

EDUCATION FOR RECONCILIATION?

“For over a decade,” Brooke Madden begins, “Canadian education across all levels and disciplines has been undergoing programmatic, curricular, and policy reform to include Indigenous perspectives, knowledges, and pedagogical approaches,”¹ although the “identification of educational approaches that effectively fulfil calls for reconciliation in an era of Indigenous resurgence remains challenging to define and apply.”²

“Through developing coursework on the topics of Indigenous education and education for reconciliation in a faculty of education,” she adds, “I am coming to understand the “wide-reaching influence of the activities and outcomes of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), prevailing constructions and critiques of reconciliation, and where Indigenous education and truth and reconciliation education come together and pull apart.”³ Madden calls for a “carefully theorized practice, which does not necessitate a moratorium on practice-based responses to the TRC,” but register her “discomfort” over the “willingness of many to undertake #reconciliACTION – a popular social media hashtag that is intended to draw attention to substantive, versus symbolic, action – with little attention to the theories that undergird such action.”⁴

“I regularly read uncertainty and/or dis-regard in the texts of scholars and educators when it comes to articulating how they conceptualize and respond to the assumptions, purposes, goals, scholarship, and discourses of reconciliation,” she reports, adding: “I have also observed collapsing of the terms Indigenous education and truth and reconciliation education; the seduction of sameness essentially obscures points of resonance and divergence between these anti-oppressive models whereby one can be left wondering, ‘Is reconciliation merely the most recent rebranding of Indigenous education?’”⁵ Moreover, “it is not uncommon for knowledge about reconciliation to be asserted from a Eurocentric paradigm without acknowledgment of the ways in which such a taken-for-granted notion is anchored to Christianity and its particular modes, categories, and signs (e.g. dualism; civility and morality; reliance on confession, apology, forgiveness, and absolution).”⁶ Her “impression is that colleagues have misunderstood and even politely dismissed work in this area presumably on a related basis (i.e. too Eurocentric).”⁷

“Guided by the central questions: How do I understand prevailing constructions of reconciliation in circulation? and How might I theorize a philosophy of education for reconciliation that responds to and upholds my de/colonizing commitments?” Madden will “develop a de/colonizing theory that includes four interrelated components.”⁸ These are: (1) “the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s notion of reconciliation and education for reconciliation,” (2) “Indigenous land-based traditions for establishing and maintaining respectful relationships,” (3) the

“central role of Indigenous counter-stories in truth and reconciliation education,” and (4) “critiques of the construction and enactment of reconciliation.”⁹ Is not being “guided by central questions” itself a “Eurocentric” research tradition?

Despite her name being listed after the title of the article, in the first section we read: “My name is Brooke Madden and I am the daughter of Denise Ducharme and Craig Madden. I am from Tecumseh, Ontario, situated on the territory of the McKee Treaty of 1790 and the traditional land of the Wendat and the Three Fires Confederacy of First Nations – the Ojibwa, the Odawa, and the Potawatomi. I identify as a woman with Indigenous and settler ancestry: Wendat, Iroquois, French, and German on my mother’s side and Mi’kmaw, Irish, and English on my father’s side.”¹⁰ It’s unclear what the relevance of this disclosure to the theory development she intends is, scholarship intended to “extend de/colonizing goals in the context of Canadian education ... through two interconnected and recursive processes: deconstructing and reconstructing,”¹¹ the former term decided European – formulated by Jacques Derrida¹² – and the latter associated with American pragmatism, specifically the philosophy of John Dewey.¹³ “Within education for reconciliation,” Madden asserts, “deconstruction illuminates and creates openings to address how colonial norms of intelligibility are produced, organized, circulated, and regulated.”¹⁴ And despite its European-American roots, she judges that “reconstructing advances educational change rooted in Indigenous epistemologies, ontologies, and community priorities that are deeply relational and place-based.”¹⁵ How exactly “reconstructing advances [Indigenous] educational change” is something we’ll learn later, presumably.

What we do learn is that Madden has “begun to replace the term decolonizing with de/colonizing,”¹⁶ a move made by many influenced by European poststructuralism generally and deconstruction specifically.¹⁷ For Madden, de/colonizing (as opposed to decolonizing) “underscores the complexity and, at times, incongruity of the material-discursive structures, commitments, and practices of educational institutions and the Indigenizing, decolonizing, and reconciliation initiatives they pursue,”¹⁸ a rather heavy load for a punctuation mark to carry I should think. Again, consonant with the influence of poststructuralism, Madden explains that “such a notion suggests that decolonization need not be (and perhaps cannot be) constructed in neat opposition to colonization.”¹⁹ If not in “opposition,” then in what relationship is decolonization to colonization: are they intertwined? Still under the spell of Derrida, Madden is “keenly aware that deconstructing stratified binaries is a double-edged sword,” as “while it presents opportunities to reconfigure problematic totalizing categories, it risks destabilizing the grounds from which identity politics are often conducted and necessary counter-stories are told.”²⁰ Is that worth the risk? Madden thinks so, and her solution is to “hold the tension between using essentialism strategically at times ... while looking to Indigenous intellectual traditions for models of relationality and plurality.”²¹ For many, there is no “tension” between those two, as Indigenous peoples have relied on DNA testing to determine identity.²²

“The first orientation that informs my emerging understanding of prevailing constructions of reconciliation in circulation and theory of truth and reconciliation education,” Madden reports, “is the TRC’s interpretation of reconciliation and education for reconciliation.”²³ She revisits the history that led to the establishment of the Commission, including 1980s legal campaigns undertaken by survivors of the residential schools.²⁴ Sought in these cases were “formal recognition of the abuses suffered ... and related compensation from both the federal government and major Catholic and Protestant denominations involved in the establishment and administration of the schools.”²⁵ She cites the 1998 Statement of Reconciliation (issued by the federal government) as well as the publication of *Gathering Strength: Canada’s Aboriginal Action Plan* to address Canada’s culpability.²⁶ Also cited is the 2006 “class action settlement in Canadian history to date – the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement – involving representatives of former students, the Assembly of First Nations, additional Aboriginal organizations, the federal government, and the churches.²⁷ Approved by the courts, it came into effect on September 19, 2007.²⁸ She reminds readers of the five features of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement: (1) A “Common Experience Payment” that provided financial compensation to everyone who attended one of the residential schools listed in the agreement, \$10,000 for the first year, and a further \$3000 for each additional year or partial year of attendance; (2) an “Independent Assessment Process” to “adjudicate and financially compensate the claims of those students who suffered sexual and/or serious physical assaults at the schools (e.g. beating, electrocution, and burning),” including students “who were assaulted by other students as a result of lack of reasonable supervision,” this latter category comprising approximately 48% (37, 951 in 2015) of students who received a Common Experience Payment; (3) funding (\$125 million) of the Aboriginal Healing Foundation provided by the federal government and 50 Roman Catholic church entities; (4) establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, charged to “(a) to reveal the truth about the history and ongoing legacy of IRS and (b) to guide a collective process of healing and reconciliation”; and (5) “funding (20 million dollars administered by Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada) for commemorative projects that invite dialogue about the residential school experience,” projects evaluated the TRC according to “three elements as essential to sustaining reconciliation projects: (a) are survivor-driven, (b) forge new relationships between Aboriginal experience and national history and consciousness, and (c) centre Indigenous oral history.”²⁹

Madden also reminds readers that “the TRC’s mandates were pursued through a variety of initiatives,” including “seven four-day national events (Winnipeg, Inuvik, Halifax, Saskatoon, Montreal, Vancouver, and Edmonton) and two two-day regional events (Victoria and Whitehorse) [that] were held between June 2010 and March 2014.”³⁰ The Commission estimated that “approximately 155,000 people attended the national events and over 9000 survivors registered (it is likely that more former

residential school students attended who did not register).”³¹ Opening in 2015 was “ a publicly accessible National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation hosted by the University of Manitoba” that “houses all materials generated and received as part of the Commission’s work.”³² The TRC depicted the Centre as “a living legacy, a teaching and learning place for public education to promote understanding and reconciliation through ongoing statement gathering, new research, commemoration ceremonies, dialogues on reconciliation, and celebrations of Indigenous cultures, oral histories, and legal traditions.”³³ Madden deems the abbreviated version of the Commission’s calls to action a “significant source of knowledge that informs how reconciliation is understood generally, and education for reconciliation specifically.”³⁴ The Commission defines “reconciliation” as “fundamentally about establishing and maintaining respectful and healthy Aboriginal–non-Aboriginal relationships in Canada.”³⁵ It is to “be practiced (i.e. #reconciliACTION) in all aspects of daily lives through understanding, taking responsibility for, and working to reconfigure the paternalistic, Eurocentric, and racist foundations of the residential school system and associated colonial structures and strategies that persist,” practice that “might include making apologies, providing reparations, and acting in ways that demonstrate societal change.”³⁶

“Former Chief Commissioner of the TRC Justice Murray Sinclair stated that, [e]ducation is what got us into this mess – the use of education at least in terms of residential schools – but education is the key to reconciliation,”³⁷ ignoring that cultural conflict animated the establishment of residential schools, as education relegated to the means to an end, namely cultural assimilation. Now Sinclair wants it serves as a means to another, this time, welcome end, namely “reconciliation”? Once again educators are demoted to letter carriers, charged with delivering others’ missives; Madden notes that the “Summary of the Final Report of the TRC ... expands Sinclair’s reference to education as the cause of intergenerational trauma and ongoing challenges facing Aboriginal communities.”³⁸ “According to the TRC,” Madden continues,

education for reconciliation focuses on the relationship between the history and legacy of residential schools and: (a) the distinct and rich linguistic, cultural, and spiritual traditions of Indigenous nations; (b) the inherent rights of Aboriginal peoples and the spirit and intent of treaty making processes; (c) the colonial logics, legislation and policy, and tools and techniques that underpinned Canada’s IRS system; and (d) the current realities confronting communities.³⁹

Certainly, these topics could be incorporated into the school curriculum, although not easily, dominated as especially the secondary school curriculum is by university admission requirements, requirements organized according to school subjects. Even if the K-12 school curriculum could be organized not according to school subjects but by ever-shifting topics – informed by the academic disciplines that are currently represented by the school subjects - to characterize such a curriculum as contributing to “reconciliation” is setting up schools as scapegoats, as no one institution can change the course of history or undo its damage.

Madden turns from this fact to her “de/colonizing theory of truth and reconciliation education,” noting that such education “requires historical grounding in and de/colonizing analysis of key campaigns, statements, policies and associated initiatives, collectives, and settlements that led to the establishment of Canada’s TRC,” including “understanding [that] the oft-cited ‘calls to action’ as emerging from this lineage, as well as connected to a network of Commission events, partnerships, activities and programs, research, commemorations, and reports that educate about the history and legacy of Canada’s IRS system works against interpretations of reconciliation towards assimilative ends.”⁴⁰ “When this lineage is casually dismissed and/or Eurocentric projections such as confession, apology, forgiveness, and absolution are applied haphazardly and in the absence of knowledge about the TRC,” she warns, “Indigenous agency, priorities, and strategies for sovereignty are flattened and obscured.”⁴¹ Moreover, Madden continues, “these problematics are further entrenched by assuming education for reconciliation is just another iteration of Indigenous education as cultural programming.”⁴² And so “understanding the emergence of the terms truth-telling, reconciliation, and education for reconciliation in relation to the history and legacy of Canada’s IRS system and TRC is the place where I urge educators to begin.”⁴³

“Following Indigenous scholars, Elders, and leaders,” Madden moves to “Indigenous land-based traditions for establishing and maintaining respectful relationships,” citing Elder Reg Crowshoe’s acknowledgement of the “importance of attending to land throughout in the Summary of the Final Report of the TRC.”⁴⁴ She quotes him as saying: “Reconciliation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians, from an Aboriginal perspective, also requires reconciliation with the natural world. If human beings resolve problems between themselves but continue to destroy the natural world, then reconciliation remains incomplete.”⁴⁵ Despite his statement, Madden notes that “how diverse sectors, including education, might approach reconciling with the Earth is noticeably absent in the calls to action.”⁴⁶ While “most Indigenous nations do not have a word for reconciliation in their own languages,” Madden continues, “spiritual ceremonies, peacemaking practices, and stories have been used since time immemorial to establish and maintain good relations, restore harmony, heal conflict and harm, and practice justice.”⁴⁷ She suggests “that Indigenous law, leadership, and governance must be recognized, and that the wisdom and practical guidance therein should inform the process of reconciliation,” a process that “challenges colonial ways of being in relation that have so often shaped engagement since contact.”⁴⁸ “Without attuning to human, more-than human, and other-than-human relations that constitute a landscape of repetitively traumatized places in need of healing,” Madden reiterates (echoing Elder Reg Crowshoe) that “reconciliation remains incomplete.”⁴⁹

Madden notes “that some scholars have suggested that governing, leading, and/or educating within frameworks of Indigenous intelligence should not and cannot

be positioned as reconciliatory endeavours,” that “to frame these traditional and ongoing practices according to a state-sanctioned and -supported initiative that relies heavily on Western political, judicial, economic, and educational systems would itself be a colonial act that reduces the radical potential of Indigenous theory to imagine and enact de/colonizing relations.”⁵⁰ Madden concurs, asserting that “engagement, in institutional education and otherwise, necessitates a paradigm that considers and nurtures Indigenous land-based traditions for establishing and maintaining respectful relationships on their own terms.”⁵¹ Isn’t invoking the concept of paradigm - itself a product of “Western political, judicial, economic, and educational systems” (and specifically historian of science Thomas Kuhn⁵²) – also a “colonial act”? Not so for Madden, who then turns to “questioning what it might mean to re-signify ‘reconciliation,’” asking: “What new space might be created through simultaneously using and troubling this concept in order to move beyond the prevailing constructions in circulation, like healing and renewing Indigenous - non-Indigenous relationships?”⁵³

“The de/colonizing approach I employ,” Madden promises, “is provoking new analytical frames; questions of substance, clarification, and provocation; and types of findings.”⁵⁴ “When I consider this orientation in relation to the texts produced by the TRC and the educational policy documents created in response,” she continues, “it becomes readily apparent that further attention needs to be devoted to land in the context of truth and reconciliation education.”⁵⁵ If “much has been written on the relationship between land and Indigenous education that can be translated and adapted for the context of truth and reconciliation education,”⁵⁶ then “land” is not exactly a “new analytical frame” is it. “My focus,” she adds, “is on the development of a de/colonizing theory of truth and reconciliation education with the explicit desire not to be seduced by the siren call of (best) practice.”⁵⁷ Doesn’t her “de/colonizing theory of truth and reconciliation education” represent another “siren call of (best) practice”? Returning to “land,” Madden tells us that “truth and reconciliation education attends to understandings of, as well as engages, land,” forefronting that “dispossession, disputes, and devastation continue to be at the heart of Indigenous settler relations in Canada.”⁵⁸ Those “relations” appear to be shifting somewhat, at least in Vancouver.⁵⁹

Given that the testimony of survivors prompted and dominated the TRC,⁶⁰ I’m unsure why Madden would invoke the notion of “counter-stories,”⁶¹ a term she traces to critical race theory, referencing rather different phenomena and in a different country.⁶² Even so, Madden maintains “that it is absolutely vital to secure space for Indigenous counter-stories related to IRS (Indigenous Residential School) in truth and reconciliation education,” as “counter-stories have the potential to honour and feed Indigenous resurgence and oppose colonial ways of being in relationship.”⁶³ She continues:

Counter-stories in various forms (e.g. youth accounts, guest lecturers, learning with Indigenous knowledge carriers, film, literature, visual art and accompanying artists’ statements) support: (a) integration of multiple, nuanced

representations of Indigeneity that challenge existing stereotypical images, (b) analysis of relations of power in situated contexts to provide a basis for understanding ‘the struggles of subjugated populations in their Indigenous homelands’ ... and (c) interrogation of teachers’ privilege and views of Indigenous peoples and groups to illuminate how individuals are produced within and reproduce interconnected systems of oppression.⁶⁴

Madden cautions against “counter-stories” causing settler-students to feel pity for the victims, as this response obscures the “resilience and agency present in counter-stories.”⁶⁵ She worries as well about counter-stories encouraging a sense of “settler innocence.”⁶⁶

Despite these dangers, Madden reiterates that “complex counter-stories have the potential to rupture colonial subjectivities and produce diverse de/colonizing positions and strategies for Indigenous sovereignty.”⁶⁷ She details these with four “R’s,” the first being “refusal,” as “counter-stories of refusal reveal the ways in which Indigenous peoples have been refusing participation in colonial systems since contact, despite the ongoing threat to their safety and well-being as a result.”⁶⁸ The second “R” is “resistance,” as “counter-stories of resistance demonstrate how Indigenous groups and communities have organized and acted to resist dispossession, disenfranchisement, and dismissal by the colonial state and demand recognition of human, Indigenous, and treaty rights.”⁶⁹ The third is “resilience,” as “counter-stories of resilience highlight the incredible ability of Indigenous peoples and Nations to overcome systematic assault on Indigenous ways-of-knowing and -being, often through drawing strength from community and traditional teachings.”⁷⁰ Fourth is “restorying and resurgence,” as “counter-stories of restorying and resurgence emphasize the healing and reclamation of Indigenous peoples and places that have experienced trauma as a result of Canada’s IRS system,” adding: “In many cases, restorying is marked by a material shift that mirrors symbolic recovery,”⁷¹ yet another “R.” Ignoring that last “R” – recovery – Madden asserts that “narratives of refusal, resistance, resilience, and restorying ... challenge historical and contemporary colonial relationships with Canada by linking traditional teachings, mechanisms of survival, and political action.”⁷²

Countering these claims is the concern that “efforts to challenge and pursue reconciliation within colonial systems are embedded in those same systems and re-grounded in their associated logics and practices (i.e. de/colonizing).”⁷³ Madden’s response seems to support that statement: “Therefore, my exploration must critically attend to instances and perspectives that exceed prevailing constructions of reconciliation,” adding: “Excess can teach about the protocols, norms, and forms intended to solidify and secure a phenomena.”⁷⁴ How, exactly? “Exploration” is the euphemism invaders/settlers used, as if the land had not already been “explored” by the Indigenous. And surely Madden doesn’t mean “perspectives that exceed prevailing” – as in Indigenous – “constructions of reconciliation”? What Madden does do is review resistance to “positioning Indigenous governance, leadership, and education

frameworks as examples of reconciliatory endeavours,” including by “framing traditional and ongoing practices in terms of state-sanctioned and -supported initiatives that leverage Western political, judicial, economic, and educational systems.”⁷⁵ She reviews “Indigenous and ally scholars” calls for “substantive, versus symbolic, restitution before any consideration of rebuilding relationships or restoring dignity for all parties involved in reconciliation takes place,” noting that “substantive restitution may involve homeland return and permanent sovereignty over traditional territories, material/monetary reparations, and/or justice for survivors.”⁷⁶ She recalls critiques of reconciliation’s “compartmentalization,” that is, its isolation and disconnection from “ongoing injustices committed by the Canadian government centred on land dispossession and diminishing self-determination.”⁷⁷ Worse are those “expectations that reconciliation places on Indigenous peoples, especially women, to forgive and love, while simultaneously obscuring and reducing space for suspicion, resentment, and rage,” expectations that “serve to regulate, restrain, and dehumanize Indigenous peoples’ identities, expressions, and priorities.”⁷⁸ Finally, Madden reiterates the critique that the TRC failed to “address ongoing healing” (the reference she provides for this allegation antedates the TRC), adding that: “Pursuing reconciliation in educational institutions is inherently de/colonizing, however, we must persist while remaining critical of the ways in which we strive towards a contemporary impossibility (i.e. decolonizing as a liberatory space untouched by colonial logics, processes, and productions).”⁷⁹ Again, it’s unclear in what sense Madden’s “exploration” did actually “critically attend to instances and perspectives that exceed prevailing constructions of reconciliation,” as she has merely reiterated critiques - not “critically attend” to them.

Madden nonetheless alleges that her “article raises concerns regarding the current overwhelming preoccupation of educational policy, scholarship, and initiatives with translating truth and reconciliation for teaching practice.”⁸⁰ “In particular,” she continues, “I flag two problematic productions that I have observed among educators: collapsing of the terms Indigenous education and truth and reconciliation education, and asserting knowledge about reconciliation from a Eurocentric paradigm. I argue these moves diminish Indigenous agency and resurgence.”⁸¹ Yet “asserting knowledge about reconciliation from a Eurocentric paradigm” appears to be what Madden has done, guided by what she terms “central questions,” including “how” questions, instances of “technological rationality”⁸²: “How do I understand prevailing constructions of reconciliation in circulation? and How might I theorize a philosophy of education for reconciliation that responds to and upholds my de/colonizing commitments?”⁸³ She answers: “De/colonizing theoretical and methodological frames ... seek to understand the construction of reconciliation through examining colonial logics and strategies, including education, that continue to be utilized to (justify attempts to) exploit Indigenous peoples, lands, and resources.”⁸⁴

Madden concludes that her “review informs the development of a de/colonizing theory of truth and reconciliation education.”⁸⁵ She “advocate[s] for

truth and reconciliation education grounded in a historical understanding of the emergence of Canada's TRC and the Commission's constructions of reconciliation and education for reconciliation that focuses on action at individual, collective, and systemic levels."⁸⁶ "In response to a notable lack of attention to land in the TRC's calls to action, and educational policy and curriculum that have been created in response," Madden "highlight[s] why and how truth and reconciliation education might work to centre Indigenous traditions for establishing and maintaining respectful relationships."⁸⁷ Her "theory," she repeats, has "four components," namely (1) the "TRC," (2) "land," (3) "counter-story," and (4) "critique," which "will contribute to theoretical and methodological frames to analyse my own attempts to design and facilitate truth and reconciliation in higher education, as well as the efforts of teachers in schools with whom I work."⁸⁸ Such "theory building enhances current de/colonizing scholarship through focusing on concepts of reconciliation and education for reconciliation that cannot be disentangled from Canada's IRS system, as well as Indigenous notions of land, resurgence, and resistance."⁸⁹

Colonization's first dictionary definition is "the action or process of settling among and establishing control over the indigenous people of an area," but a secondary more general definition is the "action of appropriating a place or domain for one's own use."⁹⁰ While obviously well-intentioned, Madden's appropriation of Indigenous conceptions of "land" and "counter-story" as "components" of her own "theory" seems to fit the bill. There is also the problematic issue Margaret Kovach raises concerning the terminology of social science "research" obscuring – I worry even embalming – the Indigenous knowledge encapsulated within the jargon of social science research,⁹¹ relegated in Madden's article to the status of "components," an ugly mechanistic term best left to science and technology. Madden's article also underscores another tendency that the corporatization of the university has only aggravated, i.e. the self-promotional character of claims such as Madden's, that her "theory-building enhances current de/colonizing scholarship," a judgement only readers are entitled to make. These three issues underscore the impossible situation non-Indigenous allied scholars face: trained in non-Indigenous even "Eurocentric" research traditions such scholars (inadvertently?) appropriate Indigenous knowledge for their own entrepreneurial ends. Critiquing Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholarship hardly extricates me from this situation, but at least critique is not conceptual recolonization.

REFERENCES

- Cameron, Chris and Walker, Mark. 2023, June 5. Lack of "Indian Blood" Deprives Black Citizens of Tribal Justice. *The New York Times*, CLXXII, No. 59,810, A1, A15.

Dao, James. 2011. December 13. In California, Indian Tribes With Casino Money Cast Off Members. *The New York Times* Vol. CLXI (55, 618), A1, A22.

Macdonald, Bradley J. Ed. 1995. *Theory as a Prayerful Act: The Collected Essays of James B. Macdonald*. Peter Lang.

Madden, Brooke. 2019. A De/colonizing Theory of Truth and Reconciliation Education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 49 (3), 284-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2019.1624478>

Onishi, Norimitsu. 2022, August 24. Indigenous Communities Acquire Prime Land, and Power. *The New York Times*, CLXXI, No. 59,525, A4.

Pinar, William F., Reynolds, William M., Slattery, Patrick, and Taubman, Peter M. 1995. *Understanding Curriculum*. Peter Lang.

ENDNOTES

¹ 2019, 284.

² 2019, 285.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. See: <https://nctr.ca/reconciliation-plans/>

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ 2019, 286.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ 2019, 287.

¹² <https://iep.utm.edu/deconstruction/>

¹³ <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25670298> See also: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/dewey-moral/#:~:text=Dewey%20saw%20his%20reconstruction%20of%20philosophical%20ethics%20as,identifying%20a%20method%20for%20improving%20our%20value%20judgments.>

¹⁴ 2019, 287.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

-
- 17 For an overview in these concepts in curriculum studies, see Pinar et al. 1995, 450-514.
- 18 2019, 287.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 2019, 288.
- 21 Ibid. For essentialism, see: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/essentialism-philosophy>
- 22 For example, see Dao 2011; Cameron and Walker 2023;
- 23 2019, 289.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 2019, 289-290.
- 30 2019, 290.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 2019, 291.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 2019, 292.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 2019, 292-293.
- 41 2019, 293. Are not Madden's concepts of "reconstructing" and "deconstructing" also "Eurocentric projections"?
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Quoted in 2019, 293.
- 46 2019, 293.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 2019, 294.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Ibid.
- 52 <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/thomas-kuhn/>
- 53 Ibid.
- 54 2019, 295.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 2019, 296.
- 59 Onishi (2022, August 24, A4) reports that Vancouver-area First Nations have been given "preference" when federal or provincial governments have sold land,

purchases funded through loans from the federal government or from banks, on occasion in partnership with private developers. Ian Gillespie, the founder and chief executive of Westbank, a major developer involved in Senákw and other Indigenous projects, characterized as “more than a real estate story, but one about achieving true reconciliation through the three nations’ acquisition of power.” “When it comes to real estate in Greater Vancouver, it’s our Microsoft, our Tesla,” added Mr. Gillespie, who is not Indigenous. “And so if you can put the First Nations at the center of that, then they are in a position of power” (quoted in Onishi 2022, August 24, A4). See also: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/squamish-nation-senakw-development-groundbreaking-1.6573841>

⁶⁰ <https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/indigstudies/chapter/truth-and-reconciliation-commission-of-canada/> See also “The Survivors Speak” - <https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/9.800109/publication.html>

⁶¹ 2019, 296.

⁶² <https://www.britannica.com/topic/critical-race-theory> See also: <https://www.nytimes.com/article/what-is-critical-race-theory.html>

⁶³ 2019, 296.

⁶⁴ 2019, 297.

⁶⁵ 2019, 298.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ 2019, 299.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² 2019, 299-300.

⁷³ 2019, 300.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ 2019, 300-301.

⁷⁸ 2019, 302.

⁷⁹ 2019, 303.

⁸⁰ 2019, 304.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² The critiques are many and continuing, but James B. Macdonald’s is especially succinct: “Technological rationality refers to the dominant mind-set of our culture... a one-dimensional orientation toward tasks and problems characterized by a complete commitment to an instrumental thinking which separates means from ends,” adding: “School personnel must be constantly alerted to this cultural mind-set....They must be constantly encouraged to shift from the ‘How?’ to the ‘What?’ and the ‘Why?’” (Ibid.)

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ 2019, 306.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ This online definition is apparently “powered by Oxford dictionaries.” See: https://ca.search.yahoo.com/yhs/search?hspart=iba&hsimp=yhs-3&type=teff_10019_FFW_ZZ&p=define%3A+colonization

⁹¹ See research brief #124.