COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF MINORITY INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Globalization, Neoliberalism and Indigenous Peoples

The first meeting of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples was held in 1975 in Port Alberni, British Columbia. Since that time, indigenous peoples have become increasingly visible in the political and cultural landscapes of both the nation states whose borders have come to encapsulate them, and in transnational debates about relations among and between communities, peoples, and states in the contemporary period of globalization. While the course will begin with an historical and comparative overview of colonialism, and of the emergence of the legal and political category “indigenous people” in diverse polities, we will focus on contemporary relations between minority indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous populations now living in liberal/democratic nation states like Canada, Australia and the U.S.A..

Based on the premise that globalization and neoliberalism are cultural, as well as political and economic systems, and working primarily with ethnographic films and readings, we will seek to develop critical understandings of the complex ways in which indigenous peoples are articulated with, and resist/challenge/accommodate/reshape contemporary local, regional, national and global processes. Within this broad context, the course will explore substantive questions surrounding indigenous sovereignty, globalization and “the new capitalism”; recognition, identity and multiculturalism; gender relations and sexuality; welfare states, welfare reform and neoliberal governance; and the politics of illness, health and healing.

Course Evaluation:

(1) Seminar participation and Presentations 40%

- .5 for attendance to a max of 10
- 10 reading response assignments (out of a possible 12)

(2) Term Paper 60%. Due week 13 for those who present on week 12, and week 14 for those who present on week 13. The term paper will be developed throughout the course through the following stages:

Week 5, June 19th

(a) 5% hand in and present to the class a point form overview of Indigenous Peoples who will be the focus of your term paper. This overview should include (but need not be limited to) the following:

- demographic overview (age, gender, residence, income, employment, education)
* summary of health status and health indicators (mortality, moribidity, infant mortality, live expectancy, major illnesses)
* geographic location (map)
* outline of political organization and relations with nation state

15 minutes (maximum) including Q&A

**Week 7, July**

(b) 5% hand in and present to class a first draft of the question(s) you will develop and pursue in your term paper. This should be 1-2 pages, and should include (but need not be limited to):

* statement of question(s) (1/2 paragraph)
* outline of argument/development of question (1 page)
* anticipated conclusions (1/2 page)

10 minutes maximum + Q&A

Other students and instructors will review this draft with you and provide feedback.

**Week 9, July**

(c) 5% hand in and present to class a revised version of your paper outline that reflects feedback received, and a basic bibliography (1 page).

**Weeks 11 and 12, July**

(d) 5% hand in draft of term paper and present to class. 10 minutes maximum. Other students and instructors will provide feedback.

**Week 13, July:**

(e) 40% Hand in term paper. (12-15 pages maximum)

Penalties of one mark per day will apply to late submissions.

e.g. hand in on time: maximum possible mark is A+; one day late A, two days late A-, etc. etc.

**Required Readings:**

A package of articles will be available in library reserves at Belzberg Library.
THEORETICAL OVERVIEW 1: settler colonialism in theory and on film

Please read in the order suggested:


Assignment 1 due at the start of class #2, May 15th: Write a _ page (12 point font, double spaced, 1” margins) reader’s response to the four assigned readings. Describe what you found most interesting in the article and why you found it interesting. Hand in.

Study Group 1:
Read:

Assignment 2 due at the end of class #2, May 15th: After reading the Twemlow article about The Piano, formulate a question, or questions, that you hope to answer after viewing the film. _ page maximum. Hand in and present for class discussion.

Study Group 2:
Read:
Assignment 2 due at the end of class # 2, May 15th: After reading the Najita article about The Piano, formulate a question, or questions, that you hope to answer after viewing the film. _ page maximum. Hand in and present for class discussion.

Study Group 3:
Read:
Assignment 2 due at the end of class # 2, May 15th: After reading the Pihama article about The Piano, formulate a question, or questions, that you hope to answer after viewing the film. _ page maximum. Hand in and present for class discussion.
WEEK 3, MAY 22

NARRATIVES AND POLITICS


Study Group 1:
Compare and contrast Sahlins and Trask. Where do these authors agree and where do they differ? 2 pages.

Study Group 2:
Assignment 3: What are the central arguments in Gooding and in Kauanui? Where do these authors agree and where do they differ? 2 pages.

Study Group 3:
Assignment 3: Does Cornell’s description of “counter narratives” apply to Tall in Prazniak? Do you think Cornell’s analysis supports or challenges (or both) Tall in Prazniak? 2 pages.

WEEK 4 MAY 29

“RACE”? POLITICS AND IDENTITY

(1) Bateman, Rebecca (nd) Slaves or Seminoles? Distribute through email


Assignment 4: Study Groups 1, 2, 3:
Prepare a question (1/2-1 page) for the guest lecturer, Dr. R. Bateman.
This question should draw on issues and arguments raised in Cowlishaw, Harrison, Underwood and applied to Bateman’s work. Hand in at beginning of class.

Each study group will meet in class for 15 minutes to consolidate questions before Dr. Bateman’s talk.
KNOWLEDGE, POWER AND HEALING


Study Group 1:
Assignment 5: Write a 2-page reader’s response to the articles by Quintero, Brown and Vernon, answering the following question: what are the significant similarities and differences between the central concerns of the three articles? Why are they significant?

Study Group 2:
Assignment 5: Write a 2-page reader’s response to the Ward, Garrity and Holmes articles, answering the following question: what are the significant similarities and differences between the populations described in the three articles? Why are they significant?

Study Group 3:
Assignment 5: Write a 2-page reader’s response to the McEachern et al, Ward and Brown articles answering the following question: what are the points of linkage and
rupture between the two articles? What are the significant similarities and differences between the central concerns of the three articles? Why are they significant?

**WEEK 6 June 12**

**Neotribal capitalism**


*Available on line.*


*available on line*

**Study Groups 1, 2, 3:**

*Assignment 6:* Prepare 1 page critical annotation of each of readings 2-5. Hand in at start of class.

**Study Group 1:**

In class study group will meet for 30 minutes and discuss the following question and prepare a 5-minute oral presentation for the class, followed by a 5 minute Q & A session: Based on class lecture and discussions, readings and films, how would you explain the concept of “indigeneity” and the central debates surrounding its deployment? All members of each study group are responsible for doing the readings and participating in the discussion.

1 member of the study group will be responsible for reporting to the class.

1 member of the study group will be responsible for responding to questions from the class.
1 member of study group will be responsible for formulating and asking a question of another study group’s presentation that links the two.

**Study Group 2:**
In class study group will meet for 30 minutes and discuss the following question and prepare a 5-minute oral presentation for the class, followed by a 5 minute Q & A session: Based on class lecture and discussions, readings and films, how would you explain Rata’s theory of “neotribal capitalism” and Fitzsimon’s and Smith’s critique of it?

**Study Group 3:**
In class study group will meet for 30 minutes and discuss the following question and prepare a 5-minute oral presentation for the class, followed by a 5 minute Q & A session: Based on class lecture and discussions, readings and films, compare and contrast Moore’s thesis re: identity and difference and Rata’s advocacy of liberal individualism?

**Recommended reading (handout):**

**Study Group 1:**
Thornley, Davinia “White, Brown or “Coffee”? Revisioning Race in Tamahori’s *Once Were Warriors*. 22-36
*Assignment 7 to be handed in at the start of class # 7:* What are Thornley’s central critiques of the film *Once Were Warriors*? (1/2-1 page).
Study group discussion and presentation to class: After viewing the film, do you agree and/or disagree with her? What about and why?

**Study Group 2:**
Thomas, Nicholas (1993) “Gender and the Politics of tradition: alan duff’s once were warriors.” *Kunapipi*. 15(2):57-67
*Assignment 7 to be handed in at the start of class # 7:* What are Thomas’ central critiques of the novel *Once Were Warriors*? (1/2-1 page)
Study group discussion and presentation to class: After viewing the film, do you agree and/or disagree with him? What about and why?

**Film: Once Were Warriors**
NEOLIBERAL GOVERNMENTALITY AND HEALTH


available on line.

Study Group 1:
Assignment 8: Juxtaposing the Baird-Olsen and Ward article with the one written by Lisa Aldred, what do you think are the significant differences between the two movements the articles describe?

Study Group 2:
Assignment 8: Juxtaposing the Grace and Lum article with the one written by Sally Merry, what do you think are the significant linkages between the two articles?

Study Group 3:
Assignment 8: Juxtaposing the Merry article with the “Haka article” what do you think are the significant linkages between the two articles?

Film: In Whose Honour?
DECOLONIZATION OR RECOLONIZATION? Multiculturalism, recognition and critique


Study Groups 1, 2, 3
Assignment 9 to be handed in at the start of class, and revised version to be handed in at the start of class # 9: What are the key issues under debate between Povinelli and Moran? Between Povinelli and Frow/Morris? 3 pages.

FILM: 40,000 YEARS OF DREAMING: A CENTURY OF AUSTRALIAN CINEMA
NEOLIBERALISM, WELFARE REFORM AND CHILD WELFARE


Cuthbert, Denise (2000) “‘The doctor from the university is at the door’: methodological reflections on research with non-aboriginal adoptive and foster mothers of aboriginal children.” Resources for Feminist Research, Vol. 28(1/2):209-228

Available on line

Study Group 1:
Assignment 10: Write a reader’s response to Torpy and Cuthbert and Shaw, 1 page each. Write one paragraph describing the most significant linkage between the three articles.

Study Group 2:
Assignment 10: Write a reader’s response to Naples and Dobson, Cuthbert, and Brzuzy, 1 page each. Write one paragraph describing the most significant linkage between the three articles.

Study Group 3:
Assignment 10: Write a reader’s response to Stromwall, Pickering and Brown. Write one paragraph describing the most significant linkage between the three articles.

FILM: GENERATION 2000
The “New Capitalism” and natural resources


Study Group 1:
Assignment II: What are the similarities and differences in the central arguments put forward by Howitt et al and Johansen (1 page)? What do you think? (1/2 page)

Study Group 2:
Assignment II: What are the similarities and differences in the central arguments put forward by Howitt et al and Hanson (x2) (1 page)? What do you think? (1/2 page)

Study Group 3:
Assignment II: What are the similarities and differences in the central arguments put forward by Howitt et al and Dombrowski? (1 page)? What do you think? (1/2 page)

Film: ALASKA: THE LAST FRONTIER
Tourism, gaming and casinos


Additional readings and assignments TBA
Weeks 12 & 13 July 24, 31

presentations of term papers

TERM PAPERS DUE AUGUST 5/03
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING CRITICAL ANNOTATIONS

i.) Statement of the authors’ theses and central points of agreement or disagreement. You should be able to paraphrase each author’s main argument in 1 –3 sentences.

ii.) a brief summary of the evidence used to support the theses, i.e. types of evidence each of the authors use with examples (at least one) of each type (be careful to cite properly). For example, you might decide that the evidence generally takes the form of comparisons and contrasts of summarizing concepts using many authoritative references etc. to support the authors theses. Remember to include the end notes as part of your evidence summary.

1. Comparisons – i.e. similar to
2. Contrasts – i.e. different from
3. Case Studies (historical and current)
4. Historical Chronologies – tracing of events over a period of time
5. Summarizing Concepts – clarification of terms, definitions (e.g. “I favour the use of ‘visible minorities’ as I understand this term to refer to ….”)
6. Personal Experience, local knowledge – personal experiences and/or local knowledge held by the author or someone quoted by the author.
7. Authoritative References – inclusion of the names of historical (local or not) figures or books or articles that have been cited in the text [e.g. (Bannerjee, 1995:46)].
8. Quantitative Findings including Statistics – this includes any form of quantification (e.g. “half of the school”; “34% of the group,” etc.)

Thanks to John Bogardus, S/A 301, January, 2000 for sharing these guidelines.
Peer review workshop on assignments for week 7 & 9: Draft of research paper question and revised draft based on feedback

Assignment description: We are combining two assignments of Week 9 & 11

**Week 9, July 3**
(b) 5% hand in and present to class a first draft of the question(s) you will develop and pursue in your term paper. This should be 1-2 pages, and should include (but need not be limited to):
   * statement of question(s) (1/2 paragraph)
   * outline of argument/development of question (1 page)
   * anticipated conclusions (1/2 page)

10 minutes maximum + Q&A

Other students and instructors will review this draft with you and provide feedback.

**Week 10, July 10**
(c) 5% hand in and present to class a revised version of your paper outline that reflects feedback received, and a basic bibliography (1 page).

**Resources for thinking about how to approach peer review and response to one another’s papers.**

**Responding to writing: the think-aloud protocol approach**

The purpose of this approach to giving feedback is to let the writer hear how you, the reader, are making sense of their text. The notes below indicate the kinds of information and wordings that are helpful for the writer:

**Reporting on your reading experience...**

1. Give a running commentary of how you are constructing meaning as you read the draft:
   “From this I get the idea... now I should keep both these ideas in mind... This is really interesting point about globalization and the environment because.....
2. Whenever something makes you stop, whether it is sentence structure, a particular word, spelling, etc. report the stoppage.
   “I had to stop here”
   “I had to reread here”

3. When you have making connections between sections report this trouble.
   “I’m not sure of the connection you are making here …”
   “can you give me a bit more of an indication of what you were thinking …..”
   “I’m wondering if you mean this is the cause of this.”

4. Report your sense that you can’t remember where the question is going or what the point is...
   I thought you were exploring (…..) but it seems that the discussion is really becoming about this …..
   I’ve lost the thread of the question here -
   Is this new information …..

5. Not sure how the writer arrived at the conclusions: report the need for more connections, some re-stating of the problem, more evidence to get to the end, remember a good conclusion is not really an issue of agreement with the reader, but internal consistency with the test, so you might be looking at how they successfully made the argument, developed a position, showed an alternate perspective, brought together many points of view, etc.

**Responding to writing: organization and structure**

This outline suggests cues for use by the reader of the discussion paper that is intending to make connections with course readings and frame a position about a group of Indigenous Peoples and a focused issue for analysis. The cues are a reminder to the reader of what she can expect and thus look for as s/he reads.

**Responding to drafts…**

As an academic reader, report (resisting the urge to correct)

1) **the points in the draft where you**
   • Have trouble with the ideas, the wording or explanation of the question
   • Have trouble getting things to add up

II) **What do you notice** at specific locations in the draft and what are you looking for and expect to find as you read?

   1. **The focus of the topic/statement of question**
      *I use the topic to help me anticipate what to look for and then try to link important information suggested by the questions to various stages of the draft.*
2. The outline of the argument or development of the question:
   • Outline of the topic/site the writer has chosen to analyze, what is its significance, how does the question help to guide your interpretation of material from the various sources of the course readings.
   • Some indication of concepts/themes/frames from readings that will contribute to some aspect of the Big Issue/topic
   • Evidence of a critical position, beginning to explore many sides to the question, critical reflexivity in the approach, both/and analyses, use of personal perspective tied to analysis, the “so what factor” is beginning to emerge,

4. The conclusion
   • I need some confirmation of the main points of the discussion
   • I’m expecting the writer to relate main ideas to larger issues
   • I’m expecting some statements that limit the extent of the claims – so I can still accept their reasonableness even if I don’t agree

SA 388 Peer review worksheet Summer 2003

Peer review worksheet: Draft of question for the final paper

1. Read over the pages carefully, keeping in mind that this is the first stage of the research and the questions are being formulated from the readings. Be respectful of others’ work, ideas and effort, but take the role of editor seriously.

2. In the margin of each paper, use a wavy line to signal all of the places where you notice yourself wondering about wordings, where you don’t understand, or stop and have to re-read.

3. Can you identify the statement of the argument? Can you put it in your own words and see if the writer agrees.

4. Did the writer convey the significance of their question and tie it in with the readings i.e. the “so what factor?”

5. Can you begin to see how the argument will develop and what kind of findings might emerge? Are there connections that the writer has made that are unique or unanticipated - can you see any gaps in the reasoning – that an outside reader might need more sign-posts in order to make the same connections.

6. Bring along this peer review work sheet, your original draft of the question, and your revised outline and basic bibliography to the next class:
1. What is the general statement or question that will be explored in the project?

2. What is the central topic, issue, or theoretical framework that the paper addresses?

3. Which parts of the question need more elaboration, support and/or evidence?

4. Can you provide some feedback that you think the writer might use to improve the next draft?

5. What new knowledge have you learned from reading and talking with the writer?