe metaphor, even if I choose one of the canoes – and I have
tried each at different times – there is no guarantee of acceptance. I seem to be invisible
to both “Red” and “White” – they appear to be unable to reconcile the possibility of the
merging that I represent – and thus I often feel that I do not belong.

In spite of that, however, the burden of being an “outsider” has been transformed
into the blessing of accessing a unique perspective. Being an “outsider” becomes an
advantage in undertaking the challenge of communicating information to a broad
spectrum of far-flung Indigenous communities with diverse backgrounds, languages, and
varying levels of literacy. I find myself in the privileged position of understanding
enough of each culture to be able to relate to and communicate with both. This duality
enables me to embark more safely as a hunter on a quest for information. Having
discovered that data, I am then able to plant the stories that will feed communities. To contextualize my positionality, the Buffalo Hunt serves as yet another metaphor, this one more concerned with methodological procedure.

1.3 The Métis Buffalo Hunt

Traditionally, the Métis Buffalo Hunt was a community-based participatory event. The community identified the tasks called for and selected those individuals best suited to accomplish them. The Buffalo Hunt was a quasi-military undertaking. Lives depended on strict adherence to procedure: in the short term, the lives of the hunters, and in the long term, those of the entire community. Any action jeopardizing the success of the hunt could result in starvation and other hardships linked to the many functions the buffalo served after it was killed, its body a source, for instance, for the means of making tents and clothing. For this reason the community meted out stiff penalties to those who deviated from prescribed protocol. It was a performative undertaking. Actors knew their parts in a well-defined script – the “theatre of life” converging with the “theatre of war.”

Once the Captain of the Hunt was agreed upon, the leaders of each family reported to him; all hunters were expected to follow his orders. Women and the older children were skilled at butchering and skinning the fallen buffalo. Each had a specific task. Medicine men or shamans were present. The scouts in the field were also part of the hunt. Those who were chosen for tasks that prevented their family from killing buffalo were compensated appropriately by the hunters.

Although the buffalo herds are no longer with us, the need to organize Indigenous life in a way that ensures its ongoing-ness is still required. The protocols used to manage
academic research are no less complex. The buffalo hunt can be likened to searching for knowledge. But who does this hunt feed, and how is it organized to ensure that results reach all who have some stake in it?

The principles of collaborating and sharing the bounty of the buffalo hunt I believe apply to the harvest of the research process. In my case the Academy coached and supported me to develop the necessary skills to scout the research territory and create a plan. I choose to render the myriad challenges I grappled with in a poem I call “Deadly Harvest.”

Gone are the sacred herds of four-legged ones
Whose thunderous passing shook three days
Freely roaming
Grazing fields
Buffaloed over cliffs
Pulverized bones to fertilize monoculture deserts
Tended by tethered tenants
Niagara falls beneath the gaze of newly wedded workers
Who will never feel the freedom
Of riding bareback chasing herds.
Two-legged legends astride four-legged Gods
Harvesting the four-legged Goddess
Hooves pounding the earth
Now prairie memories, newly minted
Jingle in beggar pockets
Buffalo nickel dynasty descendants
Shoes pounding the pavement
Gone are the sightless seers
Eyes well up
Purity gives up the wealth of the heart
The body forgoes the banquet of the senses
Avails itself of the very nutrients
Rendered inaccessible while thrilling the senses

Let the journey begin.
Chapter 2  
Getting One’s Bearings: Literature Review and Theoretical Orientation

2.1 Thesis Statement

This dissertation evaluates “best practices” concerning how film, as a technology that engages the senses in multiple ways, may be applied to transmit academic findings to Indigenous communities in a manner that most closely approximates the multi-sensorial scope of the oral tradition. My use of the term “best practices” draws on the work of Chandler and Lalonde (2004, 113). Their article, “Transferring Whose Knowledge? Exchanging Whose Best Practices?: On Knowing About Indigenous Knowledge and Aboriginal Suicide,” introduces a unique vision of “knowledge transfer” and the “exchange of best practices.” Instead of the pervasive top-down model, their vision allows for the “flow of relevant knowledge and practices as also moving ‘laterally’ from community to community, rather than only from Ottawa or some provincial capital down to the level of Aboriginal communities” (2004, 113). Chandler and Lalonde’s approach runs counter to the inconceivable “prospect that useful knowledge might flow ‘uphill,’ or even laterally from community to community” (2004, 117). For me, film constitutes a “best practice” that allows the transfer of knowledge from my MA to participating members of the Six Nations community.

Film is a medium that has many parallels to Indigenous storytelling. I have therefore chosen to explore the use of film as a means of reporting findings back to one community in particular, the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation, near Brantford, Ontario, which was the focus of my MA research. Throughout the research process the
most pertinent question has remained: what best practices may be deployed to ensure that
the process does not perpetuate colonial approaches, the imposition of harmful outside
authority foremost of all?

The construction of a bridge spanning the gulf between my Indigenous and
European ancestors requires a leap of faith from both sides. Lee Maracle, one of our
finest Indigenous scholars, describes it thus: “a basket in the middle of the bridge into
which each side can contribute their accumulated light and teachings” (SAGE Writing
Retreat, February 22, 2014). My contribution to the “basket” will be “best practices,”
revealed through this collaborative research effort, which I believe will lead to the
increased success of future communication of academic findings to participating
Indigenous communities. In this case, Six Nations is the target community and my
communication to the audience has been, and will continue to be, through the use of film.

Ensuring that the power relationship between the filmmaker and the Indigenous
community was kept in balance was a critical goal of my approach. In the past,
anthropologists and ethnographers researching Indigenous cultures have assumed control
of all the data extracted in the field. What was noted, what was written, and what and
how it was disseminated, in peer-reviewed articles and monographs, academic treatises,
books and publications, have too often remained in the researcher’s hands. Through
community-based participatory research (CBPR), defined by Castleden, Mulrennan, and
Godlewska (2012, 156) as “research undertaken in partnership with Indigenous peoples,
communities, and organizations,” I uncovered a number of best practices that proved
pivotal in maintaining a balanced relationship and ensuring that control remained in the
hands of the community.
Equally critical to my approach was the use of CBPR to determine what findings the Six Nations community would choose to prioritize and translate into film. What is unique to this research is that my analysis of information from the Ontario Ministry of Education (OME) regarding Native Studies in Ontario high schools was presented to the wider community in a culturally appropriate fashion. I used CBPR methods to create a documentary film that tells the story of Native Studies in Ontario, based on information that was first compiled in my MA thesis. I collaborated with members of the Six Nations community in order to translate selected findings into a film. Up until now, this information was only available to the public or to researchers as a PDF of my MA thesis in the Queen’s QSpace database.

Best practices, therefore, at least as I engage them, highlight ways in which film, as a means of pedagogy, may be marshalled to transmit information to Indigenous communities in a manner that resembles and echoes the oral tradition.

2.2 Literature Review

In coming to terms with pertinent literature, I focused on four themes of discussion: (i) a theoretical framework based on considerations of phenomenology; (ii) the role of literacy in the disconnect between narrative and place as well as between the human and the other-than-human; (iii) the unknown geographies of Native Studies in Ontario high schools; and (iv) the role of film in transmitting knowledge to an audience.
2.3 Theoretical Inspiration: Phenomenology and Place

For theoretical inspiration, I draw on David Abram, whose work is grounded in the phenomenology\(^1\) of the German philosopher Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) and his French counterpart Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908–1961). Phenomenology as originally conceived by Husserl “was a plea that science, for its own integrity and meaningfulness, must acknowledge that it is rooted in the same world that we all engage in our everyday lives and with our unaided senses” (Abram 1997, 43). Through phenomenology, Husserl sought to demonstrate how “every theoretical and scientific practice grows out of and remains supported by the forgotten ground of our directly felt and lived experience” (1997, 43). Although the moment of birth requires the severance of the sanguine link to our human mothers, the link to the matrix of the Earth cannot be severed, save at the moment we shed our earthly robes.

Merleau-Ponty sought to expand Husserl’s theory of phenomenology by employing a “style of language which, by virtue of its fluidity, its carnal resonance, and its careful avoidance of abstract terms, might itself draw us into sensuous depths of the life-world” (Abram 1997, 44). In so doing, Merleau-Ponty provides us with a style of

---

\(^1\) Within geography, discussion of phenomenology dates back to the seminal essay by Carl Sauer (1889 – 1975) on the morphology of landscape (Sauer 1963, 315-16), first published in 1925. In terms of the interaction between humans and the natural environment, Sauer’s concept of the "cultural landscape" expresses the essence of phenomenological thought. Building on Sauer’s concept of the cultural landscape, the Canadian geographer Edward (“Ted”) Relph explored a more nuanced methodological approach to human interaction with place in *Place and Placelessness* (Relph 1976). Relph’s book enhanced the standing of the field of human geography with his incisive focus on the meaningful interaction between humans and place. Perhaps an even earlier influence leading to developments in the field of human geography was that of the anthropologist Clarke Wissler (1870 – 1947). Drawing on Wissler’s article, “The Relation of Nature to Man as Illustrated by the North American Indian” (Wissler 1924, 312), Sauer extrapolates that “a gradual coalescence of social anthropology and of geography may represent the first of a series of fusions into a larger science of man” (Sauer [1925] 1963, 350).
language that presents a world that allows for a fluid and unceasing connection with the environment, people, other sentient beings, and the force of nature. Abram (1997, 46-47) presents Merleau-Ponty’s concept of intersubjectivity by initially outlining the “body-subject” in the following way:

The breathing, sensing body draws its sustenance and its very substance from the soils, plants and elements that surround it; it continually contributes itself, in turn, to the air, to the composting earth, to the nourishment of insects and oak trees and squirrels, ceaselessly spreading out of itself as well as breathing the world into itself, so that it is very difficult to discern, at any moment, precisely where this living body begins and where it ends.

The embodied sensory exchange that takes place, as Merleau-Ponty explains it, between the body-subject and its environment is an act of “perceiving,” a “reciprocity,” perhaps, as Abram (1997, 52) puts it, an ongoing “interchange between my body and the entities that surround it.” He elaborates:

Our most immediate experience of things, according to Merleau-Ponty, is necessarily an experience of a reciprocal encounter – of tension, communication, and co-mingling. From within the depths of this encounter, we know the thing or phenomenon only as our interlocutor – as a dynamic presence that confronts us and draws us into relation (Abram 1997, 56).

This relation in Indigenous philosophy is the interplay between the animate and the inanimate in nature. The idea that there is a separation between nature and humanity is foreign. The earth and all its manifestations – humans included – is a seamless, sentient continuum.

---

2 According to Julie Cruickshank, author of Do Glaciers Listen? Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social Imagination (2005), the experiences and oral history of Tlingit and Athapaskan peoples reinforce “a vision that humans and nature mutually make and maintain the habitable world, a view now echoed by environmental historians... Glaciers appear as actors in this book. Glaciers take action and respond to their surroundings” (Cruikshank 2005, 3).
In phenomenology, the body is not self-enclosed, as evidenced by its multiple ways of experiencing the world through the senses of hearing, touching, seeing, tasting, and smelling. Abram (1997, 125) puts it thus:

"[M]y divergent senses meet up with each other and the surrounding world, converging and comingling in the things I perceive. We may think of the sensing body as a kind of open circuit that completes itself only in things, and in the world. The differentiation of my senses, as well as their spontaneous convergence in the world at large, ensures that I am a being destined for relationship: it is primarily through my engagement with what is not me that I affect the integration of my senses and thereby experience my own unity and coherence."

Indigenous ways of being are relational. They are compatible with the phenomenological aspect of experience, in relation to nature as an extension of, and continuous with, being human. The intertwining or overlapping of multiple sensory experiences, according to Abram (1977, 124), results in the “vividness and intensity with which surrounding nature spontaneously presents itself to the members of an indigenous oral community.” The ways of being and knowing in an Indigenous community are rooted in the animistic discourse historically produced through oral tradition as an “inevitable counterpart of their immediate, synaesthetic engagement with the land that they inhabit” (Abram 1997, 130). For instance, the recognition in the landscape of signs, portents, and messages from animate nature, such as rock formations, streams, and trees, as well as in the diversity of animal life that provides information, sustenance, and the material to make up shelter in the Indigenous way of life, becomes a “way of linking ourselves to those things and letting the things weave themselves into our experience” (Abram 1997, 130).

That is, a child in any Western milieu is surrounded by an abstract explicit visual technology of uniform time and uniform continuous space in which “cause” is efficient and sequential, and things move and happen on single planes and successive order. But the African child lives in the implicit, magical world of the resonant oral world.

Both Abram and McLuhan conjecture that the synaesthetic experience – union of the senses – of non-literate Indigenous communities, whose ways of knowing were transmitted through oral traditions, had a direct implication on thought and behaviour that depended “upon the magical resonance in words and their power to impose their assumptions relentlessly” (McLuhan 1964, 22). Carothers, as McLuhan quotes him, presents the idea that “sounds are in a sense dynamic things – of movements, events, activities for which man, when largely unprotected from the hazards of life in the bush or the belt, must be ever on the alert” (Carothers, in McLuhan 1964, 23).

The originally sounded word, once written, loses its power as an imperative directed at another or at oneself, effectively losing “those emotional overtones and emphases” and by “becoming visible” – and, I might add, fixed on the page – “joins the world of relative indifference to the viewer” (Carothers, in McLuhan 1964, 20). In a literate society where verbal thought can be separated from action, “visual and behavioural conformity frees the individual from inner deviation” (McLuhan 1964, 24).
On the other hand, in oral societies where the spoken word is directly linked to thought, Carothers (in McLuhan 1964, 20) argues, “behavioural constraints must include constraint of thought” since the ability to dissemble is not even a possibility due to the interweaving and intermeshing relations between nature and humans, and between one human and other humans.

According to Abram, the inability of the ruling Aztecs to dissemble is at the heart of the “lightning-swift conquest of Mexico” by Hernán Cortés, whose few hundred Spanish conquistadors would have accomplished nothing without the deployment of legions of Indigenous allies in taking over Montezuma’s Aztec tribute state. The Spaniards who arrived in Mexico, books in hand, were already quite advanced in the art of disconnecting from the sensuous world. Whereas the Aztecs had to answer to the sensuous earth for their thoughts and actions, Abram (1997, 134) contends that the Spaniards had to answer only to themselves. The Aztecs were disoriented by their interactions with beings who magically operated within their own “self-generated signs,” men well-versed in the art of deceit as well as the politics of divide and rule.

The weapons and the diseases that the Spaniards brought with them, Abram argues, were nothing compared to a “potent new magic” that was mendacity. It enabled them to be “duplicitous and lie even in the presence of the sun, the moon, and the forest” (Abram 1997, 134). Accordingly, the Aztecs lost their dominion as their gods fell silent: their own magic, their relationship with the earth began to “wither and become useless, unable to protect them” (1997, 135). Honesty – the inability to dissemble – became in Abram’s view, the Achilles’ heel of all Mesoamerican peoples.
How can insights from Spanish and Aztec experiences help us better understand the long history of failed communications between settlers and Indigenous peoples in Ontario? Can two such different worldviews find enough common ground to bridge the divisive rapids of sentient/non-sentient turbulence? Will the chorus of Nature’s muted voices break through the din of “development” to strike a chord of peace among those disconnected from the Earth?

Abram’s premise is to reconnect the human with nature: “We are human only in contact, and conviviality with what is not human,” he writes (1997, ix). More importantly, the concepts in his book The Spell of the Sensuous are meant to explore and “make sense of, and to alleviate, our current estrangement from the animate earth” (1997, x). McLuhan (1964, xii) states that “technological environments are not merely passive containers of people but are active processes that reshape people and other technologies alike.” Although written in 1962, the book is still relevant given his statement that in the electronic age, “we encounter new shapes and structures of human interdependence and of expression which are ‘oral’ in form even when the components of the situation may be nonverbal” (1964, 3). This new age of orality has arisen from the electronic age where the “instantaneous nature of co-existence among our technological instruments … demand an interplay and ratio that makes rational co-existence possible” (1964, 5). McLuhan’s words help in formulating the possibility of relevant parallels between film and place-based narrative in the oral tradition in support of the goal of planting stories and feeding communities.

As McLuhan asserts, the multiple technological advances in cinematography, including surround sound and 3-D, provide an experience close to the synaesthetic
(multi-sensorial) experience of traditional oral narratives. How can such technologies be used to transmit information to members of a community whose ways of knowing and being are embedded in multigenerational oral traditions? My belief is that film embodies the synaesthetic experience of traditional Indigenous knowledge transference and is thus a particularly effective way of disseminating information to Indigenous communities that in the form of my MA thesis would be largely inaccessible.

I also incorporate in my work Jacques Derrida’s (2010) insightful commentary on photography, and extend it as a framework for exploring the relationship between photographic technology and its effect on the audience. Photography is understood to be the original grounding from which film can be theorized. As noted earlier, the multi-sensorial capacity of film can potentially enhance the transmission, learning, and understanding of particular knowledge and information in communities with long-standing oral traditions. As such, photography, as Derrida (2010, xxiii) claims, “once its idiomatic logic is elaborated and generalized, can be seen as an operational network and a metalanguage [sic] through which larger philosophical, historical, aesthetic, and political questions can be brought into focus.” The point is not to obscure the function of the photograph as a singular representation of an instance in time but to look at the implication of having captured this moment within the context of the subject and the surrounding events embedded in the picture. Gerhard Richter, who edits and provides the background for the dialogue with Derrida in Copy, Archive, Signature: A Conversation on Photography, urges us to consider “the photographic image as a technically mediated moment of witnessing” (2010, xxiv). This witnessing encompasses the many aspects of photography and, by extension, film, as to how a recording is stored and finally
disseminated as a collection for private or public consumption. According to Richter, “a photograph … also bears witness in that it activates the circulation of a certain cultural memory and exchange through its medium-specific modes of writing, inspection, and interpretation” (2010, xxv). Film, with the added dimensions of movement, sound, and music, has perhaps the potential of being a more evocative witness.

2.4 Communicating Academic Findings to Indigenous Audiences

How do we go about more effectively communicating scholarly findings to Indigenous communities? I preface an answer to that question with an example of research that has not met the challenge of being disseminated appropriately to either Indigenous populations or the general public. The challenge of successfully delivering relevant findings to a community greatly depends on the health of that community, as reflected in the vibrancy of its cultural continuity and whether or not the findings are perceived as being imposed from without versus being generated from within. According to Michael Chandler and Christopher Lalonde, professors of psychology at UBC and UVIC, respectively, cultural continuity is engagement in activities that link individuals or a community to a past, the present, and an imaginable future (Chandler and Lalonde 1998). Their findings in Cultural Continuity as a Hedge against Suicide in Canada's First Nations (1998) demonstrate a correlation between the presence of cultural continuity factors and the number of youth suicides in each of 200 Indigenous communities in British Columbia. They identify and test nine cultural continuity markers, four of which are (1) Native language retention; (2) some measure of self-government; (3) completion of, or involvement in, land claims processes; and (4) control over education. Each marker
plays a role in diminishing the likelihood of self-injurious behaviours such as drug abuse, early school dropout rates, and suicide. Chandler and Lalonde’s findings show that as the number of cultural continuity factors increases, the number of suicides decreases. When all of the nine factors are present, the suicide rate is invariably zero. An important corollary of their findings is that Indigeneity is not a causal factor in youth suicide. Although, at the aggregate level, this may appear to be the case, on a community-by-community basis over half of British Columbia’s Indigenous communities had zero suicides during three sets of data accumulated over fifteen years; this rate is lower than that for Canada as a whole. Chandler and Lalonde (2004, 6) conclude that “There is no monolithic indigene … and no such thing as the suicidal Aboriginal.” Yet, despite the importance of these findings, first published almost twenty years ago, they are relatively unknown in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous academic circles, and even less so in non-academic circles.

The reporting, by mainstream media, of the data concerning Indigenous teen suicide rates in British Columbia (Chandler and Lalonde 1998) is a clear example of how stereotypes are propagated. The findings of Chandler and Lalonde stand in sharp contrast to the media-fostered stereotype that each Indigenous community is plagued with a high youth suicide rate when, in fact, well over half of British Columbia’s Indigenous communities were found to have a zero suicide rate. Film can be marshalled to contest such distortions and counter the authority of sensationalist mass media. It can serve as a counter-narrative to existing stereotypes about Indigenous peoples.
2.5 The Unknown Geographies of Native Studies in Ontario High Schools

Accounts of how Native Studies came to be a curricular offering in Ontario high schools are not readily available online. A search of the Queen’s University website for the Aboriginal Teacher Education Program’s (ATEP) curriculum does not indicate the inclusion of this crucial and complex page in the story of Indigenous education in Ontario’s public schools. Yet the ongoing story spans over four decades of committed and consistent effort by a small but dedicated number of Indigenous educators to ensure that Indigenous geographies and histories are reflected in the curricula of publicly funded schools. More important than the accomplishments of a few Indigenous educators is the potential impact of their stories on current and future generations of Indigenous students in need of positive role models.

Indigenous students in Ontario’s public school system continue to suffer the daily effects of racism, negative stereotypes, and language barriers. They might arguably draw inspiration from the story of how Native Studies curricula came to be offered in public schools. Although registration in Native Studies courses totals less than four per cent of Ontario’s high school student population, enrolments in Native Studies have been steadily increasing since the launching of the suite of nine curricular offerings in 1999 (Chaput 2012). This finding was applauded; few believed just how much positive growth had been achieved. It was a cause for celebration, yet the information that was uncovered remained locked away.

The complex rural and urban geographies of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities create an additional barrier to informing Indigenous students, parents, and school boards. My thesis findings did not reach, let alone have an impact on, the
Indigenous community whose members facilitated my research. If written formulations
do not communicate effectively enough, I pondered, might film be productively deployed
to sow the seeds of a more accurate representation of the accomplishments of Indigenous
peoples in the field of education in Ontario? I believe so.

My responsibility to the individuals who so generously contributed to my MA
thesis is to enhance community access to, and control over, the transmission of the
relevant stories contained within that thesis. Using the tenets of community-based
participatory research (CBPR) – see Castleden, Morgan, and Lamb (2012) and Castleden,
Mulrennan, and Godlewska (2012) for methodological discussion – a primary goal of my
doctoral research has been to create a film in order to disseminate pertinent information
to as wide an audience as possible, to evoke the sentiments of Indigenous viewers in a
manner that enhances the integration of these stories into the oral histories transmitted
from one generation to another.

2.6 Film as a Proxy for Orality

*Straining to hear the silence*
*Leaning like a sapling*
*In the hands of an Elder.*
*Bent to a sacred purpose*
*Arching now and touching the Earth*
*In two places.*

“Sweat Lodge” (Chaput 1978)

In Indigenous epistemology, stories and storytelling encompass education, history,
religion, geography, sense of self, and sense of place. To silence a people’s stories is to
“disappear” them, to forget them. Conversely, when people are able to remember and
pass on their stories, their cultures continue to exist. In the context of providing education
about Indigenous peoples, I argue, film is the most suitable medium to utilize because it incorporates significant multi-sensorial experiences of orality that are central to Indigenous storytelling. Of all the media that I have engaged, I have found film the most effective in communicating with an audience, whether in a village hall, a university lecture theatre, an international conference, or an online venue.

The Canadian literary critic Terry Goldie (1989) defines orality through an investigation of the Aboriginal heroine of Domett’s Ranolf and Amohia, someone who “seeks a charmed form of writing, the mystery deep/ Of letters,” which she believes will be an extension of orality, “seeing talk,” or “unspoken speech unheard” (1989, 121). Goldie (1989, 108) reiterates: “Orality … is the belief that speaking has more subjective presence than writing.” An experience that is “multi-sensorial” is one that draws to its embrace all human senses: in a sweat lodge one sees the glow of the stones, feels the heat from above, and the cedar branches from below, smells sweet grass and sage, tastes sweat and hears rattles, drums, wailing, and crying. An experience that stimulates the senses is an experience more deeply felt, more memorable. It is an extension of Amohia’s “seeing talk.” Berger (2001, 19) concurs: the great Swedish director Ingmar Bergman, he writes, saw film “as dream, film as music. No art passes our conscience in the way film does, and goes directly to our feelings, deep down into the dark rooms of the soul.”

Film also provides, Cartwright (2009, 24) asserts, “a deeper representation of geography.” Its increasing use in educational settings points to its efficiency in transmitting complex information in a striking and retainable fashion. A film such as When the Mountains Tremble, with the experiences of Nobel Peace Prize winner
Rigoberta Menchú serving as its centrepiece, is even more powerful a document, as we watch the images unfold on screen, than her acclaimed if controversial text transcribed and edited by Elisabeth Burgos-Debray (1983). The universality that can be achieved in film is parallel to what a gripping tale in a novel can achieve: it creates a space for us to recognize ourselves. Berger (2001, 24) reiterates by asserting: “What is saved in the cinema when it achieves art is a spontaneous continuity with all of mankind.” Like orality, film captures our emotions because of its multi-sensorial content: our senses are invoked, our imaginations fired. Film’s embrace of music, dance, emotion, and place must evoke more effectively a story’s live telling – the oral experience – than can an ethnographer’s written records.

Film, in the service of Indigenous storytelling and ritual, is all about communication: one begins with a thought, translates it into language, and finally uses accompanying technologies to express what has been imagined. To make words memorable, to have them remembered, we struggle with conveying our thoughts effectively. By adding visual aspects, we add a seductive quality. Film can effect this seduction better than the written page, by incorporating a sudden movement, music, and the visceral experience of watching something unfold rather than being told.

Human memory is tied to images: we create them in our minds as we listen to a voice or read from the page – or, as in film, see images projected before us on a screen. A good storyteller conjures up pictures in our minds. But film does not leave image-making or memory-making to chance: it creates images for its audience. “The oral storyteller suspends time,” Brian Dunnigan (2005) asserts, “in the immediacy of his presence and the improvised interplay of teller and audience, the story is alive, immediate, and
eternal.” While film may be less alive, less adaptive than a storyteller’s first-person narrative, film records many of the dramatic multi-sensorial aspects that constitute an oral presentation but are absent from written accounts. “First Nations’ oral traditions are a powerful cultural force and part of their toolbox of survival,” McNab (1999, 3) has argued. Filmmakers are bringing these oral traditions into the twenty-first century.

2.7 In Praise of Film: Indigenous Scholarly Critiques

Jo-Ann Archibald, of the Stó:lō Nation, is a strong proponent of the visual image accompanying the spoken word. Archibald, Associate Dean for Indigenous Education in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, and Director of the Native Indian Teachers’ Education Program, is a pioneer in the advancement of First Nations’ education. Leaning on over three decades of personal and professional experience, Archibald (2008, 111) emphasizes film’s value in “working with stories:”

> Often when I read stories by Indigenous storytellers, I long to hear their voices and see them telling their stories. Seeing and hearing a storyteller in action begins a process of interrelating that happens among listener, storyteller and story. The video thus serves as a secondary source for this interpersonal dimension and context for working with stories.

A new generation of storytellers is responding to Archibald’s desire to hear, see, and tell with films. Film can be geographically ubiquitous: it can be in many places at once whereas a storyteller cannot. Film’s ability to engage is often enhanced by its ability to reach large audiences, the consistency of its presentation, and its emotional potency over that of the written word. Film has a capacity to bring communities together, to participate in the viewing of the story.
Rigoberta Menchú, a Quiché Maya woman from Guatemala, survived the genocidal atrocities of her country’s armed forces to become a storyteller. “To survive,” Grate (2002) has argued, "the people of Menchu's community incorporate their variable skills against armed antagonists who are set on the complete eradication of a culture that resists them.” Menchu’s powerful narrative, *Me llamo Rigoberta Menchú* (Burgos-Debray 1983), was made into the documentary film *When the Mountains Tremble* (1983) that same year with directors Tom Siegel and Pamela Yates. In 1992, Menchú was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. She commands a savvy grasp of the potential of available communication technologies foreign to her culture; by taking advantage of multimedia technologies, she was able to reach an international audience and dramatically influence the fate of her country (Lovell 2010, 17-25).

Historian Fred Wiseman, Professor of American Studies at Johnson State College, runs the Abenaki Tribal Museum at Swanton, Vermont. Abenaki himself, he is the artefact expert and uses unique treasures as a link to substantiating the language and cultural history of his Native Abenaki community. Wiseman, formerly Principal Research Scientist at MIT’s Center for Materials Research in Archaeology and Ethnology, draws on his considerable skill as an academic writer, in one memorable campaign challenging the adversarial position taken by the State of Vermont regarding the Abenaki’s claim that they have been present in that area for over 10,000 years. When the publication of academic books on his findings produced no significant impact on the State of Vermont’s position, Wiseman then turned his hand to the medium of film and produced *Against the Darkness*, a DVD designed to convince legislators of the legitimacy of Abenaki claims. Wiseman (2002, interview) refers to filmmaking as
a careful use of European “dominant culture” weapons (e.g. trade guns in the past, research today) in defense of native sovereignty. That is the crux of the worldview of the modern Indigenous “data warrior” – to respect tradition, but also to use one’s best tools to defeat seemingly reasoned attacks on native continuity and identity.

As Wiseman learned, with “careful use” the “weapon” of film is a powerful tool. The results of his film were dramatic: recognition by the State of Vermont, albeit short-lived, and more significantly, the adoption of the Abenaki film into State school curricula, thus ensuring the transmission of the Abenaki peoples’ story to the next generation. Wiseman’s conclusion is that he stands a better chance of reaching people’s hearts as a filmmaker than as a writer: “You can’t convince anybody through their minds,” he writes. “Film has a unique characteristic of being able to talk to people’s emotions” (Wiseman 2008, interview).

Carol Geddes, an Aboriginal filmmaker, concurs. A native of the inland Tlingit community of Teslin, she left the Yukon to study at Carleton University in Ottawa. She created a twelve-minute documentary film about the Montreal Native Friendship Centre. After the flooding in James Bay, many Cree people arrived at that centre and they, along with Cree and Inuit in the maximum security prison in Kingston, Ontario, were the basis of her short but popular film. It was “not a particularly good film,” Geddes (2003, 66) herself concedes, admitting to making many mistakes:

Yet this really encouraged me very much to understand film as something more important than entertainment…They were going because this was a document that spoke about their lives, and helped them understand… they gained insight from that film… people were coming up to me and telling me that this film helped them, and this was so important to me because it helped especially the younger people understand their history.
Similar to my experience with Six Nations, Geddes found that her documentary film could crystallize the issues of the community around her, and help native people to understand better their own experiences.

I believe that if Indigenous peoples are to regain a meaningful sense of representation, their stories must be told. On the surface this appears to be a simple task: the inherent difficulties in this “simple task” arise from the oral nature of its traditional transmission. Mackey, in his *Random Acts of Culture* (2010, 85) acknowledges that “When someone is steeped in a tradition that has no recourse to written texts, that person’s memory is acute; patterns and details are discerned with what literate people consider to be superhuman accuracy.” However, traditional storytellers who can speak the language and who have been trained to remember “by heart” are quickly disappearing. Circa 400 BC Socrates foresaw that the advent of writing would mean the loss of storytellers trained in the ancient art. Mackey (2010, 141) renders the great philosopher’s words thus:

[He] tells Phaedrus that rather than improving the memory, writing will actually make people’s memories worse. “They will not practice using their memory because they will put their trust in writing, which is external and depends on signs that belong to others, instead of trying to remember on the inside, completely on their own.”

The loss of traditional storytellers has created a void that film and filmmakers are filling. Cartwright (2009, 24) puts it most emphatically:

The power of the narrative can be used to paint ‘word pictures’ of the world and give the user/viewer a sense of geographical place… [that] takes us beyond time and space into another realm. Storytelling can provide a rich, simulated environment. In addition, when used via ‘other’ media, including film, which complements traditional map-delivered information, storytelling allows the expressivity of cultures to be recaptured. Maps alone cannot do this.
Aboriginal scholars and filmmakers, Geddes, Menchú, Wiseman, and Archibald among them, agree on the efficacy of film as a medium for Indigenous storytellers to touch and move audiences. The geographic and multi-sensorial aspects of Indigenous peoples’ stories are enhanced by film because of its ability to mimic the experience of orality. “Only movies pull us into the present and the visible,” Berger (2001, 480) argues, “the visible which surrounds us all.” He (2001, 475-6) concludes:

The cinema…transports its audience individually, singly out of the theatre towards the unknown…the screen, as soon as the lights go out, is no longer a surface but a space…A sky filled with events and people…a film is a shuttle service between different places and times…

Berger’s description of the power of film parallels that of Cartwright. How, then, best to proceed?
Chapter 3

Figuring Things Out: Methodological, Ethical, and Logistical Procedures

3.1 Norman Denzin: Methodological Use of Film

Norman Denzin, a research methodologist at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, argues in *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (1989, vii) for increased use of film technologies in the humanities. Film, he maintains, can “reveal something about society;” it can “enhance ethnographic or field studies” and record “social action produced in a laboratory context.” Furthermore, I argue that these technologies might well be used to transmit findings back to communities participating in research studies, as well as to the public at large.

3.2 Participatory Visual Research (PVR)

“Film,” Denzin (1989, 232) asserts, “is simultaneously a means of communication and a method of inquiry.” My conviction concerning the use of film is shared by a growing number of social scientists, including human geographers, as reflected in the emerging field of Participatory Visual Research (PVR), of which Rose (2003) and Ryan (2003) are ardent proponents. This critical research methodology encourages those who are typically passive subjects to become proactive, collaborative, and involved. The multi-disciplinary nature of PVR is compatible with community-based participatory research (CBPR), intimated previously but discussed in greater length in Chapter 6. Both practices lend themselves to the exploration of peer-based community research in a variety of settings and cultures. PVR, moreover, is capable of generating quality data through rigorous
social research. Collaborating, as I did, with Six Nations participants, involving them as valued members of a team, ensured that they had their say concerning the data that was gathered, above all how it was subsequently processed and relayed to others.

3.3 Public Ethnographer: Dwayne Beaver

In June 2012, the ethnography.media.arts.culture network held a conference in Victoria, British Columbia, in order to explore the challenges of public ethnography. Participants in the conference looked at possible ways of disseminating their research to make their work more accessible to the public sphere. Dwayne Beaver, an Indigenous filmmaker, currently teaching at Capilano University in the Motion Picture Arts Program, directed a documentary of the conference. In the film, conference participants raise the point that academic writing has little or no value to many of the subjects or collaborators with whom they engage as ethnographic researchers. Based on their research findings, Goodson and Phillmore (2012) conclude that participant communities are more receptive to findings communicated in forms other than academic writing.

Interviewees in Beaver’s documentary concur that the future success of public ethnography depends on the ability of researchers to use technologies such as film to reach a wider audience. First World academic researchers studying Third World subjects often report their findings in languages that are foreign to their subjects. Ideally, participant communities would have access to the research findings they have been instrumental in creating, in a format that is culturally appropriate. Film is a viable format.

3.4 Community-Based Participatory Research Methods (CBPR)

My documentary film Planting Stories, Feeding Communities seeks to answer the
question: What, by recourse to film, are the most effective strategies to pursue in order to return academic findings to the Indigenous communities from which the data was originally extracted? By combining the performativity of film (Beaver 2012) with the inter-subjectivity and inclusivity of CBPR, my goal was to engage members of the Six Nations community in co-exploring the feasibility of replanting knowledge, via stories drawn from extracted data, back into the narrative of the source community (Denzin 1989). The inclusion of Indigenous voices in every phase of the research helped me craft a film that, in CBPR parlance, “decolonized” academic field work and researcher/subject relationships (see Castleden, Morgan, and Lamb 2012, Coombes 2012, Koster, Baccar, and Lemelin 2012). Film, as a proxy for orality, parallels long-standing, multi-sensorial, Indigenous approaches to the transmission of knowledge. Accordingly, with CBPR sensitivities in mind, the content and emphasis of the finished product rested for the most part in the hands of the Indigenous storytellers/participants; my voice, as a collaborator and storyteller, was most notably reflected in shooting the film and editing footage with issues of style as well as substance in mind.

Through CBPR protocol and procedure, a community can take ownership of its stories and, ultimately, integrate them into the landscape of its historical narrative. Ideally, the story line, jointly selected by the community and the filmmaker, will appeal to a broad spectrum of Six Nations people. This, of course, is important, insofar as the matter at the heart of this particular story concerns Six Nations’ control over education, and the constitutional right to self-government. That right, Cruikshank (2005, 50) points out, includes the right to decide on exactly what kind of research can be done on Indigenous territory, as well as who owns that data, and how that particular data is
extracted from the community.

The representation of native voice is a crucial concern during the conversion of a story from one medium or language to another. “Converting spoken words to written texts,” Cruikshank (2005, 78) articulates adroitly, “also raises questions about the ‘texture’ of oral narrative.” I raise a similar concern regarding the conversion of oral storytelling to film, particularly during the editing process, when the editor is selecting visuals, layering in music, contemplating cutaways, and mulling over myriad other enhancements. The director must creatively and strategically blend the voices of the storytellers, along with those of the cinematographer, the musical director, and the editor. Great complexity is involved. How are priorities decided upon? Which aspects of story matter the most, and why? These questions remain at the forefront of the creative process.

CBPR is regarded by Castleden, Mulrennan, and Godlewska (2012, 156) as “both a philosophy and a research methodology.” It features a reciprocal approach in which decision-making is shared between the Indigenous community and the external, non-community research interests, allowing a focus to develop on a “bi-directional capacity through an iterative process of dialogue, action and reflection.” De Leeuw, Cameron, and Greenwood (2012, 182) concur, advocating the use of CBPR to “make research socially embedded and socially accountable, to … engage those who are so often distant ‘subjects’ of research, and to build meaningful, long-term commitments with Indigenous communities.”

Based on their experiences, De Leeuw, Cameron, and Greenwood (2012, 182), caution practitioners of CBPR methodologies on four primary concerns: (i) that “dissent
may be stifled by non-Indigenous researchers’ investments in being good;” (ii) that “claims to overcome difference and distance may actually retrench colonial research relations;” (iii) that “the framing of particular methods as ‘best practices’ risks closing down necessary and ongoing critique;” and (iv) that “institutional pressures work against the development and maintenance of meaningful, accountable, and non-extractive relations with Indigenous communities.” Bearing the above concerns in mind, I sought to identify best practices (at least as they pertain to current circumstances) as a contribution to the ongoing and fluid process of necessary critique, not as the laying down of immutable codes and protocols.

My film work for the Iroquois Confederacy in 2005, past negotiations with the Confederacy and the Band Council on behalf of a corporate client, and acquaintance with several members of Six Nations have placed me in good stead with the community. De Leeuw, Cameron, and Greenwood (2012, 191) consider friendships outside the research paradigm, such as those that I enjoy with Gloria Thomas and Andrea Curley, as ideal for CBPR researchers in Indigenous contexts. My intention at the outset was to collaborate with the community as a co-creator of this research. The community made decisions with me and we created together. I attempted to place my support and abilities at their disposal. I wanted, perhaps too idealistically, to eliminate the categories of “researcher” and “research subject.” My goal was to create a pertinent document that draws the community together in a mutually beneficial process.

My intended use of film as a performative research act into Indigenous issues is not ground breaking. At Queen’s University, recent examples of using performance to explore and communicate findings include the theatrical productions of Meaghan
Robinson and Tracey Guptil, both of which I attended; I initially participated in the latter in my capacity as an Indigenous actor, director, and writer. Robinson’s play *Footprints* was performed on campus in the Rotunda Theatre in Theological Hall: there she created an educational space designed to inform those who are new to Indigenous issues to come to an appreciation of the collective nature of Aboriginal ways of being. The play involved spiritual, emotional, physical, and cognitive aspects of being. After the play was over, participants were invited to share their insights while seated around a massive dream catcher drawn in chalk on the theatre floor. It was a powerful, active learning scenario.

Tracey Guptil’s theatrical piece *When I Get There* is a tour de force of environmental issues set in the racialized space of a First Nations’ territory. Through strategic use of newspaper and other media, Guptil’s event raises awareness of the core issues of her research. Over 40 people of varying ages and experiences participated in the writing, production, and performance of this one-act play. Both the co-creators and audiences who attended the sell-out performances were profoundly touched by their exposure to the central issues.

At this stage in the research proceedings, I could no longer delay. The field beckoned, urgently.
Chapter 4
Into the Field

4.1 The Six Nations Context

In the end, with myriad options to choose from, filming for research purposes concentrated on the territory of the Six Nations of the Grand River in Southwestern Ontario and in the village of Ohsweken, at the heart of the reserve. Filming also included disputed traditional lands in the Haldimand Tract, adjacent to the territory, as well as the Woodland Cultural Centre in Brantford. Filmed interviews were conducted in situ, on Six Nations’ territory, thereby re-connecting the history of the creation of the Native Studies courses to place.

My ability to use film to communicate with the Six Nations Community benefitted from the experiences I gained working in, and with, Indigenous communities as a filmmaker and consultant. From 2003 to 2005, I facilitated meetings with the Condoled Chiefs and Clan Mothers of the Iroquois Confederacy in their Longhouse on behalf of corporate clients seeking permission to build wind turbines on the Haldimand Tract. Simultaneously, I was retained by the Iroquois Confederacy as the director of two film crews covering the week-long 2004 International Indigenous Elders’ Summit in Ohsweken. With the first crew I interviewed elders, shamans, clan mothers, and other participants who hailed from all over South, Central, and North America. As I conducted interviews, a second crew filmed presentations and other relevant activities, including the completion of the Unity Ride led by Orville Looking Horse. The footage, which was left
in the hands of Dawn Hill of the Confederacy, was then used to produce \textit{Jidwá:doh – Let’s Become Again – Indigenous Elders’ Summit – 2004}. This experience availed me with useful insights into the political dynamics unique to Six Nations. Given this working relationship and understanding, I am also aware of recent protocols enacted by the Band Council with regard to conducting research on Six Nations territory and with their on-reserve and off-reserve constituents. As a Métis filmmaker embedded in a First Nation community, therefore, I have a strong foundation built on more than 25 years of experience working in Indigenous communities. This investment has earned me good will and trust, which in turn has helped create a film that truly involved community writ large in the research endeavour.

4.2 A Story Ready for Planting: The Work and Legacy of Keith Lickers

Drawing on information provided by the three most significant interviewees in my MA thesis – Keith Lickers, Gloria Thomas, and Peter Hill – I created a film that features, with strategic prominence, the career of Lickers. It is my hope that the film will “plant a story” that will take root and “feed” the Six Nations community.

In 1964, Keith Lickers, a member of Six Nations near Brantford, started teaching at the senior elementary school on Six Nations. His successful, culturally proactive approaches quickly drew the attention and respect of his community, colleagues, and students. When the Mohawk Institute (Six Nations’ Residential School) closed down in 1970, and ownership of the property was transferred to the Six Nations, Lickers was invited to step down from his teaching position to conduct a feasibility study as to what to do with the Mohawk Institute. His recommendations led to the creation of the
Woodland Cultural Centre, which now serves to promote Indigenous culture and heritage in the area. Lickers was its first director. In 1974, he was approached by the Ministry of Education (MOE) to join its Curriculum Branch. This he did, thereafter working for the MOE in Toronto for the next 33 years (1974–2006).

Lickers arrived at the MOE in time to oversee the creation of the People of Native Ancestry (PONA) texts, which subsequently served for 25 years as resource guides for teaching Native Studies in Ontario public schools. Throughout his career, Lickers championed stand-alone Native Studies courses and vernacular language of instruction. In 1997, he oversaw revisions to the PONA texts and the creation of the suite of ten Native Studies curricula.

During his final years in the Curriculum Branch he played a pivotal role in the establishment of a vibrant, well-staffed Aboriginal Education Office (AEO) that opened its doors in January 2006. He acted as interim manager of the AEO until the appointment of Alayne Bigwin in August of that year. Lickers continued on to author and usher in two historic OME policy papers: (i) Aboriginal Student Self-Identification Policy, which is incorporated in the Building Bridges to Success for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Students (Ontario Ministry of Education 2007); and (ii) the Ontario First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework (Ontario Ministry of Education 2007b). Both policies focus on Indigenous control of Indigenous education.

Upon Lickers’s formal retirement, Dominic Giroux (2006), Assistant Deputy Minister, was most laudatory: “We cannot say enough about the extent of Keith’s influence over these decades on all Aboriginal education matters within government. His
wisdom, unique skill set, personal commitment, and corporate memory will be greatly missed.”

The history of Lickers’s achievements is not yet part of a curricular offering in Ontario schools. Arguably, “planting” Lickers’s story in the Six Nations community by the use of film will eventually lead to its fuller integration into Ontario Native Studies curricula. Successful transmission of knowledge requires teamwork. Collaboration between filmmakers and Six Nations’ participants in this case favoured a popular outcome that appears to have nourished the community.

The film, which combines the personal story of Lickers with that of Hill, Thomas, and Hailey Thomas, Gloria Thomas’s granddaughter, brings the significance of the collective stories to the awareness of the Six Nations community. The multi-generational aspect of their stories lends itself to several storylines: (i) how Hailey Thomas chose to attend Western University in order to pursue a career as a Native Studies teacher – a choice that was not available to preceding generations; (ii) how her grandmother, Gloria, along with her colleagues, Keith and Peter, contributed to making that particular career choice possible; (iii) how the diverse roles played by Gloria Thomas, as a representative of Six Nations on Ontario School Boards, as a leader who was instrumental in the development of content for Native Studies curricula, and as a voice of authority (Clan Mother) in her community contributed to increasing Six Nations’ control over education; and (iv) how Lickers’s 33-year career at the Curriculum Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Education (OME) contributed to the current Native Studies and Native Language curricula.

Lickers’s story contrasts the outer success of his policy and curricular
contributions with the inner struggles and frustrations precipitated by the agenda of the federal and provincial governments. Soon after its own birth as a nation, Canada’s assimilation strategy focused on controlling the education of Native children. It sought to assert state authority by separating children from their families and forcing them to attend, in the name of education, residential schools that were run by Christian churches. There, far from home and parental care, children were subjected to physical, emotional, mental, spiritual, and sexual abuse (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015, 106). In a misguided and now discredited state project, over 150,000 First Nations, Métis, and Inuit children were cut off from their families, communities, languages, and cultures, a policy that amounted, in the parlance of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015), to “cultural genocide” (see Appendix A). Despite the eventual closing of residential schools – the last such institution closed its doors in 1986 – the Canadian government enacted policies that unilaterally imposed provincial curricula on Six Nations students, demonstrating a total disregard for Six Nations’ constitutional right to self-government (Constitution Act 1982).

Gloria Thomas’s fight for the right of Six Nations to control their education does not contradict her advocacy for mainstream education: “I want all students to become Ontario Scholars,” she declares, her feet decidedly placed in two canoes. Because of its binary complexity, Thomas’s position of championing mainstream education becomes, by definition, a divisive issue in the Six Nations community, which has a long history of suffering at the hands of residential school teachers and administrators, the community, bluntly put, is not willing to acknowledge the value of a system that was hitherto so detrimental to the spiritual and physical health of its people. Thomas, however, is far-
sighted, looking long-term at the best scenario not only for helping to educate her people in the customs and languages of Native Peoples but also to prepare them to take their place as leaders in Canadian society. Her hope is to create a Nation of educated citizenry, made up of people who understand their place and assume authority in both worlds.

It was now time to put pen to paper.
Chapter 5
Writing the Script

Writing the script was a long and arduous process. My indecision around who was to constitute the target audience resulted in several false starts. At times, I was torn between my examination committee as audience and the Six Nations community as audience; at other times an imagined global Indigenous audience took precedence. Throughout the process of selecting material from my MA thesis, I often found myself imagining how other First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities might react, despite my repeatedly realigning myself with the Six Nations community as audience.

I struggled over potential concerns regarding the inclusion of certain findings, especially those dealing with residential schools, and the underlying causes of suicide. Would treatment of these issues re-stimulate and distract some viewers from the story of my three protagonists? In that case, the “planted” story might not take root. Yet I also had to situate the protagonists in the tumultuous context of the post-residential school era. That context is essential to developing contrast between over a century of multi-generational traumatization of First Nations populations and the beginning of the healing process. As presenters at the 2004 *International Indigenous Elders Summit* held at Six Nations put it: “As we come to the end of 500 years of suffering, we must heal ourselves so that we don’t go limping into the next 500 years.” This statement captures the idea that I nurtured all along, the notion of wanting to “plant” ideas in the minds of viewers as a means of contextualizing the contributions of the three main protagonists to Native Studies in Ontario schools.
In the end I decided to begin with a standard sequence establishing the location of the Six Nations territory where the story takes place. That, I reckoned, would be appealing to a Six Nations audience. Following that, I deemed it important to look at controversial findings that were not well-known across either Indigenous or non-Indigenous communities. Despite my early concerns about engaging painful feelings around residential schools, I used that issue of native history to establish the scope and controlling dimension of Canada’s assimilation strategy.

By dictating how Indigenous children should be educated, Canada effectively institutionalized them. Generation after generation, this external control produced children who, as adults, found making long-term decisions a daunting challenge. They were deprived of an “imaginable future” and had the ability to think for themselves taken away. That deprivation results in a despondency that leads to self-destructive behaviours, the most extreme being suicide.

Throughout the opening of the film I wanted to establish temporally how the closing of residential schools signalled the beginning of a new era, for Indigenous educators and students alike. Essentially, the crucial moment when the residential schools were closed was to represent the emergence of the possibility of increased control for Indigenous educators and a more balanced education for students. Since the Six Nations Community Plan (2014) includes a suicide prevention strategy, I included key insights from the work of Chandler and Lalonde. Based on twenty years of research on Aboriginal Youth Suicide in British Columbia, they provide ground-breaking insights into the underlying causes of self-injurious behaviours. I was fortunate to receive
permission to use video excerpts from a 2013 conference in Alberta at which Chandler and Lalonde presented their findings to an Indigenous audience.

5.1 The Script

The following 30 pages are a transcript of Planting Stories, Feeding Communities, a film with a running time of 45 minutes, 38 seconds. In the left column, elements of audio (including voiceover narration) are represented. In the right column appear descriptions of visual images and sequential timings. The transcript ends with a list of image and video credits, acknowledged in their order of appearance.

5.2 Planting Stories, Feeding Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drum Music comes up slowly.</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum Music gets louder.</td>
<td>(Reversed out of black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jon Aarssen, Margaret Bentley, and Annie Palone present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>00-00-00-19 A Paul Chaput film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>00-00-00-30 (Slow zoom) <strong>Title:</strong> Planting Stories, Feeding Communities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples, and Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music intensifies</td>
<td>Zoom into:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtitle:</strong> Canada Lands Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>showing Indigenous Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtitle:</strong> “Indian Reserves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music continues building.</td>
<td>00-00-00-58 Zoom into map of Haldimand Tract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtitle:</strong> Haldimand Tract – Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granted by Haldimand Proclamation to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-03</td>
<td>Subtitle: Ohsweken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-05</td>
<td>Subtitle: The heart of what remains of the Six Nations Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-08</td>
<td>Dissolve to sign of Six Nations Grand River Territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-14</td>
<td>Dissolve to wind-blown flowered fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-19</td>
<td>Dissolve to sign of Ohsweken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-22</td>
<td>Dissolve to shot of two-lane paved road on Six Nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-23</td>
<td>Dissolve to drive-by shot of homes in Ohsweken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-01-27</td>
<td>Dissolve to drive-by shot of commercial buildings in Ohsweken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 00-00-01-29 | Cut to front of GREAT building. 
Subtitle: Grand River Employment and Training Centre (GREAT) 
Ohsweken, Six Nations, Ontario |
| 00-00-01-32 | Cut to GoPro shot of Community Circle. 
Add in sequence. 
Subtitle: GREAT Theatre 
Subtitle: Community Circle, 
Subtitle: September, 2014 |
| 00-00-01-35 | Dissolve to Medium Shot of Paul |

**We hear voices from the Circle and music changes.**

Paul: Well, first of all, my name is Paul Chaput. I’m Métis from the Red River in
Manitoba. introducing himself to the Community Circle.

**Subtitle:** Paul Chaput 4th Year PhD Candidate, Queen’s University

**Subtitle:** Community Circle, Ohsweken, Six Nations Territory, September 2015, Ninety minutes from Toronto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul:</strong> I’m hoping to transform how research is reported back to Indigenous communities.</th>
<th>00-00-01-41 Dissolve to GoPro wide shot of the circle as Paul continues his introduction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul:</strong> In my case, I took from this community certain information 00-00-01-49 Cut to medium shot of Paul continuing his introduction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul:</strong> and I put it into my Master’s and I graduated. 00-00-01-53 Cut to GoPro overhead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul:</strong> The metaphor is like somebody coming in and taking gold from your land and going off 00-00-01-59 Cut to medium shot of Paul continuing his introduction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul:</strong> and enriching their lives with it but not giving back. 00-00-01-59 Cut to GoPro overhead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrator:</strong> So I decided that for my PhD I would use film to explore the best practices of bringing that data, that “gold,” back to the community. 00-00-02-09 Dissolve to shot of Paul on the train. 00-00-02-16 Cut to shot of books on library shelves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrator:</strong> After getting permission from the Six Nations Council Research Ethics Committee, I set about organizing the filming of interviews and a Community Circle in Ohsweken. 00-00-02-19 Shot of letter of confirmation from Six Nations Ethics Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Narrator:** Accompanied by videographer, Jon Aarssen, we engaged members of the community in a collaborative filmmaking process. We were fortunate to have the help and support of dedicated community members like Andrea Curley and Gloria Thomas. They invited Six Nations’ contacts interested in learning about the roles played by Keith Lickers, Peter Hill, and Gloria Thomas in the development of Native Studies and Native Language courses offered by the Ministry of Education, an ongoing process initiated after the closing of residential schools.

00-00-02-29 Dissolve to sign of Ohsweken.

00-00-02-35 Dissolve to sign of Six Nations.

00-00-02-38 Dissolve to shot of angler fishing in the Grand River.

00-00-02-43 Cut to close-up of Andrea Curley.

Subtitle: Andrea Curley

00-00-02-47 Cut to close-up of Gloria Thomas.

Subtitle: Dr. Gloria Thomas

00-00-02-50 Dissolve to Keith.

Subtitle: Keith Lickers

00-00-02-55 Dissolve to Peter.

Subtitle: Peter Hill

00-00-03-02 Dissolve to shot of library with white students.

00-00-03-06 Fade to black.

Music fades

New music for quote

00-00-03-13 Reversed out of black: Canada would be a very different place if the stories of Aboriginal people were generally known and were a part of the shared culture of the nation. Dr. Gloria Thomas, Six Nations.

Music builds

**Narrator 4:** Not long ago and not far away, Fire licked at the last splinters of the ancient forest. Full from its feast, Fire slept. The

00-00-03-26 Rendered scenes of a forest devastated by fire – finishing with green pushing up through the earth
First drops of rain embraced the few remaining embers glowing in the tired breeze. Lightning struck awakening the seeds sleeping in the dark womb of the scorched earth. Soon, Green pushed up through the charred soil.

**Chandler:** Imagine you’re part of a culture, an Indigenous culture, a First Nations culture. Imagine that several hundred years ago some people came and turned your paradise into a parking lot, made your songs and stories appear to be ludicrous, essentially subjected you to laws and regulations that made no sense in terms of your own values.

**Narrator:** That’s exactly what the newly formed Canadian government did in 1876. Without consultation with First Peoples, it passed the Indian Act giving itself control over every aspect of First People’s lives. One hundred and thirty-nine years later it is still vigorously pursuing its assimilative agenda.

**Chandler:** “The whole policy of the Canadian government—and it’s the policy essentially of every colonizing government that I know of—is to, in fact, kill the Indian in the Indian, right, to assimilate their identity out of existence.”

**Subtitle:** Dr. Michael Chandler, Professor Emeritus, UBC, Department of Psychology

Shots of pre and post-contact Canada render Chandler’s words.

Residential school shots

Fathers of Confederation

Shots of Canadian Flag

The spine of the Statutes of Canada -1876 Chapter 18 – The Indian Act

Native workers

Peace Tower,

Indian Act Amendments

Indigenous demonstrators

Michael Chandler at the podium

Subtitle: Dr. Michael Chandler, Professor Emeritus, UBC, Department of Psychology

**00-00-05-33** before and after shot

Indigenous youth in traditional clothing and then in “settler” garb
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-00-05:50</td>
<td>Dramatic shift in music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-05:50</td>
<td>Narrator: Canada’s assimilation strategy focused on controlling the education of Native children. It hoped to achieve this by separating the children from their families and incarcerating them in residential schools. There, they were subjected to physical, emotional, mental, spiritual, and sexual abuse. In their all-out effort to eradicate First Nations, Métis, and Inuit cultures, over 150,000 children were cut off from their families, communities, languages, and cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-05:45</td>
<td>Fade to black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-00</td>
<td>Shot of TV in a ravaged house. On-screen, (old black and white footage) of a white teacher at the head of a classroom of young Indigenous students. Shots of children looking unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-01</td>
<td>Dissolve to hovel-like interior of abandoned house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-07</td>
<td>Gated residential school with tipis outside the walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-12</td>
<td>Back to ravaged house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-29</td>
<td>Same music as Chandler’s Add birdcalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-29</td>
<td>Title reversed out of black: Cultural Continuity is engagement in activities that link individuals or a community to a past, the present, and an imaginable future. Chandler and Lalonde 1998. Green shoots rise from the bottom of the screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-37</td>
<td>Lalonde: I need to stop myself and say: I’m pleased to be a visitor in Treaty 6. For communities in BC and elsewhere in Canada, it’s really important that their culture is expressed in the curriculum that their young people are enduring in the local schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-37</td>
<td>Subtitle: Dr. Christopher Lalonde, Department of Psychology, University of Victoria, Presenting at the Youth Suicide Conference May 13, 2013 Edmonton, Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-06-43</td>
<td>Dissolve to white students in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Narrator: Control over curricular content and other cultural continuity factors is so important that it can be a matter of life or death.

Lalonde: Communities that control education, and health, and have cultural facilities, and control police, and fire, they all have lower suicide rates. So when communities have control over those things, the suicide rates are lower.

Narrator: In fact, during twenty years of research, Chandler and Lalonde found that 117 out of 203 communities had zero suicides. Each of the 117 communities had three things in common: self-government, successful land claims, and control over education.

Chandler: If you want to prevent suicide, go ask the people in these over-one-hundred-communities who have never had one.

Narrator: This revelation contradicts the media-driven stereotype that all Indigenous youth are at risk of suicide. They are not at
risk in communities where **internal** control is intact. They are at risk in communities where **external** controls undermine their freedom and their resolve to endure. Loss of control leads to loss of lives. According to the United Nations, “Deliberately inflicting on a group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, is an act of Genocide.” Control is a life-saving essential.

The stories that follow, taken from my MA thesis, are about Indigenous educators regaining control of Indigenous education in Ontario’s public school system over the past 40 years.

**Birds singing**

**Narrator:** In 1969, Indian Affairs began closing down “Indian residential schools.” The first to close in Ontario was the Mohawk Institute, also known as the “Mush Hole.” Control over it reverted back to the Six Nations Band Council. The tide was turning. From the extreme external control of Native Education throughout the residential school era, to

---

No More demonstration in mall.

Excerpt of UN definition of Genocide

00-00-08-07: Dissolve to burning flower.

00-00-08-13: Dissolve to handcuffed man.

00-00-08-19: Dissolve to countryside rolling by – filmed from train.

00-00-08-24: Dissolve to Paul on train.

00-00-08-26: Dissolve to Paul working on laptop on train.

00-00-08-27: Fade to black.

**Title:** Six Nations’ Educators

00-00-08-07: Green shoots pushing up from bottom of the screen

00-00-08-35: Dissolve to Mush Hole Residential School front porch full of students and faculty.

**Subtitle:** Located in Brantford, Ontario

00-00-08-07: Dissolve to photo.

**Subtitle:** Jean Chretien, Minister of Indian Affairs -1968-1974

00-00-08-48: Another black and white
increasing opportunities for First Peoples to control parts of the education received by their children in provincial public schools. In 1964, leading up to the closure of the Mush Hole, Keith Lickers had started teaching Grade Seven History at the on-reserve Six Nations school.

| **Keith:** … young people that I’m teaching need to know their local history. So I went to Mr. Hill and said I’d like to change the Grade Seven History course. | shot of Mush Hole with empty front porch  
00-00-08-53: Back to first shot – slow zoom  
00-00-09-03: Cut to Keith in the Community Circle.  
**Subtitle:** Keith Lickers  
00-00-09-09: Cut to Go Pro shot of Community Circle.  
00-00-09-13: Keith in the Community Circle |

| **Narrator:** And he did. When the “Mush Hole” reverted to local control, the Band Council approached Keith Lickers about transforming it into the Woodland Cultural Centre including a museum, archive and a resource library – all administered by Six Nations. | 00-20-29-29 **Subtitle:** Keith Lickers  
00-00-09-22: GoPro shot  
00-00-09-28: Keith in the Circle |

| **Narrator:** But Native-control over Native education remained elusive. By funding the compulsory attendance of Indigenous students in provincial public schools, the Federal Government assured that Native high school students still left behind their communities, languages, and cultures. | 00-00-09-42: Shot of cultural centre  
00-00-09-47: Sign of Woodland Cultural Centre  
00-00-09-53: Dissolve to interior of Woodland Cultural Centre.  
00-00-09-56: Dissolve to second interior shot.  
00-00-09-59: Dissolve to third interior shot. |

| 00-00-10-03: Exterior shot of school  
00-00-10-06: Bus doors open and kids get on.  
00-00-10-19: Fade to black.  
**Subtitle:** Keith Lickers – Executive Director of Woodland Cultural Centre (1972-74) |
**Audio: Raven calls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Narrator:</strong> Education is a powerful factor in cultural continuity. Depending on who holds the power, educational institutions can destroy communities, or they can heal them. In 1972, Ontario’s Deputy Minister of Education, George Waldrum saw that Native Studies courses in schools could be used to heal the rift in Native cultures and languages created by the aggressive assimilation policies of the residential school era. From the 1850s until the 1970s, education had been used to destroy Indigenous cultures and languages across Canada. From the 1970s forward, Waldrum saw education as a tool for their restoration. He invited Native educator Alton Bigwin to join the staff of the Curriculum Branch situated in the Mowat Block, at Bay and Wellesley, in the heart of Toronto. Bigwin was assigned the task of assembling a committee of educators to create a series of Native Studies resource guides as a support for Ontario teachers interested in teaching Native Studies. In October 1974, Keith Lickers, in his</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Regaining “Indian Control of Indian Education” Native Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-10-21:</strong> Green shoots pushing up from the bottom of the screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-10-21:</strong> Dissolve to teacher and classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-10-36:</strong> Cut to teacher from left side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-10-40:</strong> Dissolve to photo of George Waldrum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-10-44:</strong> Background of teacher scene fades to black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-10-46:</strong> Native Studies’ book covers appear behind Waldrum’s photo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-10-56:</strong> Waldrum’s photo fades away leaving the Native Studies curricula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-00:</strong> Dissolve to photo of a People of Native Ancestry (PONA) document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-13:</strong> Dissolve to Alton Bigwin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-20:</strong> Cut to shot of Mowat Block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtitle:</strong> Ministry of Education, Mowat Block, 900 Bay St. Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-23:</strong> Dissolve to Paul walking by the Mowat Block sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-28:</strong> Cut to shot of Paul walking towards Mowat doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-34:</strong> Paul walks through doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-37:</strong> Paul walks into elevator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-42:</strong> Dissolve to picture of Keith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00-00-11-45:</strong> Picture fades to dark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
second year as Executive director of the Woodland Cultural Centre, gave George Waldrum a tour of the newly opened facilities, after which, Waldrum asked:

**Keith:** “Would you be willing to come and work in Toronto with the Ministry of Education to develop curriculum in Native Studies?”

**Narrator:** Lickers appreciated that Waldrum’s vision of Native Studies courses would give Native educators some control over curricular content and provide Native students with much-needed recognition of Aboriginal cultures and histories in provincial schools.

**Keith:** …I thought, Here is a chance to really do something in this area….I called him and I said, “I’m willing to give up my job here and go and work for you and develop a curriculum.”

**Narrator:** For the next 32 years Lickers made the daily commute from his home on Six Nations territory to the Mowat Block in downtown Toronto. The first assignment given Keith Lickers by Alton Bigwin was that of leading the Native Studies Curriculum Committee. It was just about to start working on the first of three People of Native Ancestry resource guides or PONA documents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-04:</td>
<td>Dissolve to PONA documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-09:</td>
<td>Dissolve to other shot of PONA documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-02:</td>
<td>Cutaways to PONA materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shots of Bigwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtitle:</strong> People of Native Ancestry resource guides (PONA documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith:</td>
<td>It was interesting. It was a committee of 32. All of them were non-Native. All of them were quite supportive – quite interested in Native Studies but didn’t have any real experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-09:</td>
<td>00-00-13-14: Keith in Community Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtitle:</strong> Keith Lickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-29:</td>
<td>Dissolve to students at residential school desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith:</td>
<td>So one of the first things that I suggested we do, as a committee, was go to a residential school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-41:</td>
<td>Dissolve to St. Anne’s Residential School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator:</td>
<td>They chose St. Anne’s in James Bay where the 32 non-Indigenous committee members were exposed to the deplorable residential school conditions endured by the Cree children from Moosenee and Moose Factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-49:</td>
<td>Dissolve to shot of priests, nuns, and boys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shots of St Anne’s in the James Bay area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith:</td>
<td>Of course these people had never been in that kind of a situation before. And, they all broke down and cried. I felt badly but I thought, this is an education. …it really struck home with these people that were on this committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-13-56:</td>
<td>Dissolve to Keith in Circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator:</td>
<td>The Committee’s first project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-14-20:</td>
<td>Paul flips through PONA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was to create the PONA series – the first resource guides ever published by the Ministry.

**Keith:** ... the PONA documents broke the standard for Ministry documents.

**Peter:** One of the things Keith did was, he got a cover to a–usually a boring white Ministry document – a guideline – and he made this look, in itself, interesting, and obviously Native. So at least somebody would open it. Ha ha.

**Narrator:** This level of influence over curricular content and publication style by Indigenous educators was unprecedented. Keith gained the confidence of senior management.

**Keith:** I certainly felt that I was given a lot more freedom by the establishment within the Curriculum Branches to be able to go ahead and do what we did.

**Narrator:** In 1975, one year before Waldrum left the Ministry, PONA1 for the Primary-Junior level was launched and the committee for PONA 2 was formed.

**Keith:** We selected a whole new group of people as the development committee. This time most of them were Native people, Native educators.
**Narrator:** PONA 3, launched in 1981 in downtown Toronto, was marked by an increase in Indigenous participation on all levels, featuring entertainment provided by Buffy St. Marie. Lickers recognized that you have to have good marketing and publicity in order to make implementation possible – the three-day PONA launch celebration brought together Indigenous educators from across Ontario for seminars and workshops.

**Keith:** That was 1981. (00-46-55-13) Those were good years.

**Narrator:** In 1983, Alton Bigwin and Keith Lickers adopted the National Indian Brotherhood’s paper “Indian Control of Indian Education” as a blueprint for the development of Ministry policies for Native Studies courses, Native Language courses, Native Language Teachers, and Native Guidance Counsellors. The paper was a response to the Trudeau Government’s 1969 White Paper – a proposal to nullify all treaties.

**Audio:** Eagle cry

**Narrator:** Satisfied with the progress on the PONA
resource guides, as early as 1978, Lickers had started turning his attention to Native Languages. He knew that Native Languages were the key to cultural resurgence. He also knew that Indian Affairs was still pursuing its agenda to assimilate First Peoples by forcing Indigenous students to attend provincial schools where the languages of instruction were either English or French. Lickers took a risk. With the Ontario Ministry of Education as a strong ally and with some trepidation, he proposed the introduction of Native Languages as subjects of instruction to then Minister of Education, Dr. Bette Stephenson.

**Keith:** I had a meeting with Bette Stephenson one-on-one and she was gung ho. I couldn’t believe that she was willing to take this on.

**Narrator:** Not only was she willing to support Native Languages as subjects of instruction but she proposed the unprecedented idea of Native Languages as languages of instruction.

**Narrator:** They were two weeks away from taking the paper to the provincial Cabinet, when Stephenson told Keith to run it by Gerry Kerr, the Regional Director for Indian Affairs.

**Keith:** He sat back and he said, “I can’t believe what you’re doing. There’s no way

| 00-00-17-27: Dissolve to PONA shot. | 00-00-17-43: Bette Stephenson picture 1 |
| 00-00-17-44: Bette picture 2 | 00-00-17-48: Bette picture 3 |
| 00-00-17-49: Bette picture 4 | 00-00-17-51: Bette picture 5 |
| 00-00-17-54: Bette picture 6 | 00-00-17-57: Keith in boardroom |
| 00-00-18-11: Bette picture 7 | 00-00-18-16: Bette picture 8 |
| 00-00-18-20: Child with text | 00-00-18-28: Cut to Gerry Kerr – image 1 |
| 00-00-18-29: Super Gerry – image 2 | 00-00-18-35: Keith in boardroom |
we’re going to support you. We’ll support you if you want to establish a program as a subject of instruction but not as a language of instruction.”

**Keith:** But the fact that Bette Stephenson, a Conservative Minister of Education, was willing to go that far was… really something. I could have kissed her. Ha ha ha!

**Audio: Bird songs**

**Narrator:** As the PONA resource guides evolved towards the later Native Studies and Native Languages curricula, Lickers called on many Indigenous Educators to help. Two of his collaborators, Gloria Thomas and Peter Hill were also from Six Nations.

**Narrator:** Dr. Gloria Thomas, an Onondaga Clan Mother, Deer Clan: as Faithkeeper for the longhouse ceremonies she is deeply involved with traditional language and culture. As an educator she has especially focused on curriculum development. Her lifelong love of learning culminated in her 2013 Doctorate in Policy and Cultural Studies, from Queen’s University. She is interested in global collaboration with like-minded people and envisions a Nation of educated people who take leadership

| 00-00-19-26: Dissolve to Peter and Gloria in Grand River Employment and Training (GREAT) centre hallway. | 00-00-19-50: Gloria in Boardroom |
| 00-00-19-32: Peter and Gloria walk towards camera. | **Subtitle:** Dr. Gloria Thomas |
| 00-00-19-38: Close-up of Peter and Gloria | **Subtitle:** Gloria Thomas and family |
| 00-00-19-54: Photo of Gloria and family | **Subtitle:** Gloria Thomas and Granddaughter, Hailey Thomas – Grade 8 Graduation |
| 00-00-19-57: Gloria and Hailey | **Subtitle:** Gloria and flower – photo |
| 00-00-20-07: Gloria graduates with PhD from Queen’s University – photo. | **Subtitle:** Gloria graduates with PhD |
| 00-00-20-12: Gloria receives her degree – |
positions in both worlds – just as she has.

**Narrator:** Peter Hill, a lifelong friend of Keith Lickers, taught History and English at off-reserve schools beginning in 1967. His humour, passion, and frankness won him the admiration of both colleagues and students.

**Peter Hill:** Thanks to Keith I ended up at the Ministry. I was an ordinary school teacher teaching English like, when in doubt, tell a story, ahhh ha ha. (People laugh.) …I can’t imagine the first committee he struck – 32 – to me, that’s a class too big and a riot. And not a Native person in the room.

**Gloria 01-01-41:** Peter was the first teacher in Ontario that was a Native person – and he was teaching English. Ha ha. How unusual is that? Ha ha. Right? He was the best English teacher ever. Everyone loved him! I mean if you were Native or non-Native.

**Peter:** In those days Grade Nine was totally and exclusively British History, Grade Eleven, Ancient History. Grade Ten there was a compulsory History course. Grade Eleven absolutely nothing Native – Native Persians I guess. By the time you got to Grade Twelve you could turn it into an Issues course and you could bring in Natives in terms of who was in control …

photo.

**Shots for Peter’s introduction**

*00-00-19-36:* Peter and Gloria shot 1
*00-00-19-38:* Peter and Gloria shot 2
*00-00-19-44:* Peter and Gloria shot 3

*00-00-20-23:* Peter in the Community Circle

*00-00-20-54:* Gloria talks in the Community Circle.

*00-00-21-14:* Peter in the boardroom
it’s interesting, you can define history by the very question: Who is in control? Because it always was an issue of equality.

**Narrator:** After retiring in the late 90s, Peter Hill was invited by Keith Lickers to chair the *Committee for the Development of the Ontario Native Studies History Curriculum.*

**Peter:** The hardest thing I found was deciding: Were there “Native” values? Was there a core Native value? The whole system of values … You got to get through that without that becoming the whole picture, which to Natives, values tends to be the whole picture.

**Gloria:** …the first thing I ever did was I worked with Peter and we did curriculum for immersion school. It was the first year that Gaweni:yo started. They asked me if I would come and write our values into the Ontario curriculum. That was one of the first times that I ever did that. It was great…wherever we go it doesn’t matter, where we go we will always be ourselves. We are always going to love our culture, love our language. It doesn’t matter the context, it’s always about First Nations control. It’s about our heart. It’s about our culture so we make it happen wherever we go.
**Audio: Bird song**

Fade to black.

**Title:** Keith Retires: It Takes a Whole Department to Replace Him.

Green pushes up.

**Narrator:** In 2005, it fell to Assistant Deputy Minister of Education, Judith Wright, to inform Keith of a critical point in his career.

**Subtitle:** Judith Wright, Assistant Deputy Minister of Education

**Keith:** She called me to her office and said, “You realize you’re coming up to your retirement age. You’re the only person working in this area. We’ve got to do something about it.”

**Subtitle:** Keith Lickers

**Keith:** I liked my job. And of course in those days you had to retire when you were 65. But, I had been doing all this work myself after 1985 when Al Bigwin retired.

**Narrator:** She gave him the task of creating a blueprint for what is now the Aboriginal Education Office situated at the Mowat Block. His job description included: Helping School Boards implement Native Studies and Native Language programs; integrating Native Trustees on Boards; mentoring the creation of Indigenous Education Authorities; and dealing with racist principals who refused to accept Native counsellors even though they had the same qualifications as non-Native counsellors.

**Subtitle:** Mowat Block, Toronto, Ontario

**00-00-24-14:** Aerial picture of Bay and Wellesley in Toronto

**00-00-24-26:** Graphic of Keith’s job description
**Keith:** So, all of these things were going on. So it had to be divided between what could the Regional Office do and what should the central office of the Ministry in Native Education do. All of that then became the Aboriginal Education Office. It therefore required hiring a Native Educator in each of the six regional offices plus finding and hiring a person who was willing to take my place in the Mowat Block.

**Narrator:** In those last two years several other critical policies were created:

- The Aboriginal Self-Identification Policy which improved the amount and quality of data relating to Native peoples in Ontario schools, and
- Ontario’s Response to the Kelowna Accord, a federal initiative to equalize Native and non-Native high school graduation rates.

**Reed:** The Framework is a very powerful document. It really continues to guide everything that we at the Aboriginal Education Office and the Ministry are trying to do. It’s a very powerful document.

**Narrator:** After 34 years at the Ministry of Education, Keith Lickers retired in 2007.

**Keith:** So, when I retired, I kinda chuckled

**Subtitle:** Keith Lickers
that all the work that I was doing, it took seven people to, in fact, replace me.

**Peter:** Well, not many can say, I left the Ministry and seven people replaced me. Ha ha. That should be on your tombstone. Ha ha.

**Audio: Cardinal bird call**

**Narrator:** Kevin Reed, whose teaching career in Kingston, Ontario was crowned with the prestigious Prime Minister’s Award for Teaching Excellence in 2008, is now Aboriginal Education Consultant to the Limestone District School Board, a position made possible by the work of Keith and other Indigenous educators in collaboration with the Ministry of Education.

**Reed:** I think the Ministry is very committed to Native Studies. They keep making agreements with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples. They keep pushing Boards and encouraging Boards to follow through with those commitments and I know that Boards are working very hard. I think we’ve reached a tipping point and that we will have more energy moving forward.

**Narrator:** Reed’s claim that Native Studies courses are here to stay is corroborated by data released by the Ministry of Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-00-26-31</td>
<td>Peter in boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtitle of Peter’s narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-26-47</td>
<td>Fade to black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Outcomes: It Just Takes Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green shoots at bottom of screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-26-54</td>
<td>Dissolve to Reed entering school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-26-54</td>
<td>Dissolve to Reed turning down hallway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-27-03</td>
<td>Reed enters the room and sits at his desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-27-14</td>
<td>Reed at his desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-27-34</td>
<td>Dissolve to kids in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-27-46</td>
<td>Graph Title: Frequency of Course Offerings by Grade (2006-2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Narrator: From 1999 to 2010 the frequency of course offerings in Ontario high schools jumped from virtually zero to 478. The Frequency of Course Offerings by Grade shows a significant increase in Grade Eleven.

The Number of Schools Offering Courses increased to 267.

The Number of School Boards Offering Native Studies Courses increased from eleven to 55.

Reed: The Ministry has only recently started publishing data to reflect how First Nations, Métis, and Inuit students are doing in Ontario. Those numbers keep going up and hence provide us with increasing amounts of information.

Reed: I think that Boards are working very hard, but it takes time. We’re still, on some level, building awareness among teachers and staff.

Gloria: It’s only now that the teachers are feeling confident about teaching Native Studies and Native Languages. And that’s
been since 2000. It’s been like fifteen years so it gives you an idea what Keith and Peter are talking about – about time and development and what it takes to educate our kids, especially in our area. You can’t just write it and all of a sudden it’s going to happen – so it does take time. FADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Narrator:</strong> The Ministry numbers tell us one story. But what about the experiences of community members back at Six Nations?</th>
<th>00-00-29-23: GoPro shot of Community Circle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio:</strong> Birdballs</td>
<td>Fade to black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Multi-Generational Influence: Living in Two Worlds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green shoots rise from the bottom.</td>
<td>00-00-28-41: GREAT sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrator:</strong> To find out, we set up a Community Circle at Ohsweken and invited Keith, Gloria, and Peter to share some stories with interested community members. The small Circle listened and shared, and their reactions were filmed. I wanted to learn more about the impact of these three individuals – and that of the Native Studies and Native Language curricula that they had been instrumental in creating.</td>
<td>00-00-29-46: Keith, Gloria, and Peter enter boardroom. 00-00-29-54: Go Pro shot of Community Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deneen:</strong> Sego. My name is Deneen Montour. I’m Mohawk Nation, Turtle Clan. I’m a teacher uhm I know all three: Peter, Gloria, and Keith. They’ve all played pretty important roles in my life. Peter was my high school English teacher and also a</td>
<td>00-00-30-06: Medium shot of Deneen in Community Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mentor. He was the one that encouraged me to take my Masters of Education, which I now have, Peter…ha ha! Gloria has always been a family friend and always very encouraging as well in any of the undertakings that I take. And Keith was very instrumental for me to get into Teacher’s College when I was at the University of Western Ontario. I also worked with him at the Ministry on a number of projects. So I know all three of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lester</strong></td>
<td>Sego (speaks in Mohawk)</td>
<td>00-00-31-06: Medium shot of Lester in Community Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lester Green</strong></td>
<td>My name is Lester Green of the Oneida Nation, Bear Clan.</td>
<td>00-00-31-06: Medium shot of Laurie in Community Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laurie Powless</strong></td>
<td>Speaks Native Language</td>
<td>Subtitle: My name is Laurie Powless and I’m a teacher on Six Nations and I don’t know Peter or Keith but I’ve seen Gloria around in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artie Martin</strong></td>
<td>Speaks Native Language</td>
<td>Subtitle: My name is Artie Martin. I’m Mohawk, Turtle Clan and I don’t know Peter but I know Gloria a little bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sylvia Bero</strong></td>
<td>So I’m very honoured to be here, to meet you, to be able to tell my</td>
<td>00-00-32-00: Long shot of Sylvia in Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| children that there are people that have worked hard to get us to where we are now today. | **Subtitle:** Sylvia Bero, Mohawk, Wolf Clan  
Subtitle: all her narrative |
|---|---|
| **Adam Freeman** Sego – in the Native Language | **00-00-14:** Medium shot of Adam in Community Circle  
**Subtitle:** Hello my name is Adam Freeman (Rhohadeo), Bear Clan of the Mohawk Nation. |
| **Jane-Leigh Jamieson:** Hi. My Name is Jane-Leigh and I am thirteen and I’m in Grade Eight and I go to Gaweni:yo Private Immersion School. I don’t know who Peter is or Gloria but I would like to. So when I go to high school I want to be able to have the option of learning my language and in university as well. | **00-00-34:** Medium shot of Jane-Leigh in Community Circle  
**Subtitle:** Jane-Leigh Jamieson |
| **Narrator:** Hailey Thomas, who majored in First Nations Studies at Western University, is planning a career as a Native Studies teacher. Despite being Gloria’s granddaughter she’s only now become aware of how Gloria’s, Keith’s, and Peter’s accomplishments have made her career in Native Studies possible. | **00-00-10:** Photograph of Hailey 1  
**00-00-17:** Hailey in Community Circle  
**00-00-23:** Another angle on Hailey in the Community Circle |
| **Hailey:** I’m actually mind blown hearing all these stories about Keith (Peter – ‘Yeah but realize we are 104.’) Like I said I’m mind blown. I had no idea that all this went on behind the scenes. | Same shot continues as she speaks. |
| **Narrator:** In Grade Eleven she had the | Same shot continues. |
opportunity to assist her Native Studies teacher.

**Hailey:** But what really struck me was that she was non-Native; she was a non-Native teacher teaching Native students. So that’s always stuck with me.

**Narrator:** Attending Native Studies classes significantly influenced her decision to become a Native Studies teacher.

**Hailey:** Going to a school even off-reserve and learning about it when I have it back home right. To be able to do that – like both at the same time – walking in two worlds – like having an education and still going to the longhouse and knowing who you are and carrying that with you. For sure, for sure.

**Gloria:** I remember my parents used to always talk about ahh experience, their experience – living in two worlds – their experience you know in the Great Law actually, what certain things meant. You know, you just kind of grew up around that. I think that’s what happened with Hailey.

**Gloria:** It was about the culture, the ceremonies; Native Studies.

**Lester Green:** And hearing the stories of Keith and Peter as well and taking those steps to make sure that that’s going to be taught within the curriculum is planting that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity to assist her Native Studies teacher.</th>
<th>Same shot continues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hailey:</strong> But what really struck me was that she was non-Native; she was a non-Native teacher teaching Native students. So that’s always stuck with me.</td>
<td>00-00-34-06: Hailey – Graduation photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrator:</strong> Attending Native Studies classes significantly influenced her decision to become a Native Studies teacher.</td>
<td>00-00-34-15: Hailey in Community Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hailey:</strong> Going to a school even off-reserve and learning about it when I have it back home right. To be able to do that – like both at the same time – walking in two worlds – like having an education and still going to the longhouse and knowing who you are and carrying that with you. For sure, for sure.</td>
<td>00-00-33-10: Gloria in boardroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloria:</strong> I remember my parents used to always talk about ahh experience, their experience – living in two worlds – their experience you know in the Great Law actually, what certain things meant. You know, you just kind of grew up around that. I think that’s what happened with Hailey.</td>
<td>Subtitle: Gloria Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloria:</strong> It was about the culture, the ceremonies; Native Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lester Green:</strong> And hearing the stories of Keith and Peter as well and taking those steps to make sure that that’s going to be taught within the curriculum is planting that</td>
<td>00-00-35-04: Lester in Community Circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtitle: Shot of Lester Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seed like you said to make sure. They may not understand at that time but as they grow older, that seed is going to grow into a sapling, or a shrub, or a tree that eventually over time it'll be strong, full of sustenance… these two gentlemen here helped introduce that back into society where I can see the effect now with my daughter. She’s taking the Oneida language in London. My son is going through law school. He’s learning the language. He’s learning the ceremonies. It’s a stepping-stone and a great push in the right direction and now I can start to see the residual effects. Everything that was lost is gonna be gained back.

**Narrator:** The findings from my Master’s thesis were not well known in the Six Nations Community – or elsewhere for that matter.

**Keith:** It certainly was very much an education… You know for everybody. Because it was a story that hasn’t been told… hadn’t been told. Hasn’t been told… just that whole lack of awareness.

**Bring in Six Nations music.**

**Narrator:** Although Ministry data tells a story of increased community control over education during the last 40 years, a community’s resurgence can’t be measured...
at the provincial level — it has to be discovered by actually going into the community and asking people how they feel.

**Artie Martin:** This is how I feel (shakes hands with Keith then crosses over to shake hands with Peter – Big laughter) Niawen.  
(Thank you.)

**Peter:** “You may use one knee only.”  
(More big laughter)

**Lester Green:** I think I’m going to have to follow suit with ahh what Marty was saying in thanking you two because you guys are pioneers of leading the way; you know, the trail blazers leading the way for that sort of education in the school systems today.

**Narrator:** The careers of Keith Lickers, Peter Hill, and Gloria Thomas have contributed to putting control over Indigenous education back into Indigenous hands.  
The generations following in their footsteps are thriving in the rich soil of their accomplishments —a vibrant cultural continuity where youth can develop strong identities with roots tapping into an imaginable future.

Stories are seeds.  
Will the stories planted in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-05:</td>
<td>Woman walking towards a school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-13:</td>
<td>Boy and girl walking in field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-18:</td>
<td>Roots, rich soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-24:</td>
<td>Plant sprouting and growing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-31:</td>
<td>Tree roots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-42:</td>
<td>Go Pro of Community Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-51:</td>
<td>GREAT exterior and sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-00-37-54:</td>
<td>Grand River riverbank and river</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

00-00-38-02: Gloria and Peter arrive at GREAT.
Circle be part of that future?

Through a community-based approach I have used film to explore planting these seed stories. The desolation has made room for new seeds to grow. Stories must be told because it is in the telling that they are watered and in the watering that they grow deep roots. Seeds, sweet rain, and salty tears replenish the barren places within and without. Tell your stories.

**Narrator:**

**To Keith, Gloria and Peter:**

Three generations later

Three Sisters harvest

Fertile fields

Children bearing fruit to (Hailey graduating)

Smiling Elders (Peter, Keith and Gloria)

Whose eyes have seen

Flowering pastures

Once black, now green

Elder hearts that know (Heart beat starts)

Seven generations later

Stories that will feed

Reconnected hearts to

Rhythm of the Mother (Heart beat peaks)

Sister Sun, Moon, Squash

Sister Water, Sky, Beans

Sister Silky Standing Corn

00-00-38-14: Heron in the river

00-00-38-18: Boy running with kite

00-00-38-26: Windblown flowers in field

00-00-38-30: Green crop

00-00-38-38: Charred smoky land

00-00-38-40: Lush forest

00-00-38-51: Dramatic cloudy sky and sun breaking through

00-00-39-03: Fade to black.
May the Creator bless you with a bountiful harvest.

Nia:wen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Nations Music</th>
<th>Though many First Nations pay the provinces to provide elementary and secondary education to their students, Six Nations remains federal, pending local control of education for their 1200 elementary students. They have never abandoned the vision of having their own high school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Subtitle:** Alton (Al) Bigwin

Picture of Bigwin

**Subtitle:** Alton Bigwin received the honorary degree, Doctor of Education, from Nipissing University, on June 8, 2011. He worked at the Curriculum Branch with Keith Lickers from 1974 to 1984 but was established there prior to Keith's arrival. Elayne Bigwin, his daughter, successfully competed for the position as the first Director of Aboriginal Education Office (AEO) in August 2006. Elizabeth Bigwin, her sister, is Education Officer at the Aboriginal Education Office, in the Barrie
Subtitle: Peter Hill
Photo of Peter and his wife Marg

Subtitle: Much of Peter's career from 1970 to 2005 was spent teaching History and English in secondary schools of the Grand Erie District School Board where Six Nations students attend. For three years in the late '90s, Peter was employed by the Ministry of Education in order to contribute to Native Studies courses. He is now happily retired with his wife, Marg, on Six Nations.

Subtitle: Keith Lickers
Images of his degree and of him as a boy

Subtitle: Keith Lickers received the honorary degree, Doctor of Education, on June 8, 2011 from Nipissing University, for his long service as senior administrator in the Ministry of Education. His father, an early Native lawyer, one of the few in Ontario at that time, would have been very proud. Keith and his wife, Phyllis, are happily retired on Six Nations where
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season 3</th>
<th>Episode 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Subtitle:** Dr. Gloria Thomas  
Picture of Gloria and Hailey. |
| **Subtitle:** Gloria is learning Onondaga and Cayuga, is committed to her roles as Clan Mother, Onondaga Deer Clan, and as Faithkeeper for Longhouse Ceremonies. She recently established Indigenous Education Research, a private company, and is working to publish her dissertation research as a book entitled: *Finding Tadodaho: An Autoethnology of Healing Historical Trauma.* |
| **Producer, Director, Writer**  
Paul Chaput |
| **Editor** Jon Aarssen |
| **Second Editor** Annie Palone |
| **Director of Photography** Jon Aarssen |
| **Co-producer** Margaret Bentley |
| **Co-producer** Jon Aarssen |
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Subtitle: Nia:wen
Chapter 6

Creating the Film

6.1 Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) and Performance Pedagogy

In July 2009, I enrolled in a course on Indigenous research methodologies. The designer and teacher was Gloria Thomas, a Six Nations educator in the last phase of her doctoral work. Our interactions have since established her as a mentor, teacher, and friend.

Thomas introduced me to Indigenous approaches to research and acquainted me with the Six Nations narrative that opposes provincial involvement in the education of Six Nations students. These insights influenced my decision to shift the focus of my MA research from one in which the province and the federal government held the power to one in which a resilient, determined Nation tenaciously held to the vision of regaining control over every aspect of their children’s education. Thomas’s support was critical in my decision to proceed with a community-based participatory research (CBPR) approach in my work with Six Nations.

In anticipation of a summer filming session, on the morning of March 14, 2014, I decided to contact Keith Lickers and Peter Hill. Before doing so I sent an email to Gloria Thomas asking her permission to mention to Lickers and Hill that she supported my doctoral research project. She responded that afternoon “Of course, Paul, let Peter and Keith know I support your work!” Thomas proposed the theories of Norman Denzin (2008) as a reference for the film project that I was planning. As earlier stated, Denzin

---

3 As stated earlier, CBPR is defined, by Castleden, Mulrennan, and Godlewska (2012, 156), as “research undertaken in partnership with Indigenous peoples, communities, and organizations.”
(1989, 232) asserts, “Film is simultaneously a means of communication and a method of inquiry.” Denzin has been a major influence in Thomas’s research. Applying his approach, she created a short video of the draft of a story she had recently presented at a doctoral seminar. She attached a copy of her twelve-minute video, Talking Back (Thomas 2014), to her March 14, 2014 response.

As I watched Talking Back, I learned about academic auto-ethnographical analysis in an audiovisual format, which conveyed more to me in twelve minutes than any written text could ever have in the same space and time. The combination of Thomas’s narration, archival photographs, and distant soundtrack of Six Nations traditional music were riveting. For me, Talking Back is haute cuisine: totally, delightfully, digestible. The references are woven into the story and their authors take root as characters in the inner landscapes of the listener’s imagination. Like credits at the end of a film, authors populate the reference page at the end of the document.

After viewing Talking Back, I responded, “I dream that one day references for the reporting of Indigenous research findings will include ‘experts’ like the Creator, Coyote, Raven, and a host of other anonymous sources. Might any of the ‘experts’ that you cite in your work, Gloria, actually wear a robe or mask? As I see it, anonymity engenders the multigenerational circularity of ‘our’ Indigenous storytelling arts and honours the myth-making prowess of ‘our’ unknown ancestors.”

Thomas found the comment interesting, but had never considered the idea of a masked anonymous storyteller prior to our discussion. I consider Thomas’s work

Rich seeds for
Equatorial fecundity
Nestled beneath the
Generous solar heat of
The heart.

The storyteller, by donning the cloak and mask of the performer, becomes anonymous. Throughout the performance, the storyteller, while peering through the mask, unseen by the audience, has the option of adapting his or her material in response to what is happening in the audience – resembling a form of interactivity. As in previous generations of Indigenous storytelling, while being entertained the audience actually takes in knowledge – sometimes multi-generational information – and then analyzes it, just as previous generations have done, in a community context. The storyteller is a “seeing screen” that responds and adapts to the audience.

In the spring of 2014, Thomas was contemplating conducting post-doctoral research with Denzin to continue her studies in performance theory rooted in Indigenous pedagogy. Looking back, my email to Thomas concerning Denzin on April 9, 2014, proved to have more than a touch of prescience. “I love Denzin!” I wrote. “It is so wonderful to find people [like him],” I wrote, “[scholars] who have ploughed the field, planted the seeds, tended the crops, and left the harvest to those lucky enough to follow in their footsteps.” The email celebrates the dedication of educators like Denzin, Lickers, Hill, and Thomas to the Indigenous cause.

In the same message I cited an apt extract from Denzin (2003, 14), the first part of which he attributes to Henry A. Giroux:

As pedagogical practices, performances make sites of oppression visible. In the process, they reaffirm an oppositional politics that reasserts the value of self-determination and mutual solidarity. This pedagogy of hope rescues radical democracy from the conservative politics of neoliberalism (Giroux 2001, 115). A militant Utopianism offers a new language of
resistance in the public and private spheres. Thus, performance pedagogy energizes a radical participatory democratic vision for this new century.

Denzin’s combining of performance pedagogy and participatory democracy goes to the heart of CBPR. Because performance pedagogy also contributes to the reassertion of the value of self-determination, it serves to deepen the match with CBPR. The appealing blend of performance pedagogy and the democracy of CBPR intrigued us both. Visions of “mutual solidarity” between researcher and community were evoked as we discussed using film to report my MA findings back to her Six Nations community.

According to Thomas, as iterated to me in a communication dated March 14, 2014, there is “no better scholar than Denzin to dismantle, deconstruct, and decolonize Western epistemologies.” Denzin (2008, 11), referring to his methods as “indigenist,” posits “underlying each indigenist formation is a commitment to moral praxis, to issues of self-determination, empowerment, healing, love, community solidarity, respect for the earth and respect for elders.” For Denzin (2008, 12), drawing on the foreword by L.M. Findlay in Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision, his commitment extends to support for a “critical indigenist pedagogy [that] contests the complicity of the modern university with neocolonial forces.”

Inspired by my discussions with Thomas, I redoubled my efforts on all fronts in order to commence my fieldwork in a timely fashion. I passed my qualifying exam in May 2014; negotiated a working agreement with Jon Aarssen to be my videographer; renewed my Queen’s University General Research Ethics Board (GREB) application (see Appendix B); and submitted my application to the Six Nations Ethics Committee. The Six Nations’ inquiry is even more rigorous than Queen’s University’s GREB scrutiny but

At the heart of the Six Nations Ethics Committee’s research policy is the protection of Indigenous knowledge. Much like the operative principles of CBPR, the fundamental position of the Six Nations Ethics Committee is that research is to be carried out with consideration of mutual respect, understanding, and trust foremost in mind. With the research proposal approved, and the ethics approvals in place, filming and interviewing could now begin on Six Nations territory. I moved into action quickly.

For the filming of the Community Circle, conducted in September 2014, and the undertaking of interviews, participants were required to read a Letter of Information (LOI) outlining my research objectives (see Appendix D – Letter of Information). Those who wished to be part of the film then were required to sign the Consent and Release forms (see Appendix E – Consent and Release Forms). These gave me permission to create a film using their images and voices.

On July 28, 2014, I emailed Gloria Thomas. I attached a Letter of Intent, a Questionnaire, a Consent Form, and a Documentary Release Form. I asked her to contact me after reviewing and signing the documents so that we could begin coordinating the logistics of personal interviews with herself, Peter Hill, and Keith Lickers, along with a public session with the community.
On August 5, 2014, I followed up with a more detailed proposal for Thomas’s and Lickers’s consideration. All communication with Hill was conducted over the telephone or through Canada Post. I proposed the two-week period beginning August 18, 2014, for filming interviews and collecting archival materials. If we were to start on Monday, August 18, 2014, it would give us a tight but manageable window within which to film interviews and collect archival materials – photos, videos, and other memorabilia – of the trio’s past involvement with the creation of the Native Studies curricula, and their various roles as members and representatives of Six Nations.

The schedule delineated four sessions: (i) filming a 30 to 60 minute conversation amongst Hill, Thomas, Lickers, and myself discussing the goal of the project, as well as the engagement of other interested members of Six Nations; (ii) filming a conversation amongst the key players discussing their roles in the creation and implementation of the Native Studies curricula for high schools in Ontario; (iii) filming three 45-minute interviews and recording relevant archival material; (iv) filming a public meeting with Lickers, Thomas, Hill, and other members of the community.

Thomas was available during the week beginning September 15, 2014, and agreed to cooperate around others’ schedules in that time frame. Lickers confirmed his availability for the same week. Much to my relief, Hill agreed to an interview scheduled for August 25, 2014, at 10 AM. We were anxious to embark on the filming. We had arrived early afternoon at the Six Nations of the Grand River Reserve, in time to capture establishing shots in prime evening light.

After breakfast the next morning, I called Hill to confirm our interview at his home. To my disappointment, he told me he was no longer interested in being filmed.
Serendipitously, Andrea Curley, who I had met and interviewed at the 2004 International Indigenous Elders’ Summit at Ohsweken, agreed to a face to face interview and became our first official interviewee.

Our return home was somewhat precipitous – we had imagined a longer stay with more filming opportunities. We did, however, manage to get good establishing shots, a first face-to-face interview, and another lesson: when conducting fieldwork, expect the unexpected.

I learned that a very long “heads-up” time frame, besides careful planning well ahead of time, is the only way to get participants lined up. Finding a convenient time for the three subjects to meet together, along with interested community members, had become a major challenge.

6.2 Implementing Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR)

In the spirit of CBPR, rather than beginning by tabling my scenarios as originally outlined in my PhD proposal, I suggested creating a forum that would encourage input from participating members of the community. I wanted above all an authentic community voice, a contribution that was not unduly influenced by my academic aspirations. What came to mind was the traditional Indigenous learning format, the Circle. For Six Nations, the Circle is a sacred configuration. It naturally favours a more egalitarian power relation than does the front-of-the-class teacher configuration. Having decided to attempt this approach, one of my first concerns was setting up a process for selecting participants, with my preferential biases entering the process minimally.
Adhering to the principles of CBPR, I sought to co-create a community-driven process. Although I was not sure how that might be achieved, in keeping with the methodological approach outlined in my proposal I wanted to film a meeting at which members of the Six Nations’ communities could voice their concerns and suggestions. The more I focused on the desired outcome, the clearer it became that I should film a small gathering of community members. These members would ideally be involved in some facet of education and share an interest and involvement in education. This demographic would probably mean contact with Lickers, Thomas, and Hill; they would very likely be interested in participating or contributing to the process. Furthermore, they were the ones I reckoned would be the most conversant with the current Native Studies curricula and the roles each had played in their creation. However, there was no guarantee as to how their involvement would work out.

Battiste (2011, ix) contends that when critical thinking is removed from the equation throughout the planning process, it could work “against the development and maintenance of meaningful, accountable, and non-extractive relations with Indigenous communities.” In spite of careful preparation, concerns that have been identified by De Leeuw, Cameron, and Greenwood (2012) were apparent in the course of my efforts to organize this project. The first was “wanting to be seen as good” which is a strong trait of mine. I was hoping to be perceived – as a friend – as “being good.” As the project moved forward, and it was apparent that relationships with the protagonists were healthy ones, I overcame that potential problem and moved forward to dealing with the task at hand. The second concern regarding “extractive motives” on the part of the researcher I found was not realistic because the entire process is extractive. I resolved that concern in my
opening remarks to the Circle. I explained, “I took from this community certain information … The metaphor is like somebody coming in and taking gold from your land and going off and enriching theirs lives with it but not giving back” (Chaput, 2014).

The goal of my PhD is to contribute to rectifying such one-sided behaviour by returning data to the community from which it was taken. Of concern to me is that what is extracted from communities is rarely returned in an adequate manner. Ideally, the community would have some control in generating the research and through that process the findings would be aligned with the long-term vision of the community itself. The person who chooses the research topic is the one who speaks to the issue and the one, by definition, who exercises power, or control. If that control lies outside the community, the research can potentially become an imposition on the community. Research topics and researchers must go through an approval process led by the community or a representative of the community. In my case, it was the Ethics Review Board of the Six Nations. I had no option but to trust that the steps I had undertaken met satisfactorily my stated goals, CBPR procedures and First Nations’ protocols.

Kirmayer and Valaskakis (2009, 28) contend that “the health of the community appears to be linked to the sense of local control and cultural continuity.” Chandler and Lalonde (2004, 7) concur: “Knowledge invented elsewhere and rudely transplanted root and branch in someone else’s back yard is often and rightly understood to be a weapon wielded by those who have it, against those who must suffer it.” It is crucial for the health of Indigenous communities that they exercise control over their knowledge and their lives. Members of many Indigenous communities who have been institutionalized in
residential schools have had the scope of their decision-making greatly diminished along with their access to community-based knowledge and traditions.

On the other hand, there are unsung heroes in Indigenous communities whose stories serve to elevate the mythic content of narratives and revitalize community consciousness.

My goal, in this instance, is to generate discussion. Using film, I wanted to raise the awareness of contributions to education made by Lickers, Thomas, and Hill – to tell each person’s story and highlight his or her contribution to education in order to enhance community awareness. With these energizing accounts will come clarification of Six Nations’ educational goals. Sharing good news and enlightening many who are unaware I believe serves to invigorate the community and encourage a heightened focus on control of education.

As indicated before, Chandler and Lalonde’s research (1998) demonstrates that when cultural continuity factors are present, language being one of them and notably in communities where over 50 per cent of the members are Native speakers, the suicide rate was consistently zero. Language proved to be a consistent predictor of community health along with other factors including self-government, settled land claims or engagement in meaningful negotiations, and control over education. Particularly important for my research is curricular content pertaining to issues of Indigenous culture and history.

As it turns out, following the retirement of Alton Bigwin in 1985, Keith Lickers was the only Native representative in the Ontario Department of Education. Lickers was creative and innovative throughout his career at the Ministry. He applied himself assiduously to the task of increasing control by Native peoples over the education of their children. Given that Indigenous students were forced to attend off-reserve provincial
schools, especially high schools, Lickers’s focus on the development and implementation of Native Studies was strategic. Indigenous control over portions of the curricular content is a proven cultural continuity factor that supports the health and wellness of the community and its members (Chandler and Lalonde 2008). Having a choice is at the core of resilience and resistance. Choices precipitate health and vitality in their wake. They defy the robotic numbness commonly associated with the controlled environments of institutions like residential schools.

The ability to influence or make choices at both the personal and community levels is the essential difference between cultural assimilation and resurgence. In view of that, and particularly regarding research in Native communities, the question remained: Who makes the decisions concerning content and style of the “research story” to be presented to the community? Through collaboration, the research becomes a shared vision and not just that of the researcher. Thus adequate compliance to the principles of CBPR requires rigor.

I repeatedly reviewed my positionality. Take, for example, the selection of establishing shots for the opening of the film: I made the decision regarding those shots, in consultation with my videographer. Due to time constraints and the availability of the three main interviewees, we filmed the Six Nations reserve signage, landscape, and architecture before any interviews were filmed. What was guiding my selection and what was guiding the videographer’s framing choices? We did not include the community in those decisions since the already slow progress would have been magnified. I wondered if that should have been a community decision but then realized that when the airing of
the film to the community occurred, each had the right to change or delete any part of the content. That seemed sufficient in the moment.

What is selected from the unlimited palette of reality later becomes the limited filmic palette. If well chosen, the colours of the limited palette – in this case establishing shots – will not pose a problem for the editing phase. However, if the video of the establishing shots is inadequate for the demands of the introductory sequence or the interviews, we would have to go back and reshoot. In our case, the “talking heads” rough cut had too much emphasis on protagonists on screen holding forth. Professor Clarke Mackey suggested that we should aim at more showing and less telling: his rule of thumb, he indicated, was 85 per cent showing and 15 per cent telling. My rough cut had more or less the reverse ratio. We knew more B-roll (filler shots) was required but we were not anticipating such notable imbalance. We needed to create a lot more film and visuals and it had to be undertaken in short order. That seemed the best procedure to follow in order to create the desired final product.

As director, I had to make decisions based on a limited grasp of what the fieldwork would eventually provide me. This immediately raised a red flag. The imagined audience that I sought to address influenced my reporting style, as well as content, music, pace, and language. Although it seemed initially like a very simple concept and style of research, CBPR, largely due to definition and required parameters, in actual practice proved rather complex. Nevertheless, I was determined to move forward and work through the process to create a product that would be acceptable to the Six Nations community, one with which my videographer and I would be satisfied. We proceeded cautiously but optimistically.
I wanted to contrast the open lush riversides at the heart of the reserve with the intense modernity of downtown Toronto. Lickers made this transition twice daily for more than three decades. It was important to me to point out some of the historical context that produced the Six Nations Territory. In compensation for fighting alongside the British in the American War of Independence (1776), Governor General Haldimand purchased 950,000 acres from the Mississaugas of the New Credit and deeded it in perpetuity to the Six Nations. The Six Nations reserve today is a mere four per cent of the original tract that once included all the land six miles on either side of the Grand River from source to mouth. Hence the presence of the river and the bridges that cross it lie at the heart of Six Nations life.

In part, I invoke the adaptive right of the storyteller. There may be others in the community more skilled at storytelling than I. While it would be a pleasure to collaborate with them, it is not likely to take place given that the editing suite is a four-hour drive from the reserve. In any case, no one ever offered storytelling skills to help bring the stories in my MA thesis back to the community. I proceeded with the mission of planting the story in hopes of feeding the community.

Of the dozen community participants in the introductory Circle, half used the Mohawk language to introduce themselves. That, to me, was most heartening, especially so in view of Chandler and Lalonde’s (1998) research on retention of language. In addition, five participants mentioned their clan name – two Bear Clan members, two Turtle Clan members, and one Wolf Clan member. This is a meaningful cultural element of the story as explained in the following text from a Haudenosaunee Confederacy website (2014):
Among the Haudenosaunee are groups of people who come together as families called clans. As a matrilineal society, each clan is linked by a common female ancestor, with women possessing a leadership role within the clan. The number of clans varies among the nations with the Mohawk only having three to the Oneida having eight. The clans are represented by birds and animals and are divided into the three elements: water, land and air. The bear, wolf and deer represent the land element, the turtle, eel and beaver represent the water element and the snipe, hawk and heron represent the air element.

Gloria Thomas, a central figure in this film, is a Clan Mother of the Deer Clan of the Onondaga. Each member of a clan is considered a relative, regardless of which nation they belong to. A Wolf Clan member of the Mohawk Nation and a Wolf Clan member of the Seneca Nation are considered relatives. Family names and clans are passed down from mother to child. For example, if a man belonging to the Turtle Clan were to marry a woman of the Wolf Clan, their children would be of the Wolf Clan.

In Haudenosaunee society, each person has his or her own family, including mother, father, brothers, and sisters. But with this comes the extended family including everyone else belonging to the same clan. This system proved practical as well as helpful: when traveling from Nation to Nation, people would search out members of the same clan who would then would provide food and shelter and care for them. Because people of the same clan are considered family, marriages between members of the same clan are forbidden. However, within certain clans there may also be different types of one animal or bird. For example, the Turtle Clan has three different types of turtles, the Wolf Clan has three different types of wolves, and the Bear Clan includes three different types of bears, allowing for marriage within the clan as long as each belongs to a different species of the clan. The clan system still survives among those who follow the traditions.
Within the Circle of contributors, I consistently witnessed pride in their culture, language, and way of being. Although not all spoke their Native language, most made a reference to their language and their deep commitment to its retention. There was a certain dignity and pride that each felt in using his or her Native language. This continued as they translated so that all could understand their meaning.

Since the overriding majority of attendees voiced the high priority of language, I decided to adjust the content of the film to include the Circle introductions where participants were speaking in their Native language. This became especially important when I imagined that, in the final analysis, the audience to whom I was reporting through use of my film would be, by definition, the Six Nations community – the very people in the Circle. Reflecting on the preponderance of issues around retention and/or continuation of language, I wondered how much of that information I should use in the script and ultimately how my final product, the film, would affect future generations. Allowing others in the community to experience and understand the vast amount of community effort that had gone into improving their future as a Nation was becoming more important to me. Although it was somewhat complicated, it demonstrated just how important the Circle was for collecting and receiving relevant data.

The job at hand was to explain or demonstrate how film can raise awareness of the importance of local control with regard to the retention of culture and language. What Chandler and Lalonde revealed in their research, namely that with control comes health, was precisely what I was witnessing at Six Nations. I felt that the film was beginning to gel and we were moving in the right direction. Above all, I was firmly convinced that adopting CBPR procedures was going to reap rewards.
Shooting film is a process that requires a great deal of equipment and know-how. We went to Six Nations on two separate occasions to film location photos and interview protagonists. Since technologies for filming and editing constantly evolve, the list of equipment used by videographer Aarssen is “state of the art” only in relation to the summer and fall of 2014. Aarssen provided a full inventory of all equipment that he assembled for trips to Six Nations and Toronto (see Appendix F – Inventory) as well as furnishing further insights and notes (see Appendix G – Videographer’s Notes) – into the collaborative experience.

6.2.1 Community Circle Participants

Including Keith Lickers, Peter Hill, and Gloria Thomas, there were twelve participants in the Community Circle. The twelve members were contacts known to Thomas and Andrea Curley. My emails to both, leading up to and upon our arrival at Six Nations on Monday, September 15, 2014, were filled with surprises and last-minute adjustments.

I explained to Thomas and Curley, as co-organizers, that my idea was to film Lickers, Hill, and Thomas herself in conversation with members of the community in a Community Circle. The footage would be used to create a film that would be screened to the community. A few days before the planned community meeting, Thomas and Curley sent out emails to contacts who they felt would be interested. Curley was confident that she could count on at least six attendees. Because of Hill’s health concerns, I had not expected him to be a participant, but at the last moment, Thomas called him and offered to pick him up and drive him to the Circle. Their long and trusted association was all the leverage that Hill needed to agree to participate and be filmed. On her own initiative,
Thomas sent the following email – to which she attached a PDF of my MA thesis – to a small list of contacts she felt would be interested in attending the Circle.

Sent Sunday, September 14, 2014, at 10:30 P.M., Thomas wrote:

Hi all! So sorry this message is late. Paul Chaput is a PhD student at Queen’s University. His MA thesis concerns Six Nations in Secondary Education Reform, especially development of Native Studies & Native Languages courses. For the MA thesis, Paul interviewed Keith Lickers, Peter Hill and myself concerning our admin & curriculum development roles in Secondary Reform.

Paul, an NFB filmmaker, is now setting his MA thesis to film, which is his PhD research topic/project; so the film will be about our community. He is interested in filming your thoughts & contributions concerning education for our students, i.e. Hodinohso:ni: voice & vision in programs, support, student success, and new progress & positions since Secondary Reform.

On Paul’s behalf, I am inviting you to be part of a community meeting tmrw evening, Monday, Sept 15 at 6:30. The location is Two Arrows Restaurant, 700 Chiefswood Road.

Keith, Peter & I will be at the meeting & I sincerely hope you’ll decide to attend and be a part of this film; a little bit of history about education and us!!

Nyaweh,

Gloria.

On Monday, September 15, 2014, three hours before the meeting, Thomas sent another email notifying everyone of the last-minute change of venue from the Two Arrows Restaurant, just outside of Ohsweken, to the Grand River Employment and Training (GREAT) theatre in the heart of Ohsweken. This was to prove a fortuitous and fitting change of venue. Thomas wrote:

Hi again: I’m resending this email without Paul’s thesis. Pls see note below. Some people did not receive this msg… The meeting has moved to the GREAT theatre in Ohsweken at 6:30 pm.

Two doors are open. Straight ahead from 1st parking lot and side
door around the corner of building. Hope to see you there!!!

At 6:30 P.M. participants began arriving. Each of the participants was required to sign two documents affording me permission to use film footage of them: this procedure took longer than anticipated. I had hoped to film each one as they came in and have them answer the question: “Do you know Keith, Gloria or Peter?” Aarssen was so occupied setting up sound and lighting for a Circle shoot that we decided to pass on the idea. Instead I decided to ask each participant as they introduced themselves to tell us if they knew or were acquainted with the three main protagonists (see Table 1).

Table 1: How Many Knew Keith Lickers, Peter Hill and Gloria Thomas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Knew Keith Lickers</th>
<th>Knew Gloria Thomas</th>
<th>Knew Peter Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Thomas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Green</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Powless</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Martin</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bero</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-L. Jamieson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Freeman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Montour</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Introductions

By 7:30 P.M. the participants had seated themselves in the Circle, which was adjusted as people arrived. I explained the purpose of the meeting and invited Suzie Miller to start introductions. She began, “My name is Suzie Miller, Native Studies teacher for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit with the Grand Erie Board. I know Peter Hill. He taught me in
secondary school. He was a lot of fun. And Gloria – just from my mother’s
neighbourhood… I don’t know Mr. Lickers.” I include Miller’s introduction as an
example of what was said in the opening round. The audio for her introduction, alas, was
particularly weak and so was not included in the film. It took approximately half an hour
for the opening round of introductions to run its course.

At the conclusion of the participants’ personal introductions, I introduced myself
and spoke to the purpose of the Community Circle. I then invited Lickers to speak about
his experiences with Native Studies. Lickers spoke at length of the first part of his career
in education as a public school teacher and then as the director of the Woodland Cultural
Centre. He also discussed the first decade at the Curriculum Branch of the Ontario
Ministry of Education. It was the turn of Hill and Thomas next, followed by comments
and stories from most other participants. The two-hour session was marked by mutual
respect and eloquent articulation of thoughts.

In keeping with the spirit of CBPR, the capacity of a Circle to moderate the
dynamics of power makes it an ideal tool for meetings and discussions. Jane-Leigh
Jamieson, the youngest participant was heard with the same deference and attention
given to those who spoke before and after her. She informed the Circle that she was
thirteen years of age, voicing with clarity and conviction her desires concerning her
future cultural and educational goals:

I’m in Grade Eight and I go to Kawenni:io Private School. I don’t know
who Peter is or Gloria but I would like to. So when I go to high school I
want to be able to have the option of learning my language and in university
as well.
The introductory comments reflect a strong commitment to language, culture, and ceremony, which bodes well for cultural continuity. If the voices of this gathering are representative of the wider community, there is, indeed, great hope for the future of the Six Nations culture.

Hailey Thomas, Gloria’s granddaughter, who had introduced herself earlier, commented as follows: “I’m a student at Western University in First Nations Studies Program. I don’t know Keith or Peter but Gloria’s my grandmother.” Sylvia Bero proudly introduced herself as “Katehraien, Mohawk, Wolf Clan.” She did not know Lickers, but was aware of his work:

I think I’ve read a lot of your stuff. I think I even have some of your work in my home. As you were talking, it brought back a lot of the stuff that… I’ve been trying to teach my children and get them to understand about education… So, I’m very honoured to be here, to meet you, to be able to tell my children that there are people that have worked hard to get us to where we are now today.

The passing on of such stories to coming generations speaks to the very purpose of Planting Stories, Feeding Communities. Next to being present to experience the palpable electricity emanating from the participants as they spoke of their language and culture, film is a viable proxy. The young men in the Community Circle attest to that. Near the end of the discussion, I asked how the participants felt about what had been conveyed thus far:

I’d just like to hear your comments about your reactions to learning a bit about what they’ve been involved in, how you see that and where you put that in terms of valuing that as a community story. It is the story I want to tell. I just want to know how people are feeling about that.
The reaction was immediate. Arty Martin, seated to the right of Lickers, rose from his seat enthusiastically addressing the whole Circle. “This is how I feel,” he said, extending his hand to shake Lickers’s. Martin then crossed the circle to shake hands with Hill, amidst great laughter punctuated by “Nia:wen” (“thank you” in Mohawk).

Martin was not alone in his gratitude. Within moments Lester Green, seated to the right of Lickers, spoke up: “I think I’m going to have to follow suit with what Marty was saying in thanking you two, because you guys are pioneers of leading the way. You know, the trail blazers leading the way for that sort of education in the school systems today.”

When Green refers to “that sort of education,” he means a Western “sort of education.” During a passionate outpouring of deeply felt insights, he expressed a yearning, common to many Indigenous people, to return to traditional Indigenous pedagogical approaches. Although he is grateful for the accomplishments of Lickers, Hill, and Thomas, in the realm of Western education it remains that Six Nations students are still obliged to leave their communities to participate in the Ontario Provincial system. For Green, the vision of “Indian control over Indian education” would (in his words) “see none of those programs in the school one day, because our children will already know that.”

By the end of the Community Circle, I sensed that the sharing had a notable impact on the twelve participants. Not one person, I believe, left the meeting without having expressed a sincere commitment to the recovery of their Six Nations language and culture (see Table 2). The footage from that evening would serve well as a record in their historical archives, even in raw unedited form. There was now the promise that Lickers’s
little-known achievements could provide inspiration to current and future generations of Six Nations’ peoples interested in practicing their language and culture. As Green commented in the Community Circle: “They may not understand at that time but as they grow older, that seed is going to grow into a sapling, or a shrub, or a tree that eventually over time it’ll be strong, full of sustenance.”

Table 2: Community Circle Participants’ Use of Clan, Language, and Nation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Stated Clan</th>
<th>Used Language</th>
<th>Stated Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Thomas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Green</td>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oneida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Powless</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Martin</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mohawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bero</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mohawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Lee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Freeman</td>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mohawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Thomas</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Lickers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hill</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Montour</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mohawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the Circle participants spoke, they demonstrated a strong commitment to the resurgence of their language and culture, and included Clans and Nations in their introductions (see Table 2). They spoke of renewing their efforts to learn the language and practice their ceremonies. Lickers’s story had not only been planted, it had taken root. There was no doubt that a filmic version of the Community Circle could serve to nourish the Six Nations culture. How, I wondered, could these packed hours be distilled into pared-down minutes?
Chapter 7

Showing the Film

7.1 The Quality of the Film

When time constraints and limited resources reached a head in June 2015, a choice had to be made between my ongoing concerns about production values in creating a documentary film and the completion of a program of doctoral research in a timely fashion. Determining the readiness of the film for screening required the consideration of whether or not the content adequately conveyed the findings of the MA thesis. In keeping with the principles of the CBPR approach I had pursued, I felt at this point that input from the community was required to determine the degree to which the film’s form would be amenable to a Six Nations audience. In spite of the fact that we were far from having a final version at hand, I opted to screen the film as a preliminary rough cut.

Hierarchically, my research focus was, first, to explore the ability of film to serve as a means of “planting stories” in the community of origin; and second, to create a documentary with good production values. I asked myself constantly, “Is what I have done adequate and sufficient?” To answer this question and complete the film work in a reasonable time frame, I needed community input in the form of post-screening feedback. The questionnaires completed by community members who would attend screenings were critical to understanding the effectiveness of the film.

The quality of the film was also affected by technical and artistic challenges throughout the filmmaking process. Jon Aarssen, as editor, worked out of his home using
his personal editing suite. All proceeded well in assembling the draft script but problems ensued when rendering the project file. Exporting the film to the convenient, portable format of a USB key proved a real challenge. It was an unexpected glitch that tested technical acuity and lateral thinking (de Bono 1969, 159). Although we had experienced technical problems several times before, Aarssen had hitherto managed to resolve them.

With that assurance in hand, the decision was made to go ahead and book a screening at the GREAT theatre at Ohsweken on July 21, 2015, for a Six Nations presentation; at Tyendinaga Public Library on July 22, 2015; and at the Screening Room in Kingston on July 28, 2015. Press releases were sent out and hand-drawn informational posters were distributed via email and at each venue (see Appendix I – Poster).

7.1.1 Editing, Logistics, and Preparation

Throughout the editing process, initiated in December 2014, I created draft scripts drawing from time-coded transcripts of the footage from the Community Circle, the boardroom interviews, and establishing shots of the Six Nations territory. Jon Aarssen then assembled the video accordingly and provided feedback concerning the technical suitability of the film clips I had proposed. Considerations of sound, lighting, and composition at times rendered some footage inadequate. In those cases I would consult with Aarssen and make appropriate adjustments. The editing process climaxed in June 2015 as pressure mounted to finalize a satisfactory version of the film for community viewing.

With dates set and information distributed, Aarssen refined his work with co-editor Annie Palone, who stepped in at the last minute and made valuable contributions
that enhanced narrative flow. A concerted effort over the final three weeks ensued. Round table conferences produced decisions in spite of varying opinions. Photographs were unearthed. Emails, texts, and phone call after phone call resulted in an abundance of data being relayed. Plans were drawn. Portions of the script were re-written. Voice-overs were revisited. Clips were deleted, shortened, lengthened, and re-ordered. There was a flurry of activity at every turn.

7.2 The Questionnaire and Screening Times

Despite all our efforts, much remained to be attended to as the first screening scheduled for July 21, 2015 fast approached. Working into the wee small hours became routine. Aarssen pulled several all-nighters. The file grew as many refinements were made: the original plan for a 22-minute film ended up with a running time of 45 minutes. Finally, *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities* was ready to screen.

Audience members at the July 2015 screenings were required to read the Letter of Information (Appendix D). They were then given the choice of remaining anonymous or signing a Consent Form (see Appendix E) permitting me to quote their responses to the Questionnaire (see Appendix H – Questionnaire). The forms were signed by 67 per cent of the respondents. At Six Nations, fifteen out of 21 signed. At Tyendinaga, four out of twelve signed, and in Kingston eighteen out of 21 signed.

For the Six Nations screening, two members familiar with community practices, Gloria Thomas, and Elvera Garlow, director of GREAT, suggested 5:00 P.M. to 6:30 P.M. as an ideal time frame. This would allow attendees the opportunity to go to other evening functions or return home for family time. GREAT is in the town of Ohsweken,
three and one-half hours west of Kingston. The venue offered a state of the art theatre with comfortable graduated seating, large screen, and controlled lighting, along with an excellent sound system. A technician was on hand to assist with the screening. Our first showing was well received by the Six Nations audience. There was a feeling of great anticipation since all of the main players were in attendance. Joyful greetings and a great deal of discussion were evidenced before and after the screening. The audience was vocal as familiar faces on the screen were greeted with delighted recognition. That added to the fun of the event.

The second screening was scheduled for the following evening at the Kanhiote Tyendinaga Territory Public Library, an hour drive west of Kingston. We followed the same procedure as we had the previous evening in Ohsweken. We arrived at 4:00 P.M. to set up and started the film around 5:15 P.M. The screening ended just after 6:00 P.M. A lively question and answer discussion followed, which concluded after 6:45 P.M. The library closed at 7:00 P.M., by which time all but our crew and Karen Lewis, the head librarian, had left. Although there was often a rather quiet atmosphere during the discussion period, feelings ran deep. Every time Jane-Leigh Jamieson appeared on screen, there was an audible murmuring through the room. She was apparently the only person with whom everyone was familiar. Marlene Brant Castellano was particularly articulate in her post-screening commentary.

At the library, we used a conference room with a SMART Board, which is approximately four by six feet and a projector into which we plugged a USB. Although curtains were closed they were relatively transparent. The small screen and undimmed
room did not detract unduly from viewer pleasure, though my preference is always to show film in a darkened theatre on a large screen.

At the Screening Room in Kingston, the owner, Wendy Huot, offered a special afternoon slot from 5:00 P.M. to 6:20 P.M. to allow for her customers to arrive and establish themselves for the regular 7:00 P.M. feature. The morning of the screening I met with Huot to test the most recently rendered version of the film that was stored on a USB drive, which she transferred to her MAC Book Pro. We established colour and audio levels. Again, watching the film on a big screen with an excellent sound system, proved an optimum viewing experience. A commercial theatre with comfortable graduated seating, large screen, controlled lighting, and technical assistance proved efficacious. Audience members once more expressed satisfaction and delight. An animated discussion ensued.
Chapter 8

Responses to the Film

8.1 Questions 1 and 2

Due to their thematic similarities, the first two questions and the responses to them will be addressed together.

1. Were you aware of the roles played by Keith [Lickers], Gloria [Thomas], and Peter [Hill] in the creation of Native Studies and Native Language curricula before viewing the film?

   a. Keith [Lickers]  Y  N
   b. Gloria [Thomas]  Y  ☐  N  ☐
   c. Peter [Hill]  Y  ☐  N  ☐

2. Without seeing the film would you have known about the roles and contributions of Keith [Lickers], Gloria [Thomas], and Peter [Hill]? Y □  N □

As part of establishing film as a viable alternative to textual documents, primarily to transmit knowledge back to the community, I wanted to know the degree to which people were aware of the roles of Lickers, Thomas, and Hill in the creation of the Native Studies curricula prior to the Community Circle – in the case of the Community Circle participants – and prior to viewing the film for all other respondents. How many of the people who were able to attend the screenings were already familiar with any of the three major characters? Where were the “Yes” respondents from? Were they also educators? Were they also Six Nations community members? Indigenous? Board members? Students?
Based on my previous experiences while conducting MA research, I steeled myself to be surprised if the responses showed that many people knew of the roles played by Lickers, Thomas, and Hill in the creation of Native Studies curricula. Through my doctoral research I wanted to change that reality. Film, I believe, can raise awareness of their roles and may even promote an interest in reading my MA thesis to find out more. By answering “No,” viewers would become ideally positioned to gauge the efficacy of film, much like a storyteller from some distant village regaling the community with tales of deeds by little-known members of their own village. During interviews I conducted during my MA research, Lickers made it clear that his story was not common fare in the Six Nations territory. Looking back on the Community Circle the following morning, Lickers observed: “It certainly was very much an education… you know for everybody. Because it was a story that hasn’t been told… hadn’t been told … just that whole lack of awareness” (Chaput 2014).

I regard film as a kind of minstrel, spreading stories from beyond the edges of the community, stories about the roles and contributions of Lickers, Thomas, and Hill that, without them seeing the film, viewers would not have known. If nothing else, a “No” would confirm the ineffectiveness of a text-based thesis as a medium for the transmission of stories back to the community.

Question 2, which is closely associated with Question 1, contributes to establishing the effectiveness of film in conveying story-based knowledge back to the Six Nations community. As was the case for Question 1, I expected negative responses to Question 2. I wanted to probe respondents’ opinions as to the likelihood that they would ever have learned of the roles of Lickers, Thomas, and Hill without the film. An
overwhelming positive response would signal a need to research other sources, besides the film, that might have brought these stories to their awareness.

By cross-referencing information from Question 11, I reckoned I would also be able to factor in the impact of the various categories. For instance, respondents of the same generation as the protagonists would be more likely to know them and have knowledge of their careers than those of the younger generations.

8.1.1 Results of Questions 1 and 2

For Question 1, the demographics of the respondents who knew Lickers, Thomas, and Hill revealed:

Six Nations (n=21): Eight knew Lickers, eleven knew Thomas and nine knew Hill.

Tyendinaga (n=12): One knew Lickers, none knew Thomas and one knew Hill.

Kingston, The Screening Room (n=21): One non-Indigenous person knew Lickers; this person had worked at the Mowat Block on curriculum development. None of the other respondents knew Thomas or Hill.

These initial outcomes were somewhat surprising, and at odds with those of the Community Circle. As I ruminated on the answers further, certain factors that skewed the results came to mind.

It is important to note that, as part of the introductory round in the Community Circle of September 2014, the participants were asked to state their name, occupation, and whether or not they knew Lickers, Thomas, and Hill. Of the nine participants, only one knew Keith, six “had seen Gloria around the community,” one knew Gloria, and two knew Peter (see Table 1 below). Question 1 is slightly different; it does not address knowledge of the three educators’ roles in the creation of Native Studies curricula.
Therefore, in the context of the Community Circle, a positive response did not necessarily mean knowledge of their roles in the creation of Native Studies curricula.

At the Six Nations screening of June 21, 2015, those in attendance were more informed of Lickers’s, Thomas’s, and Hill’s roles as a result of either participating in the Community Circle or being an observer. The latter included Elvera Garlow and Andrea Curley who, along with Thomas, were instrumental in organizing the Community Circle and inviting people to the screening. This skewed the results to the first two questions in at least one case.

Thirteen-year-old Jane-Leigh Jamieson, who participated in the Community Circle, did not even mention Keith in her introductory comments: “I don’t know who Peter is or Gloria, but I would like to” (Circle Transcript, September 2014). However, in her answer to Questions 1b and 1c she indicates that she was aware of the roles played by Gloria and Peter before viewing the film. This is technically correct as is her “yes” answer to Question 2. “Without seeing the film,” the question asks, “would you have known about the roles and contributions of Keith [Lickers], Gloria [Thomas], and Peter [Hill]?” Jane-Leigh is apparently basing her answer on the knowledge she gained from being part of the Circle. Yet, in her answer to Question 1a she says she did not know of Keith’s role, which, technically, she did. For this reason I have not counted her answers to the first two questions.

The answers of the three protagonists were also not counted for the first two questions because as subjects of the stories they all knew about each other’s roles. Two of the respondents were the wives of Hill and Lickers, and so they too do not fit the criteria for the first two questions. Finally, Garlow, director of the GREAT, is the sister
of Thomas and has been aware of the roles of the three across the years. She also unhesitatingly offered the use of the GREAT for both the filming of the Community Circle and the premiere screening of the resulting film. Removing Jamieson, Thomas, Lickers and his wife, Hill and his wife, and Garlow left fourteen responses to consider for Questions 1 and 2. Of these remaining fourteen, only three knew Lickers, five knew Thomas, and two knew Hill. These proportions closely resemble the findings of the Community Circle in the graph below (see Table 1). As for Question 2, twelve of fourteen indicated that they would not have known about the stories of the three protagonists without seeing the film.

Table 1. How Many Knew Keith Lickers, Peter Hill, and Gloria Thomas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Knew Keith Lickers</th>
<th>Knew Gloria Thomas</th>
<th>Knew Peter Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Miller</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Thomas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Green</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Powless</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Martin</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bero</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-L Jamieson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Freeman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Montour</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Question 3

3. How did learning about the contributions to education in Ontario by Keith [Lickers], Gloria [Thomas] and Peter [Hill] make you feel?
Films, if nothing else, are evocative and emotional. I was therefore interested in the qualitative experience of the respondents with regard to the content of the stories. The “transplantability” of a story rests greatly on the compatibility of the cultural soil. When I imagined a people that, for many generations, have been controlled by a government determined to eradicate their myths, legends, and religion in the cause of assimilation, I imagined a people who would welcome stories that belonged to them rather than those imposed upon them.

8.2.1 Results of Question 3

Of those who attended the screening at Ohsweken, nineteen of the respondents were members of the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation. Of these nineteen respondents, nine used the word “proud” to describe how learning about the protagonists’ contributions to education made them feel. An anonymous respondent – who appears to be a Six Nations citizen – felt “proud that we have the people living in Six Nations who had the education, and desire to promote and develop Native content in curriculum.” Others said they felt “inspired,” “awed,” “amazed,” “honoured,” “overwhelmed,” and “happy.” All of the responses were positive except for a bittersweet comment by an anonymous viewer who was “sad – so long in coming to some sort of light for us.” Of the two who were not members of Six Nations, one, who identified as Indigenous, felt “confident” and the other, who identified as non-Indigenous, declared themself “joyful.”

In Tyendinaga, four anonymous respondents used the word “proud.” The sentiments of Rotinonhshyonni (Haudenosaunee) scholar Marlene Brant Castellano, who voiced her “Respect for their endurance through decades,” resonated with an anonymous
respondent who answered “It was exciting to know that Rotinonhsyonni people have been integral to the curriculum as we know it today.” Further to that, one respondent was simply “Proud to be Haudenosaunee.” Another anonymous Indigenous respondent sounds a forlorn note, echoing modern realities: “What they did was important, but many obstacles remain as far as ever [with respect to] regaining our languages.”

Of the respondents from the Screening Room movie theatre in Kingston, two Indigenous and four non-Indigenous respondents used the word “proud.” Kim Chapman elaborates: “Proud and thankful for the contributions they have made. As a primary school teacher their work has affected the programs I have taught.” Clara Snyder, a non-Indigenous high school student, announced herself “amazed, proud, and hopeful”: after the screening she asked if the film could be screened for her school history course. Leigh Barnum, a non-Indigenous elderly businessman, declared himself “tremendously respectful.” Evolutionary biologist Lonnie Aarssen, expressed himself “sad but also happy for them” and indicated that he “could feel their pride,” further commented on “the great value of storytelling as a medium for discovery and education.” Richard Chapman, one of the three Indigenous respondents, experienced a wide range of emotions: “Sad, happy, filled with wonder. I could not help but cry. So very proud.”

The Kingston responses proved how off target I had been in my expectation of a more technical focus on the part of the respondents, given that they were not familiar with the three Six Nations protagonists. Perhaps it had to do with the universal aspect of the story in which the protagonists are pitted against seemingly impossible odds – a David and Goliath scenario. Responses to the three screenings, overall, were notably positive. Perhaps the responses to the remaining questions will shed light on why.
8.3 Question 4

4. What stood out for you in the film?

During his presentation to a 2013 Youth Suicide Awareness Conference in Alberta, Michael Chandler stated: “The whole policy of the Canadian government … is to, in fact, kill the Indian in the Indian – to assimilate their identity out of existence.” A crucial component of Canada’s assimilation strategy, he continued, was to suppress and belittle Indigenous stories. Conversely, this research seeks to restore and nurture a yearning for stories long denied. To that point, an anonymous Six Nations respondent, present at the Ohsweken screening, commented that he was taken by “the importance of learning about [his] culture and language, and building [his] confidence.” His statement is an indicator that the film achieved its purpose.

I wanted to understand what engaged and touched the viewers; what did they take away; what would resonate with them? Was their focus on the technical quality of the film, its content, omissions, or other issues? In the event that the focus was on the content, were there obvious themes? In the responses to the question, “What stood out for you in the film?” I expected commonalities arising from the shared experience of multi-generational cultural suppression. Would the film catalyze a more conscious awareness of these denials and thereby fulfill the promise of “feeding” the community? Question 4 provided an opportunity for viewers to quantify what they valued the most in the film.

8.3.1 Results of Question 4

**Six Nations: What Stood Out**
The word “proud” is what stood out in Six Nations responses. For Barbara Miller it was pride in “the achievements of the humble people in the film,” for Rod Miller “the length of time it has taken to get here.” Other respondents pointed out “the lack of knowledge of people in our community.” For Joshua Manitowabi, the positive contributions of the “Aboriginal Education Office in Toronto” dominated his post-screening reflections. Of the 21 attendees at the Six Nations screening, five were participants from the Community Circle: Lickers, Hill, Gloria and Hailey Thomas, and Jamieson. Hill’s humour, especially the suggested epitaph for Keith’s tombstone – “I left the Ministry and it took seven people to replace me” – resonated with Jamieson and Gloria and Hailey Thomas. In addition to Hill’s humour, multi-generational education stood out for Gloria Thomas.

“The work yet to be done” was much on one respondent’s mind: “What exists is encouraging but what we need is greater.” The theme of allies within the Ministry of Education drew comments. People were surprised about the support of the Ministry of Education for Native Studies and Native Languages, especially when compared to federal government opposition. Another expressed his opinion: “The importance of learning about your culture and language and building your confidence.” That was what I had hoped – that Native viewers would feel a sense of pride.

**Tyendinaga: What Stood Out**

Always the astute observer, Tyendinaga’s Brant Castellano noted how “rooted in community they [the protagonists] remained, their humour and, [their] impact on successive generations of learners.” She deftly captures the essential elements of successful cultural continuity: a community with deep multi-generational roots and humour in the face of adversity nourishes future generations. Although all three
protagonists worked outside the community, their homes and families remained rooted on Six Nations, their efforts in education providing a strong foundation for those to come.

For Melinda-Nikki Auten Tayohseronitye, “The experience Keith spoke of – taking non-Indigenous committee members to the residential school and the impact it had on them” made her wonder how other non-Indigenous people might benefit from similar experiences. In the film, Keith is overseeing a Curriculum Committee of 32 non-Indigenous educators tasked with developing a Native Studies resource guide. By way of introduction to the subject matter, he takes them on a four-day tour of St Anne’s Residential School in the James Bay area. Witnessing the reality of the Cree children’s existence reduced all of them to tears, he says. Tayohseronitye suggested that first-hand experience is the best teacher. Evva Massey felt there was a “need for Native Studies to be strongly embedded in the curriculum for ALL.” In agreement, Auten Tayohseronitye expresses a chronic weariness of repeatedly setting the record straight.

“The passion Keith had to make a difference in education for Aboriginal peoples” stood out for one respondent. For another it was “just realizing how much work went into getting where we are.” The use of the word “we” implies that the film brought out a strong sense of community between Tyendinaga and Six Nations. Despite the four-hour drive separating the two communities, there exists a sense of unity. One viewer was filled with admiration, dismay, and a sense of shared destiny. He was able to appreciate “the many years each put in and how early they started and how after 30 plus years with all that effort we are somehow still behind.” Another respondent, referring to the three protagonists, was moved by “their humility and modesty.”
Confirming the effectiveness of film to bring stories back to the community, what stood out for one respondent from Tyendinaga was “that some of the Circle participants didn't even know these community trail blazers, and they are from the same community.” In the words of an anonymous respondent, the film brought out an awareness of “the amount of history [they] didn't know.”

Kingston: What Stood Out

“This film had every promise of being boring: a documentary on education? On writing curriculum?” Local writer Rose DeShaw’s post-screening comment brought laughter to the theatre. So why wasn’t it boring? As she continued to speak, the reality of that opening statement hung in the air like a piñata filled with answers – some of them written on the questionnaires and some of them spoken in the Question and Answer period following.

Three non-Indigenous respondents, Christine Grossutti, Andrea Choi, and John Rose, all doctoral candidates in Department of Geography and Planning at Queen’s University, took the time to participate and were willing to go on record. What stood out for Grossutti was “the importance of telling and knowing stories like this because it gives us hope.” For Choi it was “the generally positive reception by the Ontario Ministry of Education to implementing a Native Studies curriculum,” while for Rose it was “the combination of narration and conversation in the Circle; a complementary use of voices.” The comments by Grossutti and Choi echo those of a number of Indigenous respondents, whereas Rose’s comment takes me back to the heart of the challenge we faced in our efforts to achieve a balance between the voice of the community and that of the narrator.
Although the questionnaire provided little space for written comments, the
Kingston responses were copious by comparison to those of Six Nations and Tyendinaga.
The content was rich and targeted and aligned with the issues reflected in the comments
from Six Nations and Tyendinaga.

In her questionnaire response, what stood out for DeShaw was “its clarity – the
tone of shared wisdom.” She found it “gripping and was sorry to see it end.” The film
was “valuable – not just for the Aboriginal community,” and represented “a true
honouring, retelling, and questioning” of the role played by Indigenous educators in the
Ontario school system.

Other audience members included painter and writer Douglas Snyder, who stated
himself “fortunate to hear about their efforts” and noted “the honesty and enthusiasm for
this education.” Bruce Kauffman, a local poet was “happy that some progress is being
made” and especially “that against certain initial odds, some people were able to
advance.” Susanna Davis, a nurse and healer, who has worked over a lifetime with
Indigenous peoples and knows their stories well, was “hopeful and thankful” and found
“this film is a great educational visual aid for classrooms.” Jim Neill, a retired teacher
who had also worked on the Native Studies curricula at the Mowat Block, was interested
in “the personal accounts in the Circle.” Bob Raftis, retired businessman, found
noteworthy “their patience, perseverance and commitment.” For Leigh Barnum, a nation-
wide business owner, it was “the courage and perseverance of these three,” that stood
out. The little-known contributions of high-level administrators in the Ontario Ministry
of Education were pointed out by a non-Indigenous teacher, Kim Chapman, who noted:
“There have been people at higher government levels such as Dr. Bette Stephenson who
were so supportive.” Chapman announces herself “proud and thankful for the contributions they have made. As a primary school teacher their work has affected the programs I have taught.” Her daughter, Portia Chapman, a Queen’s University undergraduate student, was one of four Indigenous respondents. What stood out for her was “the progress of Native Studies being taught in schools over time.” She is “glad to know that there are people who are trying to make Native Studies more public.” Portia’s Indigenous father, Richard Chapman, also attended the screening. What emerged for him was “silence. The Circle was silent, dear, and caring. True honour transpired and transcended the film.” The Chapman family response thus spanned the generations.

It was only after I had looked through the completed questionnaires that I realized that one of the four Indigenous respondents had experienced difficulty in responding. Although he speaks English, he is more at home in his traditional Cree language. He would be described as a “traditional person” in Indigenous parlance. He chose to remain anonymous. An option to have a verbal interview would have served him better. As it was, he offered: “I don't know how to put it into words.” Although lack of English writing skills presented as a problem for at least one Indigenous person, for three other Indigenous attendees writing is a strength – as witnessed in post-screening responses written after the event. All respondents are Indigenous women and each screening location is represented. (See 8.13 Post Screening Responses)

Part of the explanation as to why the film was so well received may be found in Jennifer Snyder’s telling of what stood out for her. As part of the non-Indigenous majority (eighteen of 21) at the Kingston screening, Snyder is ideally positioned to identify the element that contributed to the film’s appeal for that demographic. What
stood out for her was “the underscoring of shameful Canadian history contrasted by the
gentle deep nature of the Native people.” This theme is at the heart of the May 2015
report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRCC), chaired by
peoples by the Canadian government and its agents as a tragedy of epic proportions, the
telling of which is gradually making its way into the public sphere of the nation. Growing
awareness of a century and a half of what the TRCC terms “cultural genocide” (see
Appendix A), has finally pierced the shroud of denial that enabled the Canadian
government to dismiss or even refute the tragic consequences of its assimilationist
agenda (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015).

In an online article (Aboriginal Peoples Television Network 2015), Chief Justice
of Canada Beverley McLachlin explains that “Canada committed ‘cultural genocide’
against Indigenous peoples through policies like Indian residential schools, which were
created to wipe out the languages and cultures of pre-existing nations.” What in the past
was termed assimilation, explained McLachlin, “in the language of the twenty-first
century … is called cultural genocide. The most glaring blemish on the Canadian historic
record relates to our treatment of the First Nations that lived here at the time of
colonization.” McLachlin added that “an initial period of cooperative inter-reliance
grounded in norms of equality and mutual dependence” was supplanted by “the ethos of
exclusion and cultural annihilation.”

In an interview with Evan Solomon of CBC Radio's *The House* (Canadian
Broadcasting Corporation 2015), Justice Murray Sinclair concurred with McLachlin “that
cultural genocide is probably the best description of what went on … But more
importantly, if anybody tried to do this today, they would easily be subject to prosecution under the genocide convention” of the United Nations (see Appendix J). Sinclair explains to Solomon that “by forcibly removing children from their families and placing them within institutions” the actions of the government “fall within the definition of genocide under the” United Nations' Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (see Appendix J).

The historic designation of cultural genocide has, in part, been rendered official due to the inconceivable magnitude of the horror. Planting Stories, Feeding Communities addresses this situation from the outset of the film. The multigenerational scale of residential school abuses is often met with disbelief. “There must be some mistake.” “No one would systematically perpetrate such evil. If exposed, it would be stopped.” Jennifer Snyder paints a picture of a shameful antagonist and a gentle, yet resilient, protagonist. To the degree that this analysis is correct, it makes the case for why the film struck home for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous viewers. Both groups of viewers understandably felt proud of, and inspired by, the protagonists’ achievements.

8.4 Question 5

5. Have you read the online Thesis: Native Studies in Ontario High Schools: Revitalizing Indigenous Cultures in Ontario? Y ☐ N ☐

Question 5 was included to substantiate the working premise that the findings in my MA thesis were virtually unknown to the members of the Six Nations community. If my premise were correct, there would be no positive responses from members of the Six Nations community who attended the screening. Even though the data is relevant to their
community on several fronts, and has been available online at QSpace for over three years, I maintained the belief that no one from the Six Nations community was likely to have read it. Part of the reason is that without a promotional strategy to bring it to public attention, how would members of the community have had the opportunity to even consider the option of reading it? Most people are not interested in reading a 200-page academic thesis, even if the material is relevant to their interests. Thus, the document will very likely remain forever collecting virtual dust on its virtual shelf.

If the film successfully presents relevant stories and findings to the Six Nations viewers, it could serve the function of a promotional tool. By animating a lifeless document, *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities* has the potential of generating interest in previously unknown findings that are relevant to the Six Nations community. Opening the door to such knowledge, via a communally shared screening on a large screen – the theme of “writ large” will be addressed further on – has the prospect of generating a level of dialogue that could not be achieved by watching the same film alone on the small screen of a computer or hand-held device, or by reading the document. The social hum of a premiere screening in a well-equipped theatre, featuring members of the community has, in itself a degree of allure. Considering that we had less than a week to advertise using the community radio, newspapers, and posters, we managed to secure a satisfactory turnout.

The title and text of the poster did not promise blockbuster action scenarios. *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities: Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples, and Film*, calls out to the traditional more that the modern in the potential audience member, that is, until the last word. “Film” introduces a note of modernity to the traditional ones that precede
“Film” also stands in contrast to the poster’s visual content and layout. The poster sketch is based on the traditional Haudenosaunee story, “The Three Sisters: Corn, Beans, and Squash.” It depicts a woman planting seeds, silhouetted by what could be an early morning “squash” sunrise, or perhaps a late evening “squash” moonrise.

The text of the poster invites the potential viewer to participate in four activities. Two are described in the first sentence:

Please join us in celebrating the stories of three Six Nations educators, Keith Lickers, Gloria Thomas, and Peter Hill, and to answer the question: Is film an effective way to bring research findings and stories back to the communities from which they were taken?

Celebrating stories and answering questions is not an ideal combination to attract an audience to a 5:00 P.M. screening on a sunny, late-July Tuesday. However, the alternative did not align with the honesty and openness that had characterized my relationship with the community to date. So to err on the side of integrity, I sealed my fate by informing them of further activities that would take place following the screening.

Viewers will be invited to fill out a brief questionnaire, followed by a brief Question and Answer period with researcher/producer/director, Paul Chaput MA, PhD Candidate from Queen’s University.

My goal was to ensure that all potential attendees understood that they were in for a combination of entertainment, knowledge transference, and participatory research.

The answers to Question 5, I anticipated, would likely be a resounding “No,” but there was another element that served to amplify the depth of this expected negative response. Those most likely to have read or to have had an interest in reading a thesis on Native Studies are educators. Based on the film’s focus on Native Studies, I estimated that a significant proportion of those who would attend the screening would either have
an interest in education, a connection to the three protagonists, or both. If no one in such a demographic had read my MA thesis, then the odds were that no one else in the community had. In fact there are three exceptions to this. The protagonists of the film figured prominently in several areas of the MA research. They each proofed quotes that I used from their interviews, and they each received a copy of the completed MA thesis. If they were to be in attendance, I would expect three positive responses to Question 5.

If an aversion to academic writing was not a factor in a respondent’s decision on whether to read the MA thesis or not, then we would be left with interest in the material as the deciding factor. In the case of the latter, the answers of Indigenous educators to Question 5 should generally be positive, not only for Question 5 but for all subsequent questions. By introducing the audience to relevant unknown knowledge, the film facilitates the possibility of respondents making choices that, prior to the screening, were not possible to make. Using these answers, I would hope to gain insight into addressing the mechanics behind the disturbing absence of relevant knowledge, and the related stories that have been generated by academic research, my MA thesis being a case in point.

8.4.1 Results of Question 5

Six Nations Responses

Lickers, Thomas, and Hill indeed were in attendance at the screening and, as I anticipated, they were the only respondents to indicate that they had read the MA thesis. All three signed the Consent Form (see Appendix E) permitting me to disclose this information. Out of 21 respondents at the Six Nations screening, nineteen self-identified
as members of Six Nations, one as Indigenous, and one as non-Indigenous. Of the nineteen Six Nations respondents, five were teachers.

**Tyendinaga Responses**

Five out of 11 Indigenous respondents from Tyendinaga were also teachers. One was non-Indigenous.

**Kingston Responses**

Six of the Kingston respondents were teachers but only one self-identified as Indigenous. The comparison of the responses of the non-Indigenous teachers from the three screenings with those of Indigenous teachers to Questions 6 to 10 should provide valuable insights. Given that the subject matter is Native Studies, I assumed that non-Indigenous respondents would be less likely to read the MA thesis after having seen the film.

**8.5 Question 6**

6. Do you think film is more suited to communicating findings back to the community than a written thesis? Y ☐ N ☐

What works best to return findings to Indigenous communities: a textual thesis or some form of audio-visual? I would have been surprised to find that people thought film was not more suited to deliver the stories to the community than a written MA thesis. The stories in the thesis were not known for the most part, so we know, in this case, film is more effective than written text. This resonates with Lickers use of publicity and other marketing strategies to raise awareness of the newly created Native Studies curricula. I am open to the possibility that film can, in this instance, serve a function similar to that of a good PR campaign. It could raise awareness of textual material and, thereby, the
possibility of deeper interest. If you were not aware of the existence of something, why would you look for it? In fact, it may not be that film is “more suited” than the written thesis to bring findings back to the community, but that it is better at presenting the contents of the source document.

8.5.1 Results of Question 6

Six Nations Responses

Out of 21 responses, 18.5 thought that film is more suited to communicating findings back to the community than a written thesis. (One respondent gave a “50/50” response, which was counted as .5 for each of “Yes” and “No”). One respondent did not answer the question. Instead, he wrote, “We need several ways to communicate the findings back to the community.”

Tyendinaga Responses

Out of twelve Tyendinaga respondents, 11.5 (one respondent gave a “50/50” response) said they think film is more suited to communicating findings back to the community than a written thesis.

Kingston Responses

All of the 21 Kingston respondents think film is more suited to communicating findings back to the community than a written thesis. Of the respondents, seventeen self-identified as non-Indigenous and four as Indigenous.

Overall
I expected a measurable difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous responses to this question. I assumed that Indigenous respondents would think that film would be a more effective way of communicating findings back to the community and that non-Indigenous respondents would be less inclined to agree. Instead the slight hesitation came from the Indigenous respondents.

8.5.2 Question 7

7. Having seen the film, are you now more likely to read the thesis? Y ☐ N ☐

I wanted to know if the film, by generating a deeper interest in the subject matter, would serve to motivate viewers to read the MA thesis, much like an alluring trailer might entice people into the theatre for the full feature. If some respondents answered that, after seeing the film, they were more likely to read the thesis, then it would open up the possibility that film might indeed serve as an awareness-building tool. Overall, it seems likely that most would feel excluded from access to the Academy.

8.5.3 Results of Question 7

Six Nations Responses

Out of 21 responses, eighteen said they are more likely to read the thesis. The two respondents who said they would not likely read the thesis are both members of Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation. One respondent did not answer the question.

Tyendinaga Responses
Out of twelve Tyendinaga respondents, 11.5 said they were more likely to read the thesis. (One respondent gave a “maybe” response, which was counted as .5 for each of “Yes” and “No”).

**Kingston Responses**

Of the 21 Kingston respondents, nineteen are now more likely to read the thesis after having seen the film. The two who are not likely to read it are both non-Indigenous. Of the respondents, seventeen self-identified as non-Indigenous and four as Indigenous.

**Overall**

What I find most fascinating here is that 48.5 respondents of 54 are more likely to read the thesis. Of the 4.5 who are not likely to read it, 2.5 are Indigenous and two are non-Indigenous. I expected a high “Yes” response from teachers, but not 100 per cent and certainly not such a high positive response rate from the other respondents.

**8.6 Question 8**

8. On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the usefulness of film as a format to communicate academic findings back to the community?

Least 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Most

Here, I wanted to quantify the efficacy of film as a tool to communicate academic findings. Ideally, I would have preferred to test the viewers on their mastery of specific points, such as the correlation between youth suicide and the level of cultural continuity. I expected that most viewers would rate film toward the higher end of the scale. The reason for this has to do with the discrepancy between not knowing anything or very
little concerning the contributions of Lickers, Thomas, and Hill at the beginning of the film, to knowing a lot 40 minutes later. I believe the tendency in those circumstances is to attribute the difference to the usefulness of film. What else could have caused it? I wanted to deepen my understanding of the underlying structure at play throughout this exploration of audio-visual efficacy in education.

8.6.1 Results of Question 8

Six Nations Responses

On a scale of 1 to 10, eight respondents rated the usefulness of film at 10, five at 9, six at 8, one at 9.75, and one at 5, for a total of 8.940 out of ten.

Tyendinaga Responses

Out of twelve Tyendinaga respondents, four rated the usefulness of film at 10, three at 9, four at 8, and one at 7, for a total of 8.833 out of ten.

Kingston Responses

Of the 21 Kingston respondents, twelve rated the usefulness of film at 10, four at 9, one at 8.5, three at 8 and one at 4, for the highest total of 9.166 out of ten.

Overall

Combining all three screenings the overall average of the 54 respondents is 9.004 out of ten.

8.7 Question 9

9. Do you feel the material in the film is valuable to the community? Y □ N □

This question is qualitative and probes the feeling of the viewer concerning the perceived value to the community of the material in the film. A “Yes” or “No” choice
worked best here in the spirit of keeping the questionnaire as simple and quick to complete as possible given the limited timeframe, common to all screenings. Since the material was likely to be new to most of the viewers, their evaluation would likely be based on the sense of pride that arose from the positive portrayal of the protagonists’ accomplishments. I wanted the respondents to focus on the content of the film, rather than the medium of film. I could have also asked for examples of what is specifically valuable but I wanted to keep the questionnaire simple in order to accomplish our goal in the timeframe allotted.

8.7.1 Results of Question 9

**Six Nations Responses**

Of the 21 Six Nations respondents, twenty felt that the material in the film was valuable to the community. One did not answer the question.

**Tyendinaga Responses**

All twelve Tyendinaga respondents felt that the material in the film was valuable to the community.

**Kingston Responses**

Of the 21 Kingston respondents, everyone felt that the material in the film was valuable to the community.

**Overall**

Combining all three screenings, 53 of the 54 respondents felt that the material was valuable to the community.
8.8 Question 10

10. Would you recommend the film

   a. to others in your community?    Y ☐ N ☐

   b. to Indigenous contacts outside of your community?    Y ☐ N ☐

   c. to non-Indigenous contacts?    Y ☐ N ☐

   d. for use in Native Studies courses?    Y ☐ N ☐

I find it hard to imagine that someone would recommend a film they felt had no value for the intended audience. Question 9 establishes whether or not the viewer sees value for the community in the film. This question sought to establish the size and nature of that community, and to understand who else they thought would find value in the film. By recommending the film, they are projecting the receptivity of the imagined audience.

I also wanted to know how universal they thought its appeal was. For example, recommending it only for others in their community would have indicated they believe its appeal resides at the local community level: in other words, assessing the viability of the story, as “planted” in the compatible cultural landscape of Six Nations. Recommending the film to other Indigenous contacts outside the community would suggest the respondent saw the film as having broader appeal or value to Indigenous communities beyond Six Nations or Tyendinaga. However, it must be noted that the respondents were not asked whether the other communities included other First Nations. Answers to Questions 10c and 10d could help identify how the film might be used as an educational tool. It could potentially be sourced on line or become part of Native Studies curricula, in which case the likelihood of the stories becoming part of a resurgent
mythology is heightened, as is the idea of “feeding” the community throughout successive generations.

8.8.1 Results of Question 10

Six Nations Responses

Would you recommend the film

a. to others in your community? Nineteen said yes, two did not respond.

b. to Indigenous contacts outside of your community? Eighteen said yes, one did not respond, and one said No.

c. to non-Indigenous contacts? Twenty said yes, one did not respond.

d. for use in Native Studies courses? Twenty said yes, one did not respond.

Tyendinaga Responses

a. to others in your community? Eleven said yes, one did not respond.

b. to Indigenous contacts outside of your community? Eleven said yes, one did not respond.

c. to non-Indigenous contacts? Ten said yes, two did not respond.

d. for use in Native Studies courses? Twelve said yes.

Kingston Responses
a. to others in your community? Twenty-one said yes.
b. to Indigenous contacts outside of your community? Twenty-one said yes.
c. to non-Indigenous contacts? Twenty-one said yes.
d. for use in Native Studies courses? Twenty-one said yes.

**Overall**

Combining all three screenings (n=54), the overall numbers concerning to whom viewers might recommend the film are as follows:

a. to others in your community? Fifty-one said yes.
b. to Indigenous contacts outside of your community? Fifty said yes.
c. to non-Indigenous contacts? Fifty-one said yes.
d. for use in Native Studies courses? Fifty-three said yes.

**8.9 Question 11**

11. Check off the categories that pertain to you:

   a. ☐ Member of the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation
   b. ☐ Indigenous
   c. ☐ Non-Indigenous
   d. ☐ Teacher
   e. ☐ Public School Student
   f. ☐ Private School Student
   g. ☐ Undergraduate Student
   h. ☐ Graduate Student
   i. ☐ School Board Trustee
j. □ Employee of a School Board

The background of the respondents is an essential factor in analyzing the questions. First of all, I wanted to identify members of the Six Nations community, because they are the audience that I had in mind when creating this film. I also wanted to be able to compare their responses with other groups.

The second group I wanted to identify included respondents who were Indigenous but not members of Six Nations. The third important category was non-Indigenous respondents. I expected to see a difference between the responses of Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents.

### 8.9.1 Results of Question 11

**Six Nations Responses**

Of the 21 respondents at the Six Nations screening:

a. Nineteen were members of the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation, and one was non-Indigenous. (Of the nineteen who identified as Six Nations, fifteen also identified as Indigenous. I deleted these redundant, although technically correct, responses).

b. One self-identified as Indigenous

c. One as non-Indigenous

d. Five as teachers

e. One as a public school student

f. None as private school student

g. Five as an undergraduate student
h. Four as a graduate student
i. One as a school board trustee
J. One as an employee of a school board
Two added their own categories: one social worker and one policy analyst in education.

Tyendinaga Responses
Of the twelve respondents at the Tyendinaga screening, one anonymous respondent did not answer.
b. Ten as Indigenous
c. One as non-Indigenous
d. Five as teacher
e. Two as public school student
f. Zero as private school student
g. Two as undergraduate student
h. Four as graduate student
i. Zero as school board trustee
j. Zero as employee of a school board
k. One added the category: “educator,” preferring this terminology instead of teacher

Kingston Responses
Of the 21 respondents at the Kingston screening,
a. Zero self-identified as members of the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation
b. Four as Indigenous
c. Seventeen as non-Indigenous
d. Six as teacher

e. One as public school student

f. Zero as private school student

g. Eight as undergraduate student

h. Seven as a graduate student

i. Two as school board trustee

j. One as employee of a school board

8.10 Additional Comments or Recommendations

The comments section provides an opportunity to elaborate on points that have not been addressed in the questions.

8.10.1 Six Nations Comments

Fourteen people signed the consent form; four were men. There is no way of determining the gender of the seven respondents who remained anonymous.

I start with the comments of Jane-Leigh Jamieson, the youngest audience member at the Six Nations screening. Jamieson commented: “This film is so real with our people. Making history with our humour (Peter). Good to hear our language.” Her sparse sprinkling of positive words builds on her answer to Question 3, which asked how the viewer felt about learning of the accomplishments of the three protagonists, “Proud.” Jamieson’s comment, “the film is so real with our people,” underscores the reality of how rarely, if ever, she sees her Six Nations community on the “big screen” of modernity. Yes, there are films and documentaries featuring Indigenous peoples but they are mostly
English-speaking, pan-Indigenous characterizations disconnected from the bosom of specific, recognizable, Indigenous communities.

Jamieson’s comments brought an unforeseen dimension to the impact of the film. Her view that “this film is so real with our people” stands in contrast to an implied customary absence of her “people” in film and media. The concept of walking in two worlds is simpler to grasp through Jamieson’s eyes. The film awakens a forgotten appetite for the reality of “our [her] people” – a reality that is never reflected in the mirror of global mass media. The film breaks the spell of an unquestioned form of assimilation – absence. That absence has filled the curricula forced upon Indigenous children in Ontario for the past 150 years. It is still the case in Ontario high schools in spite of rising numbers of Native Studies course offerings.\(^4\)

In a riveting presentation at the Isabel Bader Centre for the Performing Arts, Queen’s University, Justice Murray Sinclair, Commissioner and Chair, TRCC, described a perfect crime as one in which the “victim believes that a crime has not occurred and nothing’s been done wrong to them and they actually defend the perpetrator” (the Tom Courchene Distinguished Speakers Series, March 27, 2015). Indigenous youth like Jamieson are accustomed to the absence of their traditional culture in dominant non-Indigenous society. The normalization of this passive daily condition is a “perfect crime.” Assimilation by omission simply offers cultural choices that leave out traditional

---

\(^4\) In 2007–2008, the number of students enrolled in Native Studies courses was 2,216, or 0.31 per cent of the total Ontario high school student population of 716,103 (Ontario Ministry of Education 1999-2010). In 2008–2009, Native Studies enrollees increased to 0.6 per cent and in 2009–2010 to 1.14 per cent of Ontario’s total high school student population (Ontario Ministry of Education 1999-2010). These apparently minor increases are rendered more meaningful when we consider that Indigenous peoples constitute only two per cent of the Ontario population (Statistics Canada 2006).
products. For Jamieson, the customary experience of not seeing herself is suddenly filled by a solid recognizable humour, and the music of the rarely heard language that she learned in an immersion school.

As if in answer to Jamieson’s implied wish for more “real” film, the voice of undergraduate student Jessie Anthony sounded a hopeful note for a future in which reflections of the Six Nations realities will more frequently populate the global media’s fare of familiar strangeness. Anthony firmly placed her stake in the ground. “As a Onondaga Six Nations Beaver Clan woman and emerging film maker,” she remarked, “I was very inspired, educated, and thankful to have seen this work! Nia:wen!” That she formally spoke as a Six Nations woman with the authority of her clan adds an important implication for the future of the Six Nations culture. Both Anthony’s and Jamieson’s comments are potent indicators of a vibrant cultural continuity rooted in the traditional Haudenosaunee governance model, presided over by Clan Mothers and Condoled Chiefs.

The voices of the men who signed the consent form speak of more technical data-related issues. Among them is Joshua Manitowabi who wanted to know, “How many schools taught Native Studies in the late ’80s and early ’90s?” (Unfortunately the Ministry of Education did not start collecting data until the late ’90s). Similarly, Lickers, who “was really impressed with [the] research,” appreciated the film’s recognition of the contributions to Native Studies curricula by Al Bigwin, Gloria Thomas, Peter Hill, and George Waldrum.

Barbara Miller, also an undergraduate student, made some practical suggestions that implied a solid endorsement for the role of film in education. “Thank you for producing this film and [your intention to] notify the Education Department if more films
are produced. Brock University’s Adult Aboriginal Education program could use this film as an example” (Miller, 2015, Six Nations Screening). Having the film recommended as a resource for post-secondary education is heartening. I am curious, however, as to why her recommendation specifies the Adult Aboriginal Education Program. Perhaps the combination of information and entertainment is at the heart of it.

The last word goes to the Elder and Clan Mother Onondaga Deer Clan, Gloria Thomas, and her granddaughter Hailey Thomas. Though two generations separate them, their comments show uncanny similarities. For Hailey it is Hill’s “humour and multigenerational education” that stand out. And for Gloria it is “Peter's humour …and … walking in two worlds.” They share a common love of humour coupled to the art of brevity and clarity in expressing a clear, long-term vision. These qualities are the stuff of strong leadership. The simplicity of the vision of multigenerational education can be likened to that of the seed whose sprouting leads to unimaginable complexity as it develops. That this is accomplished all the while “walking in two worlds” is the important contextual Six Nations reality, essentially, amounting to being educated in two worlds. Combining their comments succinctly summarizes Gloria Thomas’s long-held vision of a “Nation of educated people who take leadership positions in both worlds” (Chaput 2014). She “gets into trouble for it because not everybody on reserve believes [they] should be “A students” in state-run schools. For these two women, and for several others, Hill’s humour stands out as a memorable quality they take away with them.

Hill himself did not make a comment at the end of the questionnaire, but in his answer to Question 3 (How did learning about the contributions to education in Ontario by Keith, Gloria, and Peter make you feel?), he could not resist the opportunity to turn to
humour: “Amazed,” he declared. “Even I was impressed!” As for what stood out for him the most he offered: “The subtle humour present. We did have fun!”

For all three audiences, seeing Six Nations protagonists writ large on the “big screen” is an experience that is out of the ordinary. It was my first time, and perhaps the first time for all 54 respondents. The cloak of invisibility is momentarily lifted, revealing insights that were previously inaccessible.

8.10.2 Tyendinaga Comments

There was a notable shift in the energy of the audience during the Tyendinaga screening. Within the section of the film where community members make their comments, there was a palpable emotional peak in the room as Jamieson, the youngest member of the Community Circle, spoke. Later, during discussion following the film, several audience members commented on that moment. They explained that Jamieson, a shy, silent, pre-teen, had lived at Tyendinaga in the recent past. They were amazed at her onscreen presence in the Community Circle, surrounded by “important” people. Jamieson drew in the audience by providing a personal link to the story.

8.10.3 Kingston Comments – non-Indigenous Voices

My film made it possible for the words of Six Nations people, in a Community Circle, to touch the lives of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous audience members across space and time. In this section, Michelle Savoie, a Monitoring Team Leader, NCIC, Clinical Trials Group at Queen’s University, and others who are quoted are non-Indigenous. Indigenous voices follow in Post Screening Responses. Savoie “learned a lot through this film about how a community and its identity can be reinvented with a positive impact for
the future and even *now.*” She comments about learning about the “role of education, and how it can be used in destructive ways,” and how it “can take on a new spin to change the negative back to its proper form.” This is a fulfilling and unexpected outcome for those of us who collaborated to bring the story back to the Six Nations community and beyond.

The theme of the film’s potential as an educational tool is reflected in the comments of over half the respondents. John Rose, who is nearing the completion of his PhD in Geography, comments, “The film would be useful for Education students (future teachers of elementary and high schools).” Rose sees that it is “important for education to know how curriculum development occurred and how to help Native Studies move forward in the province.” He adds his voice to the growing chorus of non-Indigenous teachers and academics who espouse the continued expansion and development of Native Studies. Long-time teacher Kim Chapman has “attended a number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit workshops/presentations at the Hastings Prince Edward DSB.” She believes that “it would be worth having this movie as part of teacher presentations in the future.”

Snyder, Ethics and Regulatory Team Leader, NCIC Clinical Trials Group, at Queen's University, cuts to the heart of the matter, commenting “the progress in the area of education is well-told in the film without being overshadowed by the tragedy of the residential school children.” Professor Lonnie Aarssen aptly summarizes my hopes for this research: “This film deepened my appreciation of culture in general and its importance for the wellness and equanimity of humanity.”
I added two additional questions for the participants in the Community Circle after the questionnaire was completed: Question 0 and Question 5.a. Since there were two surveys (one for Community Circle participants and one for audience), in order to collate the data accurately, I shifted the original numbering. As a result, the first question for Community Circle participants became Question 0.

8.10.4 Question 0

0. As a participant in the Community Circle did you feel your voice was represented in the process used by the researcher? Y ☐ N ☐

Since my research was based on CBPR I wanted to make sure that the Community Circle participants felt that their voices had been represented. Based on the efforts taken to ensure that each participant had a screen presence, I expected positive responses. Above all, I wanted the scenes in which they appeared to feel like true representations of *them*. As the storyteller, I created the film for the benefit of the Six Nations community. I wanted to tell *their* story.

8.10.4 Results of Question 0

Of the 12 who participated in the Community Circle, only five were at the screening. Hill did not answer the question and apparently Jamieson filled out the General Form, which did not include this question. Gloria Thomas, Hailey Thomas, and Keith Lickers all felt their voices were represented in the process.

8.10.5 Question 5.a

5.a. Did you read the thesis before ☐ or after ☐ the Community Circle?
For those respondents who were Community Circle participants, I wanted to know if they had read the thesis before or after the filming of the Community Circle. If they had *not* read it beforehand, then I wanted to know if their participation in the Community Circle and their exposure to the stories shared that evening would influence them to read the thesis.

**8.10.6 Results of Question 5.a**

The results of this question are inconclusive. Only five of the twelve Community Circle participants were present at the Six Nations screening to complete the questionnaire. Three of the five participants, Hill, Thomas, and Lickers *had* read the thesis before the Community Circle as a result of their role as interviewees in the research for the thesis in 2012. The two remaining Community Circle participants, Jane-Leigh Jamieson and Hailey Thomas, did not respond to this question.

**8.11 Post Screening Responses – Indigenous Voices**

**Six Nations: Gloria Thomas**

Gloria Thomas wrote a thoughtful message via email on September 2, 2015 to say, “Paul, I’ve been thinking about my feedback comment to your film re ‘other narrative’ of community based education.” She explained that she had “worked with Keith and Peter on policy that impacts Aboriginal students in provincial schools, including our 500 secondary students who attend local provincial boards via tuition agreement.” Thomas continued that, although “many First Nations pay the province to provide elementary and secondary education to their students, Six Nations remains federal pending local control
of education for 1200 elementary students.” She emphasized that the community have “never given up the idea for [their] own high school.”

By her comment, Thomas “meant to clarify that Six Nations (as is the case for 364 other First Nations) remains committed to education design/delivery based on [their] inherent rights. It’s a narrative [she] finds hard to give up due to [her] experience,” she summarizes, “and a complicated, imperfect [one] because Six Nations has lots of work to [do to] achieve it.”

Out of concern that the Six Nations vision be accurately represented, Thomas added that since she, Lickers, and Hill “represent Six Nations educators in [the] film,” she “thought reference to narrative of nationhood informs a complete picture.” She continues with an apology: “Sorry for my interference on that issue.” For me, it was a most welcome comment and one that importantly reflects the community’s voice as represented by Thomas. In closing her email, she says: “It may be too much to rework my feedback into your written text.” My response was to include her comment – in accordance with the collaborative principles enshrined in CBPR.

**Tyendinaga: Marlene Brant Castellano**

Post-screening reflection brought a perceptive comment from Tyendinaga’s Marlene Brant Castellano. As a seasoned educator, she weighs in on the challenges and possibilities afforded by “new media tools” in the realm of education. “Your project stimulates imaginings of how new media tools can change education. We don’t have to wait for publication of weighty text books.” She emphasizes, “We can capture and feedback stories that inform and inspire.” Brant Castellano (2015) continues in her analysis
by comparing film and “You Tube” with the hope of “streams of images” being more durable than viral phenomena. She summarizes, “The challenge will be to capture the stream of images and hook them into loops that give them more durability and impact than viral phenomena on You Tube.

Brant Castellano leaves us to ponder the creation of long-term educational products with the capability of educating rather than serving as momentary entertainment. Even though weighty textbooks have their place, can film effectively help community-based researchers introduce Indigenous societies to stories, just as Planting Stories, Feeding Communities has done? Brant Castellano thinks that film can play an important role in education.

**Kingston: Rose DeShaw and Portia Chapman**

Rose DeShaw posted a review of the film on her blog the day following the Kingston screening. For DeShaw, “Planting Stories, Feeding Communities is a remarkable piece of work in itself.” But, she adds, “That it is as well, scholarly, and academic in the best sense, is an achievement that deserves to be honoured by all cultures.” DeShaw, who has only recently embraced her Inuit ancestry, felt that she “suffered the loss of never having the opportunity” to be immersed in her culture and to talk about her Indigenous roots. The film offered such an occasion.

Marlon Brando declined his Academy award for The Godfather in 1973 so as to allow Indigenous activist Sasheen Littlefeather to deliver a message concerning working conditions for Native American actors in film and television. Littlefeather delivered one minute of the address. Nevertheless, Brando’s “Unfinished Oscar Speech” (1973) was a
defining moment for Native Americans. Their story had been told and through its telling, their lives had been changed.

The quote from Gloria Thomas’s (2013) doctoral dissertation near the beginning of Planting Stories, Feeding Communities, makes a similar point: “Canada would be a very different place if the stories of Aboriginal people were generally known and were a part of the shared culture of the nation” (2013, viii). Integrating these stories into a shared culture is the preoccupation of many Indigenous artists devoted to deepening the narrative leading to such integration.

Portia Chapman (2015) wants to tell the repressed stories of her people through the medium of art. She aspires to be part of the “awakening” that “gives the people back their spirit” (Riel 1885). “As a person raised in a white world of ‘privilege’ one would think that my first people’s stories would not be that important to me,” Chapman writes, “nothing could be further from the truth.” While her grandfather cautioned his family to hide their Native roots, her father made their heritage part of their everyday lives. “The voices of our people … seem to … run through our veins.”

“If in my lifetime,” Chapman (2015) reflects, “my spoken words are never … heard, maybe visual expression of those words will be heard,” just as the “dissertation film struck me and my family in our hearts and minds. I am proud of my lineage,” she explains, “and the stories shared in the film filled me with even more pride.”

8.12 Word Clouds

Planting Stories, Feeding Communities is a film about control over the words and stories that populate the public school curricula in Ontario. Prior to 1975, the curricula offered
by the Ontario Ministry of Education (MOE) were populated by non-Indigenous words and stories. In the instances where there was mention of Indigenous peoples, they were non-Indigenous versions. The introduction of the People of Native Ancestry (PONA) resource guides in 1975, and subsequent suite of ten Native Studies curricula, launched in 1999, established the equivalent of Indigenous “curricular reserves” providing a space where Indigenous stories, words, and languages were being introduced into “settler educational landscapes.”

From this perspective, the film Planting Stories, Feeding Communities could be seen as Indigenous territory: a place free of colonizing forces. Drawing from the palette of the Community Circle participants’ words, the film paints a scene of collaborative sharing and learning. Whereas ministry curricula are tethered to social and political constraints, film and the arts in general are often given broader latitude.

I wanted to compare, contrast, and analyze answers and reactions from the audiences in Ohsweken, Tyendinaga, and Kingston, to examine responses for similarities and differences. My goal was to survey Indigenous and non-Indigenous answers to Questions 3 and 4 as well as peruse individual comments. Plowing through questionnaires, once again, seemed like an onerous task for what it might yield. My second editor for the documentary film, Annie Palone, introduced the idea of “word clouds.” They provide researchers a means of visually representing text. “The more frequently a word is used the bigger and bolder it is displayed” (McKee 2015). I was curious to see what would be revealed by having the text translated into a graphic representation based on frequency of usage. McKee (2015) finds word clouds easy to
share and a simple way to image and understand results. A visual representation of words intrigued me and I was drawn to the possibility of acquiring useful insights.

I wondered if the prominence of certain words at the micro (the three screenings) and macro levels (combined screenings), might bring to light insights into Indigenous versus non-Indigenous responses. The first three word clouds on the next page represent the aggregated or combined responses. The following nine word clouds are graphic representations for the responses at each screening.
8.12.1 Aggregated Responses Questions 3, 4, and Comments

**Question 3**
How did learning about the contributions to education in Ontario by Keith, Gloria, and Peter [Lickers, Thomas, and Hill] make you feel?

At the aggregate level, “proud” is the most prominent word used by the respondents. The words that follow, in descending order, are: “work,” “film,” “people,” “knowledge,” “happy,” “curriculum,” and “inspired.”

**Question 4**
What stood out for you in the film?

At the combined level, “film” dominated the responses to Question 4, but not to the same degree. The words that follow are: “people,” “proud,” “education,” “knowledge,” “work,” “community,” and “curriculum.”

**Comments**

In the Comments, the word “film” is notably more prominent than in the responses to Question 3 and Question 4. In descending order of prominence, “film” is followed by: “education,” “Great,” “history,” “schools,” and “community.”

---

5 Note: The prominence of the word “Great” is attributable to respondents correcting our decipherment of the acronym GREAT from Grand River Education and Training to Grand River Employment and Training.
The aggregated word clouds of the three screenings reveal some fascinating similarities. The responses to Question 3 yield the following words in descending order: “proud,” “film,” “work,” “people,” “know,” and “happy” (see Figure 1). The responses to Question 4 show the order of the following words in descending order: “film,” “people,” “proud,” “education,” “know,” and “work” (see Figure 2).

Remarkably, there is a close match between the most prominent words in the responses to Questions 3 and 4 with the exception of “happy,” in the responses to Question 3 and “education,” in the responses to Question 4. The rankings are admittedly different but the consistency is evident. The combined Comments (see Figure 3) yielded the following hierarchical prominence of word usage in descending order: “film,” “education,” “history,” “Great,” “community,” and “schools.”
8.12.2 Question 3: How did Viewing the Film Make You Feel?

Question 3

How did it [viewing the film] make you feel?

The universal predominance of “proud” for all three screenings is a welcomed endorsement of my earlier projection, at least where Six Nations and Tyendinaga are concerned. The Kingston audience responses did surprise me. When I looked more closely at their responses, there were several who felt proud for the Six Nations educators; it was pride by proxy. Jennifer Snyder was “proud and impressed with their persistence.” Portia Chapman and her father, Richard Chapman (both Indigenous), felt “proud” and “so very proud.” Four anonymous respondents from Tyendinaga were “proud.” One was “very proud” and another “proud to be Haudenosaunee.” For (Melinda) Nikki Auten Tayohseronitye, it was “exciting to know that Haudenosaunee people have been integral to the curriculum as we know it today.”

Six Nations had nine out of 21 respondents who used the word “proud.” Four were “proud” of the protagonists, others were “proud” “hopeful,” “inspired,” and “excited.”
8.12.3 Question 4 What in the Film Stood Out for You?

The disaggregated responses of Six Nations to Question 4 reflect the predominance of “people” and “film.” Barbara Miller appreciated the “achievements of the humble people in the film.” What stood out for an anonymous respondent was the “lack of knowledge of people in our community.” Other words that stood out include “Peter’s,” “community, language, education knowledge,” and “government.”

In Tyendinaga “Keith,” and “community” stood out the most followed by “Peter,” “Gloria,” “know,” “years,” and “experience.”

For Kingstonians, the word “people” dominated their word cloud, e.g., “People at higher government levels” (Chapman, Kim), “some people [who] were able to overcome certain odds” (Kauffman, Bruce), “Hearing stories directly from people” (Snyder, Clara), and “the positive impact of these dedicated people” (Savoie, Michelle).

Overall, the word “people” stood out at Six Nations and Kingston. In Tyendinaga the words “Keith,” “Peter,” and “Gloria” stood out. In other words, people generally stood out.
8.12.4 Comments

The word clouds resulting from the responses to the “comments” are similar for all three screenings. “Film” is the most obvious for each but the similarity does not end there. For each of the three screenings, “education” is also a top contender. Barbara Miller from Six nations comments, “Thanks for producing this film.” Jamieson’s comment emphasizes the preponderance of “film”: “This film is so real with our people.”

In Tyendinaga, Marlene Brant Castellano comments on film’s “effectiveness in education,” while Aubrey Auten “loved the film because it had a lot of useful information for a lot of Indigenous people.” Others commented that it was a “great film,” that “the film was put together very well,” and one wished that “this film could have been produced ten years ago.”

In Kingston, where I had anticipated a more reserved tone to the comments, I was pleasantly surprised to discover that for Carolyn Hetherington, an accomplished actress, “this was a very well produced and positive film that provides hope for the future.” Michelle Savoie “learned a lot through this film.” Jim Neill commented, “Great film. TVO or CBC Docs should air it.”
8.12.5 Summary of Word Clouds

The word clouds tell a simple story. At the most basic level they tell us that respondents felt “proud,” that what stood out the most was “people.” The two-dimensional landscapes of the word clouds are not normally within the sphere of our visual awareness. “Proud,” and “people,” seem logical outcomes, now that the word clouds have brought them out of the shadows of written text. Each audience is in tacit agreement with the other across space, time, languages, and cultures.

8.13 Writ Large

What might one glean from the social quality of a community convening for a screening of a film about their “own people?” There is something about the big screen that cannot be duplicated by smaller screens. TVs, monitors, and hand-held devices are less compelling for a large crowd and generally accommodate a lone viewer or small gathering.

From 2000 to 2008, I worked as a co-producer, director, writer, narrator, and host with Mushkeg Media on the series Finding Our Talk: A Journey through Aboriginal Languages. These stories of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities were aired on Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN), a national TV network. Since 2008 I have had occasion to meet some of the members of the communities whose stories I wrote and directed. One such story is that of the Maliseet (in their language the Wolastoq people) of New Brunswick (Chaput 2001).

The Wolastoq documentary shares a thread with the Six Nations story. Each film explores personal histories, the common thread being the element of a shared experience:
the communal viewing of the film. Although the APTN episodes were not always viewed on a large screen, they were viewed on the “big screen” of a national TV network. For both Jane-Leigh Jamieson of Six Nations and the Wolastoq peoples, the larger forum provided the experience of being visible in a medium typically devoted to mainstream culture. For the Maliseet it also provided the opportunity of being introduced to other First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities who followed the Finding Our Talk series. Planting Stories, Feeding Communities has only begun to reach more distant audiences.

Every episode of Finding Our Talk featured a Language Warrior who had played an important leadership role in saving both language and culture. In the case of the Wolastoq, the episode entitled Gentle Words – Maliseet featured Christine Saulis, then in her early seventies. She had been involved in developing curriculum for the Maliseet or Wolastoq language since the late 1980s at the South Devon Elementary Public School in Fredericton, New Brunswick.

Imelda Perley, who is the first of her people to get a degree in linguistics in Maliseet/Wolastoq at the University of New Brunswick, has taken a leadership role in the recovery of the traditional language and culture of her peoples in the communities of St. Mary's, Kinglear, and Tobique; she emphasizes Saulis’s key role in language recovery. During one of her filmed interviews, Perley praised Saulis at the time of Saulis’s retirement: “If she retires, she’s only retiring from teaching in the classroom. She’ll always be a teacher. Christine is one of those people we will always remember” (Chaput 2001).

When the film about Saulis’s contributions came to the big screen, I was not present but assumed, as was the case with previous audiences, there was a great feeling
of pride. When one’s own makes a major contribution to community and their story is projected onto a large screen, it is as if the person is present. They are larger-than-life and the audience feels as if they know the person. After the Saulis screening, I received no feedback. Coincidentally, in the fall of 2011, a decade after the filming, I met her son, Malcolm Saulis, at a course on the Negotiation and Implementation of Treaty and Aboriginal Rights at Kingston Centre for Mediation Services. Saulis is a trained traditional circle keeper and a professor on the Wilfred Laurier University’s Faculty of Social Work, born on the Tobique Indian Reservation of the Wolastoq or Maliseet peoples. Always curious about how our efforts had impacted the communities featured in Finding Our Talk, I asked him if he would care to comment on any notable events after the launching of the episode in 2001.

Saulis expressed great emotion about the impact of the community screening of the film about his mother’s life. The stories affected them deeply; Christine Saulis, whose life was featured, had died soon after the film was completed. The screening brought up potent emotions for all concerned. For Saulis to see his mother on the big screen and for her community to view the screening after her death touched them profoundly. It was as if Christine was still present, continuing her valuable work.

Without that film, Christine Saulis’s initiative in restoring Native language and culture to children in Fredericton would have been lost. In a parallel situation, Lickers and Hill in Planting Stories, Feeding Communities were retiring and moving out of the limelight. The chance of their stories being lost was equally great. Thomas was involved in education so her presence seemed to be guaranteed for a time. Fortunately, in this case, timing was propitious: all protagonists were in attendance for the premiere screening.
Time is of the essence when a few people hold valuable historical information and it has not been put into any form that can be passed on to the next generation. The films in each case were powerful messengers.
Chapter 9

Conclusions: In Search of Best Practices

My dissertation explores what Chandler and Lalonde (2004), among other social scientists, describe as “best practices,” resorting to the use of film to return knowledge from academic findings to Indigenous communities in a manner that most closely approximates the multi-sensorial scope of the Indigenous oral tradition. The supreme challenge is to undertake such an exercise without perpetuating past colonial approaches, the imposition of harmful outside authority foremost of all. Best practices can contribute to increased peer-based communication between academic institutions and Indigenous communities. Using the methodology of community-based participatory research (CBPR) has proven useful in maintaining a balanced relationship between the researcher and the community, and has ensured that control remained as much as possible with the community throughout the entire research process. Best practices are meant to contribute to an ongoing critique, and are not advanced as the laying down of immutable codes and protocols. Best practices as championed by CBPR strive to protect the voice of the community and ensure that engaged representation is factored into the development and implementation of research.

The idea of returning research findings back to Indigenous communities in a culturally appropriate fashion took root while I was writing my MA thesis. I knew that an online PDF version would not meet that criterion. In my Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) application for doctoral funding, I emphasized that I wanted to deploy my training as an Aboriginal filmmaker in the cause of
conducting research, ultimately creating a documentary as part of my dissertation. Film is a well-trodden geographic territory for me, one that I have traversed in the past with reward and satisfaction.

I was delighted to receive SSHRC funding and so I began my doctoral odyssey on a familiar path – also seeking “social justice and change” as De Leeuw, Cameron, and Greenwood (2012, 181) passionately champion. Forging uncharted geographies by using film to bring my MA findings back to the Indigenous community from which they had sprung brought my doctorate into a focus that diverged from the traditional academic path. Thus my journey began.

As a co-producer of 26 episodes for the APTN television series Finding Our Talk: A Journey Through Aboriginal Languages, I played the role of host and narrator for the series in both French and English, writing and directing five episodes. Participating in Community Circles was also part of my previous occupation. With those experiences shaping me, I embarked on making a documentary film with participants from Six Nations. I recognized CBPR as a mode of inquiry I had already engaged in my earlier endeavours as a filmmaker. I was excited to begin collaborating with an Indigenous community I respected and with whom I felt a rapport.

Established relationships with Six Nations participants created a comfortable and stimulating milieu. This was especially the case with my key subjects, who had given me telephone interviews four years before for my MA investigations. I had also interviewed Andrea Curley at the International Indigenous Elders’ Summit in 2004. I eagerly anticipated the filming portion of the research with Six Nations, where I would finally meet Keith Lickers and Peter Hill face to face. Familiarity with the Indigenous
geography of Six Nations Grand River, along with my thesis material, would provide a sound foundation on which to build a story that nagged to be told. I set the initial project rolling with a call to another prominent Six Nations figure, Gloria Thomas, at that time pursuing her PhD in education at Queen’s University.

9.1 Establishing Best Practices
At the outset, it was necessary to undertake a critical analysis of components of filming, communications, and editing, to ensure adherence to participatory research protocols in Indigenous communities. I was aiming for considerate, thoughtful interactions that would not inadvertently perpetuate a colonial mindset. Creating the film was a complex process: mulling over and synchronizing the direction of photography, set design, camera operation, sound, music, lighting, editing, and post-production was a constant challenge. We were a team of two, videographer Jon Aarssen and myself, working on a low-budget film with time constraints.

In terms of best practices, I advocate the following:

1. Embark on the project with a tight-knit team. A crew of four would have been ideal – including a director, a sound engineer, a director of photography/camera operator, and an additional camera operator. When filming is community-directed, the team must have consummate technical skills to maintain credibility and engender confidence among the participants.

2. For most shooting situations, two cameras would have been ideal, especially to capture the extent of dynamic environments during “one shot, one stake” situations.
3. As a result of my close ties to the community at Six Nations, I benefitted as director in being able to organize and accommodate participants. In some situations, that required additional assistance, as in the case of the larger gathering of the Community Circle in Ohsweken. To further such ends, I recommend hiring a trusted director’s assistant for group filming.

4. Ideally, all participants should feel at ease and relaxed, understand what is happening, and be apprised of the time frame, especially when it is operationally tight. While shooting the Community Circle with only two crew in Ohsweken, elements of pre-production were overlooked, shots missed, sound not optimally captured, and participants to some extent neglected, or at least not kept sufficiently informed on the filming process. For large groups an extra cameraman on set, along with a sound person, would improve the overall quality.

5. Including film in which CBPR considerations are to be borne in mind creates an added dimension: the undertaking must align with the intention of the academic project, as well as the objectives of the community. Production values and production decisions aside, each reasonable suggestion should be taken into account. Pertinent concerns of the Indigenous community ought to come first.

6. The issue of directorial power and control remained critical throughout the project. The familiar Hollywood power structure places control in the hands of the director. As both primary researcher and director, community members and collaborators in the production side of the undertaking generally deferred to me in the decision-making process. On occasion the complexities of filmmaking can become a deterrent to participatory collaboration. Feeling the pressure of my role
as producer, director, writer, and researcher was at times overwhelming. In those moments I reminded myself that I was part of a decolonizing, community-based participatory process and, as such, power and control must ultimately rest with the community I wanted to serve. To be an effective manager in those circumstances required learning to shift my focus from myself as a lone “leader” to that of maintaining and forging friendships with members of the Six Nations community participating in the project. By sharing the power accorded me as director, I managed to unburden myself of the toxicities associated with hoarding it. Meaningful friendship is synonymous with respect. Where respect prevails, power is more likely to be shared. I recommend that research of this kind be predicated on the basis of friendship; it is key to the success of CBPR. De Leeuw, Cameron, and Greenwood (2012, 192) state categorically that “research relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples” need to include activities unrelated to research in order to “find in friendship a potentially fruitful space to undertake such work.” I wholeheartedly, and most emphatically, concur.

7. A personal assistant would have been of great value because of the extraordinary number of small tasks to attend to throughout. I recommend that any researcher secure sufficient funding in order to create an efficient team with adequate equipment. Filming is an expensive as much as an onerous undertaking.

9.2 The Director
As the creative force behind the film, I became the storyteller. I organized shots, championed quality in sound and lighting, solved problems, decided on the style of shots
and how to frame them, stored data, and dealt time and again with all kinds of challenges, including inclement weather and uncooperative security personnel at the Mowat Block. While simultaneously selecting shots, contemplating framing and angles, adjusting lighting and editing visuals, layering in music, and cutaways, I was strategizing about how to blend them. I sought to combine a storyteller’s voice with those of director of photography, musical director, and editor to create a coherent, integrated vision. Which story elements matter the most? I had to bear this always in mind as I wrote and narrated the story.

The film *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities* adds a dimension to traditional research methodologies but remains intimately connected to all my investigative undertakings and its final companion, a dissertation. These two elements of my doctoral pursuit were used as tools to honour ancient practices and traditions of Native peoples, above all to emulate the Indigenous oral tradition.

### 9.3 Considerations and Recommendations

The director must consider CBPR, and other aspects of the research methodology, at all times during the shooting and editing process. Effective representation of voice is a central concern, especially when it comes to the conversion of a story from one medium or language to another. As Cruikshank (2005, 78) observes, “Converting spoken words to written texts also raises questions about the ‘texture’ of oral narrative.” I raise a similar concern regarding the conversion of oral storytelling to film, particularly during the editing process, while the editor is selecting visuals, layering in music, cutaways, and other enhancements. The director must creatively and strategically blend the voices of all
the storytellers, along with those of the cinematographer, the musical director, and the
editor. Great complexity, I repeat, is involved. How are priorities decided upon? Which
story elements matter the most, and why? These questions, at the forefront of the creative
process, must be resolved with best practices in mind, to ensure that the director protects
and transmits the voice of the community. In addition, I offer the following observations:

1. While filming, the director must take pains to see that subjects’ wishes are
honoured and that ethics documentation is completed, collected, and secured.
2. The director, as the person most responsible for undertaking the project, must
make sure that he or she transmits the overall intent, as community preference
dictates.
3. Questions posed in interviews and focus groups by the research team must be
worded carefully, so that they are not considered leading, or misleading.
4. The director must be open to change, be flexible, and be willing to be part of
the creative process that is directed by the players, depending on what the
community finds valuable in the process. It was necessary to assume several
roles: director of photography, sound editor, birdcall expert, communicator,
apologist, encourager, and planner. At times, I confess, it all seemed too much,
and I felt overwhelmed. Furthermore, at times we were forced back to the
drawing board by narrations, clips of footage, and renderings gone wrong,
cancelled interviews, disturbance around venues, riding the train and retracing
steps in Toronto in spite of armed security guards who took a dim view of what
we were up to. The critique of an early preview by Clarke Mackey triggered a
rethink of basic procedures so as to avoid a “talking heads” outcome in the finished product.

5. My ability to make decisions accurately with regard to CBPR was largely based on a healthy working relationship with the Indigenous community; it is critical that the researcher/director values this relationship. Friendships not only within the Indigenous communities but also amongst my team – that which De Leeuw et al. (2012, 181) describe as “a space within which to develop and articulate critiques” – proved to be just as important in terms of resiliency when things went awry. I sought always to cultivate a respectful working relationship with the community, collaborating with them and valuing each contribution, all the while considering changes that would make the film resonate with audiences.

To enhance best practices further, I would also advocate that:

1. Crew should rehearse set up of cameras, lighting, and sound equipment since timing can be crucial for many shots, especially when participants’ availability is limited.

2. Community participants should be encouraged to tell their stories without structured or scripted interviews.

3. All participants should recognize the importance of establishing and maintaining good relations. “Claims to overcome difference and distance may actually retrench colonial research relations” caution De Leeuw, Cameron, and Greenwood (2012, 191). This is a point well taken, and one I trust acted upon positively.
9.4 Next Step: A Gift Ceremony

Based on analysis of the data and the general reactions of respondents, I believe that *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities* serves its primary purpose: to deliver academic findings back to the Six Nations community. How, then, best to effect an actual hand-to-hand delivery?

What I envision, and harbour hope in, is a ceremony that would formalize a trusted relationship. I picture co-creating a performative event, a Gift Ceremony of sorts, one that would include representatives of Six Nations Band Council and members of Queen’s University administration. The Gift Ceremony might take place on Six Nations Territory following a screening of *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities* for the broader community as well as the Community Circle participants who would be honoured for their critical role in the research work. A copy of my MA thesis, doctoral dissertation, and documentary film would be presented to the Chief and Council, and the traditional Condoled Chiefs and Clan Mothers for use in their library and dissemination beyond.

I end with a Mohawk prayer of thanksgiving translated by Chief Jake Swamp:

Akwekon onkweshona entitewatkawe ne kanonhweratonhtsera

To be human is an honour and we offer thanksgiving for all the gifts of life.
REFERENCES


Chaput, Paul J.A. 2014. Film Interview Transcript.


Appendix A – The Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Definition of Cultural Genocide


For over a century, the central goals of Canada’s Aboriginal policy were to eliminate Aboriginal governments; ignore Aboriginal rights; terminate the Treaties; and, through a process of assimilation, cause Aboriginal peoples to cease to exist as distinct legal, social, cultural, religious, and racial entities in Canada. The establishment and operation of residential schools were a central element of this policy, which can best be described as “cultural genocide.”

> Physical genocide is the mass killing of the members of a targeted group, and biological genocide is the destruction of the group’s reproductive capacity. Cultural genocide is the destruction of those structures and practices that allow the group to continue as a group. States that engage in cultural genocide set out to destroy the political and social institutions of the targeted group. Land is seized, and populations are forcibly transferred and their movement is restricted. Languages are banned. Spiritual leaders are persecuted, spiritual practices are forbidden, and objects of spiritual value are confiscated and destroyed. And, most significantly to the issue at hand, families are disrupted to prevent the transmission of cultural values and identity from one generation to the next.

In its dealing with Aboriginal people, Canada did all these things …
There should be little wonder that Aboriginal health status remains far below that of the general population. The over-incarceration and over-victimization of Aboriginal people also have links to a system that subjected Aboriginal children to punitive discipline and exposed them to physical and sexual abuse.

The history of residential schools presented in this report commenced by placing the schools in the broader history of the global European colonization of Indigenous peoples and their lands. Residential schooling was only a part of the colonization of Aboriginal people. The policy of colonization suppressed Aboriginal culture and languages, disrupted Aboriginal government, destroyed Aboriginal economies, and confined Aboriginal people to marginal and often unproductive land. When that policy resulted in hunger, disease, and poverty, the federal government failed to meet its obligations to Aboriginal people. That policy was dedicated to eliminating Aboriginal peoples as distinct political and cultural entities and must be described for what it was: a policy of cultural genocide.

Despite being subjected to aggressive assimilation policies for nearly 200 years, Aboriginal people have maintained their identity and their communities. They continue to assert their rights to self-governance. In this, they are not alone. Like the Settlement Agreement in Canada, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is a milestone in a global campaign to recognize and respect the rights of Indigenous peoples. It is time to abandon the colonial policies of the past, to address the legacy of the schools, and to engage in a process of reconciliation with the Aboriginal people of Canada …
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You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period. An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours. Report to GREB through either ROMEO Event Report or Adverse Event Report Form at http://www.queensu.ca/ors/researchethics/GeneralREB/forms.html.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes in study procedures or implementation of new aspects into the study procedures. Your request for protocol changes will be forwarded to the appropriate GREB reviewers and/or the GREB Chair. Please report changes to GREB through either ROMEO Event Reports or the Ethics Change Form at http://www.queensu.ca/ors/researchethics/GeneralREB/forms.html.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely, Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.

Chair
General Research Ethics Board

c.: Dr. George Lovell, Faculty Supervisor Dr. Mark Rosenberg, Chair, Unit REB Ms. Joan Knox, Dep. Admin.
Appendix C – Six Nations Ethics Approval

July 15, 2014

Paul J. A. Chaput
5 Emily Street, Apt 2
Kingston, Ont
K7L 2W2

Dear Paul:

The Ethics Committee met on July 15, 2014 and reviewed your application entitled, “Planting Stories, Feeding Communities: Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples and Film”.

This will confirm that approval is hereby granted by the Six Nations Ethics Committee to continue the ongoing research under the revised methodology set out in the update provided to the Committee.

Thank You

Marilyn Mt.Pleasant
Administrative Assistant

Cc – file, SN Library & IKC
Appendix D – Letter of Information

Letter of Information
“Planting Stories, Feeding Communities: Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples and Film”

This research is being conducted by PhD Candidate, Paul Chaput, under the supervision of Professor George Lovell, in the Department of Geography at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario.

What is this study about? In 2011, during the course of my MA research, I interviewed three members of the Six Nations community regarding their roles in the creation and implementation of Native Studies curricula for Ontario high schools, embracing the period from the early 1970s to the present. The resulting thesis, Native Studies in Ontario High Schools: Revitalizing Indigenous Cultures in Ontario, is now online and has been read by a few academic peers, but the story of the individual contributions of Six Nations members remains relatively unknown to the broader community. This research explores the ‘best decolonizing practices’ to transmit academic findings back to the Indigenous community from which the data was originally extracted. To that end, I argue that film, as a form of story telling that engages the senses in multiple ways, closely approximates the long-standing oral tradition of the Iroquois Confederacy. Using a Community-Based-Participatory Research (CBPR) approach, this research will explore how best the researcher and members of the Six Nations community can collaborate in the co-creation of such a film.

The study will feature filmed interviews, which will take place in a location or locations agreeable to the participant. I will ask questions about the creation of Native Studies curricula and how it has affected Six Nations individuals and communities. There are no known physical, psychological, economic, or social risks associated with this study.

Is my participation voluntary? Yes. Although I will be grateful if you would answer all questions as frankly as possible, do not feel obliged to answer any questions that you find objectionable or that make you feel uncomfortable. You may also withdraw all data relevant to your interview at any time by contacting Paul Chaput; paul.j.a.chaput@queensu.ca.
What will happen to my responses? Until the film is screened, I will keep your responses confidential. Only my supervisor, the videographer, the editor, and I will have access to this information in its raw form. You will have the opportunity to see, comment upon, and request adjustments during drafts of the film. The conclusions may be published in professional journals or presented at scientific conferences, but any such presentations will be of general findings and will never breach individual confidentiality. I will quote only material which you have given me permission to use. Should you be interested, you are entitled to a copy of any publication generated from this research.

Will I be compensated for my participation? No.

Consent Form and Documentary Release Form: These forms (found below) will require your signature – if you have not already done so – in order that I may use the content of the interviews in the creation of a documentary film and the writing of my dissertation.

What if I have concerns? In the event that you have any complaints, concerns, or questions about this research, please feel free to contact Paul Chaput; paul.j.a.chaput@queensu.ca; project supervisor, Dr. George Lovell lovellg@queensu.ca; or the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board (613-533-6081) at Queen’s University.

Thank you. I very much appreciate the time you have taken to read this Letter of Information. I hope you are able to participate in this research study.

Sincerely yours,

Paul J. A. Chaput M.A., PhD ABD
Department of Geography
Office: Mackintosh-Corry Hall, Room D 303
Phone: (613) 533-6000 ext. 75122
Email: paul.j.a.chaput@queensu.ca
Info link: http://geog.queensu.ca/grads/chaput.asp
Appendix E – Consent and Release Forms

Consent Form

“Planting Stories, Feeding Communities: Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples and Film”

Name (please print clearly): ___________________________________________

1. I have read the Letter of Information and have had any questions answered to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that I will be participating in the study called: “Planting Stories, Feeding Communities: Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples and Film.” I understand that this means that I will be asked to answer questions posed by researcher Paul Chaput. I understand that a digital video camera and audio recorder will record the interview. I understand that transcripts will be made of the interview.

3. I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time. I understand that every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of the data now and in the future. Only the researcher and his supervisor will have access to the raw data. The data may also be published in professional journals or presented at scientific conferences, but any such presentations will be of general findings and will never breach individual confidentiality. Should I be interested, I know that I am entitled to a copy of the findings.

4. I am aware that if I have any questions, concerns, or complaints, I may contact Paul Chaput; paul.j.a.chaput@queensu.ca; project supervisor, Dr. George Lovell lovellg@queensu.ca; or the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board (613-533-6081) at Queen’s University.

I have read the above statements and freely consent to participate in this research:

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Documentary Release Form

Name: ____________________

Project Title: Planting Stories, Feeding Communities: Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples and Film

I hereby consent without further consideration or compensation to: the use, broadcast, and distribution (full or in part) of all digital images taken of me and/or recordings made of my voice and/or written extraction, in whole or in part, of such recordings for the purposes of creating a documentary film featuring the roles of Six Nations educators in the creation of Native Studies curricula for Ontario high schools.

Signed at Six Nations on ________________________ 2014

(Month) (Day)

Participant Signature ________________________________________________

Address __________________________ City __________________________

Email ________________________________

Province __________________ Postal Code _____________

Date: ____/____/_____
Appendix F – Inventory

Video

**Camera:** Canon 60D  
**Lenses:** Canon 50mm 1.8  
Samyang 85mm Cine T1.5  
Canon 16mm-35mm 2.8L  
18mm-200mm 3.5-5.6 IS  
10-24mm 3.5-4.5  
**Memory:** over 120GB of SD card memory, most 45MB/s class 10 (2@90MB/s+)  
**Battery and accessories:** (4 LP-E6 Li-ion Battery packs, Magic Lantern, and Cinestyle,  
rain cover, UV clear, Circular Polarizer, Warming, and Fluorescent lens filters, Energizer  
AA)

Additional Cameras and Accessories:

GoPro Hero HD  
GoPro Hero 3 (Black Edition, tripod mount, articulating clamp mount)  
Hotshoe accessory mount for 15mm rig (homemade)  
Sevenoak View Finder SK-VF02  
Sevenoak Cam Stabilizer, SK-W02  
Cowboy Studios 15mm Shoulder rig (Extra weights), Follow Focus,+ Matte Box and  
handles.  
CanadianStudio Pro 48”/120cm Pro DSLR Camera Slider  
Manfrotto 128LP tripod Head  
Manfrotto 128RC tripod Head  
Manfrotto 055XB tripod  
HP 7 inch Android Tablet (DSLR controller equipment)  
Tablet mounting bracket (for tablet to be used as external monitor)

Audio

**Recorder:**  
Zoom H4N, 4 track field recorder, (Wind screen, Mic stand mount)  
**Microphones:**  
Rode VideoMic Pro Shotgun Microphone with Rycote Stabilizer hot shoe mount.  
Audio-technica OMNI lavaliere Microphone  
AKG D5 Microphone  
AKG TPS D3700 Microphone  
**Mixer:**  
Mackie DFX-6, six channel integrated live sound mixer.  
Roland Weighted Boom Mic Stand  
2 x 10’ XLR cables
2 x 20’ XLR cables
2 x 25’ ¼” cables
40’ 3.5mm male to female headphone cable
Sony Studio headphones
Skull Candy Earbud headphones

**Lighting**

RotoLight RL48 (9 colour gel set)
2 8’ PVC light stands (homemade)
8” Clamp Light 150w max
10” Clamp Light 150w max
3 x clamp-on flood lights 60w max
2 x 40w draw 200W CFL bulbs soft white 2700k
2 x 40w draw 200W CFL bulbs daylight 6500k
4 x 100w full spectrum light bulbs
3 x floodlight bulbs (white, red, orange)
5 x 10lb sand bags + one 20lb sand bag (homemade)
2 x 8’ PVC light stands (homemade)
2 x Small (4”) Cowboy Studio Light stands
3 x 35’ extension cords
2 x 10’ extension cords
2 x 6 outlet power bar
Reflectors (silver) 2x 4”
2 x extra-large gorilla clamps
2 x extra small Guick Grip clamps
2 x 10” ‘c’ clamps
2 x 4” ‘c’ clamps
Appendix G – Videographer’s Notes

This creatively charged academic journey we now know as the documentary film *Planting Stories, Feeding Communities* began as a desire to apply the analysis and research skills I had learned at Queen’s. I contacted W. George Lovell, whose course GPHY 229 “Place, Space, Culture and Social Life” I was attending at the time, to inquire about volunteer opportunities in the upcoming summer months. Lovell was an ideal contact considering that his passion for geography and Aboriginal Middle American cultures motivated my return to Queen’s as a mature student. Lovell responded that he was fully engaged over the summer, but pointed me to a doctoral student of his, who was considering the creation of a film as part of his research. It took a single meeting with Paul Chaput to realize the importance of his MA research and his subsequent vision of returning stories to communities – of making research more accessible. With my background in photojournalism and filmmaking, along with a lifelong interest in Aboriginal culture and history, my fit with the project was natural.

During our first meetings we discussed the film as it was proposed, a creative piece complete with dramatizations and original visual examples. I was asked to help with camera operation in the role of director of photography, as well as editor. These proposal ideas were to be made possible with the aid of funding, and would involve a small crew of people to help in the production. I was a little naïve about the scope of the project. If adequate funding had been available throughout there is no doubt that Paul’s original proposal ideas would have come to life on screen. Over the following months it became clear that funding would be an issue. The film took on an entirely different focus: one of involving the community in the filmmaking process and letting the film come to life from that experience.

This project was a tremendous learning experience for me. I had a few months to prepare for the first two shoots in Ohsweken, which allowed me to test a transition to a fully functioning one-man film crew. Having only a very limited personal budget I had to make some considerations about lighting. In the past I had relied on natural light or a LED Rotolight. In this case, I knew that I would be filming indoors in a variety of lighting situations and would have to add light to keep the ISO low enough to avoid excessive noise in postproduction. I have lit scenes indoors with halogen work-lights which, although cheap and bright, are also hot and bring added headaches via colour correction in postproduction (to overcome their yellow hue.) I wanted to avoid that in this production.

Having been a budget filmmaker for a few years I am familiar with “do it yourself” blogs and aids for digital video production. On one of the forums I read a post advocating the use of PVC plumbing to create useful stands at a minimal cost. I designed my own version and headed to the hardware store for the necessary supplies. In the end
each of the two stands cost me 25 dollars and a few hours labour. They served well as light stands, but were customized for my needs. Given the nature of PVC though, and its weight, the light stands required the use of sand bags, and had limited capacity. In the past I had made a 25 pound sand bag for use on the base of the video tripod. I made additional bags to support the light stands. They comprise two extra-large slide-lock Zip-lock bags, and two different types of duct tape in “traditional silver” and “high visibility orange.” Along with technical planning I also practised the ‘flow’ of set up and tear down procedures.

The biggest learning curve was dealing with sound – much of my previous experience had been with a focus on visuals, music being synched and added later. This project made it crucial for me to be able to control both the sound and visuals, which added a whole new level of pressure to the various shooting situations. Paul and I went to Six Nations without any additional help. Paul was preoccupied with the logistics of accommodating and organizing a variety of participants and interviewees while I did the technical work of setting up the camera, lighting, and sound. Normally, within a documentary film crew there would at least be one person dedicated to each of the above tasks. That allows team members the necessary time to consider what is best for their part of the production without having to multitask.

Time was of the essence. I was monitoring the audio via headphones, without being actively involved in its capture. That was problematic in situations where the sources of sounds were dynamic. I was unable to actively engineer the sound capture in a way that minimized interference – my focus was unequally divided between what I was seeing and what I was hearing.

Jon Aarssen, 2015
Appendix H – Questionnaire

Film Questionnaire: Planting Stories: Feeding Communities

1. Were you aware of the roles played by Keith, Gloria and Peter in the creation of Native Studies and Native Language curricula before viewing the film?
   a. Keith Y ☐ N ☐
   b. Gloria Y ☐ N ☐
   c. Peter Y ☐ N ☐

2. Without seeing the film would you have known about the roles and contributions of Keith, Gloria, and Peter? Y ☐ N ☐

3. How did learning about the contributions to education in Ontario by Keith, Gloria and Peter make you feel? 
   ____________________________________________________________

4. What stood out for you in the film?
   ____________________________________________________________

5. Have you read the online Thesis: “Native Studies in Ontario High Schools: Revitalizing Indigenous Cultures in Ontario”? Y ☐ N ☐

6. Do you think film is more suited to communicating findings back to the community than a written thesis? Y ☐ N ☐

7. Having seen the film, are you now more likely to read the Thesis? Y ☐ N ☐

8. On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the usefulness of film as a format to communicate academic findings back to the community?
   Least 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Most

9. Do you feel the material in the film is valuable to the community? Y ☐ N ☐

10. Would you recommend the film:
    a. to others in your community? Y ☐ N ☐
    b. to Indigenous contacts outside of your community? Y ☐ N ☐
    c. to non-Indigenous contacts? Y ☐ N ☐
    d. for use in Native Studies courses? Y ☐ N ☐

Please complete the last question on the reverse of the questionnaire.

11. Check off the categories that pertain to you:
k. ☐ Member of the Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation
l. ☐ Indigenous
m. ☐ Non-Indigenous
n. ☐ Teacher
o. ☐ Public School Student
p. ☐ Private School Student
q. ☐ Undergraduate Student
r. ☐ Graduate Student
s. ☐ School Board Trustee
t. ☐ Employee of a School Board

Comments: Add any additional comments or recommendations.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your contribution to this research.

The participant’s questionnaire had two additional questions:

0. As a participant in the Community Circle did you feel your voice was represented in the process used by the researcher? Y ☐ N ☐

and

5a. Did you read the Thesis before ☐ or after ☐ the Community Circle?
Appendix I – Poster

Premiere Screening @ GREAT
Tuesday, 21 July 2015 at 5 p.m.

Planting Stories:
Feeding Communities
Knowledge, Indigenous Peoples, and Film

PLEASE JOIN US in celebrating the stories of three Six Nations educators, Keith Lickers, Gloria Thomas and Peter Hill, AND to answer the question: Is film an effective way to bring research findings and stories back to the communities from which they were taken?

Viewers will be invited to fill out a brief questionnaire, followed by a brief Question and Answer period with researcher/producer/director, Paul Chaput MA, PhD candidate from Queen’s University.
Appendix J – UN Convention on Genocide

Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide


Article 1

The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article 2

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;
(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.