

Professor Isobel M. Findlay
Department of Management and Marketing
College of Commerce
University of Saskatchewan
25 Campus Drive
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5A7
tel:(306) 966-2385; fax: (306) 966-2516; e-mail: findlay@commerce.usask.ca
Web page: <http://www.commerce.usask.ca/faculty/findlay/default.htm>

Re-imagining Co-operative Research Futures: Co-operation as Decolonizing Theory and Practice

Paper for Mapping Co-operative Studies in the New Millennium: Joint Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance Research Committee and the Canadian Association for Studies in Co-operatives, University of Victoria, 27-31 May 2003

Revised August 2003

Re-imagining Co-operative Research Futures: Co-operation as Decolonizing Theory and Practice

Theory is always a (necessary) detour on the way to something more important.
—Stuart Hall, “The West and the Rest.”

The Indigenous peoples who have survived European colonization and cognitive imperialism . . .
. are ready to imagine and unfold postcolonial orders and society.—Marie Battiste, Introduction,
Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision.

Introduction

In the context of globalization and resurgent neo-colonialism, re-imagining co-operative research futures is both an opportunity and an obligation. The opportunity is to develop Co-operative Studies in distinctive and transformative ways that will help in negotiating many of the challenges, changes, and

controversies facing people in Canada today. Though Canada's record in the United Nations Human Development Index is an enviable one,¹ the disparity in social health indicators between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal populations, for instance, threatens to erode capacities for community identification and collective action and hence the formation of social capital.² This growing disparity is especially remarkable in the light of increased levels of formal mainstream education supplementing traditional knowledge in Aboriginal communities.³ In the face of such challenges as globalization, resource depletion (as in the East and West Coast Canadian fisheries), and environmental degradation, Aboriginal identities and aspirations need to be better understood and appreciated in the interests of a renewed and shared culture of possibility, of co-operation as effective alternative to competition and co-optation alike. Re-imagined Co-operative Studies can help realize new forms of multilateral coalition, capacity-building, and cohesion. The obligation, then, is to enrich current debate by revaluing Aboriginal knowledge and heritage; decolonizing theory and practice; and recognizing the benefits of committed, collaborative, cross-disciplinary, and cross-cultural research. Drawing on cultural, postmodern, and postcolonial studies, this essay rethinks categories and concepts in order to re-imagine and reconstruct co-operative research futures—not a matter of dream teams, casino capitalism, or commodity futures, but of plural, revitalized social relations and realities, membership made meaningful, and “the co-operative advantage” restated in ways that might reverberate more thoroughly and for more of the co-operative community now.

Re-imagining co-operative research futures means investing in revisionary theory and history, recasting discursive practice, sharing the power to define, and remaking meanings and relationships. To be sure, this is easier said than done, but it is not hopelessly utopian. Re-imagining is not about the “free

play” of the imagination, about transcending the material conditions of possibility, but is always part of the scene of production. It is importantly connected to rationality—and to forms of reasoning that constitute something more than market rationality. In line with Benedict Anderson,⁴ I see no alternative to re-imagining as a means of creating discursive, cognitive, and social space to resist dominant frames. And theoretical reflection is a critical part of the journey to new spaces, concepts, and identities. To this end, this essay focuses on Co-operative Studies as mode of inquiry and object of study, as agent and object of decolonizing, and proposes as key change agents co-operative intellectuals, a version of Antonio Gramsci’s “organic intellectuals,”⁵ democratizing expertise and dispensing knowledge that is rooted in communities and ecologies. In pursuing a decolonizing agenda, the co-operative intellectual can promote notions of interdependence and develop membership as sustainable citizenship. New coalition of the committed is needed to address a globalizing logic that would desocialize and delimit, reducing membership to acts of consumerism or economic investment. The essay aims to rethink terms and assumptions by underlining the situation of knowledge--its locations in particular intellectual, institutional, social, and cultural settings--and reflecting critically on what “we” take for granted. If new terms spawned by postmodernity can be unsettling, they can also be enabling so long as reflexivity, fluidity, indeterminacy, the death of the subject, and the so-called end of big stories do not license an enfeebling relativism, acquiescence, or post-oppositional fatalism. Instead, postmodernism’s deconstructive, demystifying capacities and its revaluing of the local, the particular, and the different need to be harnessed to the reconstructive and remythologizing of postcolonial and cultural studies committed to agency, accountability, and action.⁶ Communication is, as James Carey argues, “a symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired, and transformed. . . .

Communication is . . . the basis of human friendship; it produces the social bonds . . . that tie men [sic] together and make associated life possible.”⁷ If things are not just the way they are, but are socially constructed, then we have the ability and obligation to change what humans and cultures created in the first place.

Postmodern, Postcolonial, and Cultural Studies

Paradigm shifts—like that from the modern to the postmodern—have a habit of leaving elite interpretation in control, shifting from one orthodoxy to another, leaving the “lowly” with little capacity to define issues or determine fates. In the recurrent shifts to an allegedly new world order, traditional medicine or Indigenous knowledge, women’s, working class, or other alternative—and feminized—ways of knowing somehow get lost in the shuffle. So too co-operatives are nowhere to be seen in postmodernity, although their liminal status should fit well with the border crossing of a liminal postmodern age, as Brett Fairbairn argues.⁸ Despite postmodern claims about the end of history, the nation state, and the liberal subject, big stories persist in favouring the mainstream or central interests and reproducing inequalities, while mediating and restructuring our understanding of natural and inevitable “realities” and our (in)capacities to act and intervene in changes (deregulation, monetarism, contingent labour, patterns of development and underdevelopment). And despite claims about the “free play” of the postmodern imagination daring to envisage things otherwise, even our imaginings do not entirely escape such dominant frames of reference.

While postmodernity denies centrality to *any* activity or movement and therefore denies its capacity to contest power deriving from centrality, the postcolonial refuses to give up the centre, historicizes its privileges, and renegotiates in the interests of redistributive justice centre-periphery

relations that modernity has defined to the benefit of First World capital and economic individualism.

The postcolonial is associated with multiple processes and products, diverse aspirations and applications, and a distinctive double gesture that marks a shift from the binary thinking of modernity (either/or) to the productive and processive logic of both/and—and with such related outcomes as political emancipation, cultural renewal, and justice for all. What postmodernity does is mistake the exposure of pretensions to centrality for the achievement of democratic change and expanded access to economic levers. Where the postmodern dissolves pretension and promotes a permissive cultural carnival, the postcolonial, an agent of new solidarities, is principled and persistent in its commitment to agency, change, and enabling collective capacities.

If the colonial project depended massively on cultural capital at home and abroad, on the diffusion of Western binary thinking as the natural and neutral way of mapping and thus managing the world, attending to such cultural mediation has in recent decades proven a powerful means of rethinking discursive, conceptual, and other categories, intervening so as to open up new imaginary, institutional, social, political, and economic spaces. Cultural studies, refusing traditional distinctions between high and low culture, the centre and periphery, investigates social, economic, and political power structures that shape phenomena and endow them with meanings, value, and status. It is colonial presumption that these interdisciplinary initiatives probe, exposing what we have taken for granted, showing that the language we use, the stories we hear and retell, and the institutions (including educational ones) we inhabit are never neutral but materially shape how we experience and understand our identities and realities. They have shown too how expert and increasingly professional disciplinary and other knowledge has legitimated structures of authority by undermining the legitimacy of local, experiential or

cultural knowledge. Such dominating structures of authority support and supplement military, economic, political, and legal means of persuading us that the way things are is natural and inevitable and could not—even should not--be otherwise. Postcolonial writers revalue differences in positive terms to reconstruct meanings and identities and demystify power structures in order to remythologize who we are and would like to be.

If postmodern thinkers have often focussed on European intellectual history and practice and been content to do no more than expose connections between language and power, knowledge and legitimacy, postcolonial theory has been a productive tool for the global redistribution of expertise, for liberating thinking and the voices and stories of those so long silenced within Western structures and canons of value. Postcolonial writers have been concerned to “speak back,” “write back,” or “research back” as subjects and not objects, as Maori scholar Linda Smith recommends, “re-centring” Indigenous identity and experience and “reclaiming history” to decolonize and “transform history into justice” with a view to “rewriting and *rerighting*” the position of Indigenous peoples.⁹ If the first phase of the postcolonial focused on territoriality and political independence of new or reconfigured nation states after World War II, the current phase is preoccupied with the intersecting domains of the social, cultural, and economic as well as with globalization and cyber-community and the dangers of these latter repeating the claims of discovery and empty territory (or *terra nullius*) to justify neo-colonial infractions. The postcolonial is an open forum that builds on connections as more than accident or entrenched illusion; it rehabilitates tradition and history while recognizing the temptations and dangers they represent as well as the stories vital to a sense of belonging and the kinds of formal and informal membership that attend it.

Globalization and Neo-Liberalism

Globalization, according to Zygmunt Bauman, is one of those vogue terms that pretend to a common sense transparency that belies their increasing opacity: “The more numerous are the orthodox truths they elbow out and supplant, the faster they turn into no-questions-asked canons.” From Bauman’s point of view, globalization is a term that “divides as much as it unites—the causes of division being identical with those which promote the uniformity of the globe.” It is a process whereby business, finance, and information become global, but freedom is unequally distributed across a globe where “localities are losing their meaning-generating and meaning-negotiating capacity” in the face of new canons of meaning-making and a new breed of absentee landlords.¹⁰ And, as international lawyer Amy Chua argues, the export of free markets as conduit to democracy destabilizes developing countries and induces ethnic conflict, bringing a politics with profound consequences for notions of membership in society. And in applying a standard of absolutely unencumbered economic activity, the First World is imposing standards it itself never had to meet.¹¹ Talking about the “Public Good” at an International Humanities Forum, Paul Martin, current candidate for leadership of the Liberal Party of Canada (and prime minister in waiting), has warned of the dangers of globalization becoming “another name for aggravated inequality.”¹² In the economic rationalism of neo-liberalism, the extension of the rights and freedoms of the market have indeed eroded human rights, including the United Nations 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development, on the right of people to be both participants and beneficiaries of development—and with especially devastating effects on women, children, and Indigenous peoples, their lands, and resources across the globe.¹³ Maori scholar Graham Hingangaroa Smith, for example, emphasizes “new forms of colonization” in the free-market economics of New Zealand that have left

Maori the ““worst off” group in New Zealand society,” while the “new free-market economy simply privileges the already privileged,” promotes the “competitive individual” and “consumer sovereignty,” and threatens a people whose “culture is centred on the values of sharing and cooperation that are embedded in tribal (*iwi*) and extended family (*whanau*) structures and responsibilities.”¹⁴

At a time when dissent is demonized and discourse impoverished inside and outside universities, the co-operative intellectual is especially vital. And it is to new kinds of intellectual and renewed co-operation that French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu turns in his *Acts of Resistance*. For Bourdieu, the variously described “collective intellectual,” “critical intellectual,” or “committed intellectual,” help to “[win] back democracy from technocracy” not by neglecting but by unpacking cultural mediations--the discursive production of the naturalized or self-evident economic and other necessities--and hence neutralizing the effects of such forbidding fatalism.¹⁵ Collective intellectuals can neutralize mainstream privilege and presumption by enriching civil society and countering the hegemonic utterances of what Bourdieu calls “the new intellectuals” (akin to Gramsci’s “traditional intellectuals”) whose depleted discourse and preemptive strikes have obliterated the “public” in “the public good” in the name of the “minimal state” and facilitated a “return to individualism” that makes it all too easy to assign blame to the victims of industrial, social, political, and financial disasters. In recovering the political and legal choices that have severed the economic from the social and cultural, Bourdieu’s collective intellectuals expose the “justificatory myth” of “globalization” acting as “the main weapon in the battles against the gains of the welfare state” as well as neo-liberalism’s “very smart and very modern repackaging of the oldest ideas of the oldest capitalists” while dismissing “progressive thought and action as archaic”—a fate all too familiar to co-operators and Aboriginal peoples.¹⁶

To counter globalizing economic logic that sees undue privilege or outmoded past in forms of social security, Bourdieu proposes “a new” and “critical internationalism” and “*an economics of happiness*” committed to a more inclusive and humane cost-benefit calculus. Determined not to substitute eurocentrism for “the wounded nationalisms of the old imperial nations,” Bourdieu looks to collective, committed, and critical intellectuals to fight “authority effect” with “authority effect” and draw on “collective research, interdisciplinary and international,” while devising new communications between academics and activists to create the conditions for effective mobilization without mystification. From Bourdieu’s point of view, “Social cohesion is as important a goal as stable exchange rates and social harmonization is the precondition for the success of a genuine monetary union.”¹⁷

Like John Stuart Mill in similarly challenging conditions in nineteenth-century England, looking to co-operatives as “school[s] of the social sympathies and the practical intelligence,”¹⁸ Bourdieu turns in the final chapter of his book to the only institutions he thinks capable of effecting change. In his relentless struggle against modes of domination such as the casualization of labour and the apparent unanimity deriving from the symbolic force of dominant discourse that underpins “*flexploitation*”--the “*insecurity-inducing strategies*” not of an “*economic inevitability*,” but of a “*political will*”-- Bourdieu identifies co-operatives among the only institutions--from the nation-state to “unions, societies and cooperatives”--capable of “obstructing the logic of the pure market” and mobilizing for change.¹⁹

Interestingly, political theorists Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in the concluding chapter of their *Empire* (2000) likewise look to cooperation as a means of organizing political space against Empire in its currently globalizing character:

As in all innovative processes, the mode of production that arises is posed against the conditions

from which it has to be liberated. The mode of production of the multitude is posed against exploitation in the name of labor, against property in the name of cooperation, and against corruption in the name of freedom. It self-valorizes bodies in labor, reappropriates productive intelligence through cooperation, and transforms existence into freedom. The history of class composition and the history of labor militancy demonstrates the matrix of these ever new yet determinate reconfigurations of self-valorization, cooperation, and political self-organization as an effective social project.²⁰

Importantly for Hardt and Negri, militant figures—something like the “militant agitator of the Industrial Workers of the World”—are educated through organizing: “Militants resist imperial command in a creative way. In other words, resistance is linked immediately with a constitutive investment in the biopolitical realm and to the formation of cooperative apparatuses of production and community.” Militancy “knows only an inside, a vital and ineluctable participation in the set of social structures, with no possibility of transcending them. This inside is the productive cooperation of mass intellectuality and affective networks, the productivity of postmodern biopolitics. This militancy makes resistance into counterpower and makes rebellion into a project of love. . . . This is a revolution that no power will control.”²¹ Here, the Foucauldian micro-biopolitics with which *Empire* begins²² is given a shot of (and at) a Du Boisian social intelligence—“intelligent co-operation” for the “common good”²³--so as to redeem it from care of the fractured self and put it to work in social movements capable of achieving reasonable and desirable change beyond the ken of market rationality.

Neo-Colonialism: Back in Indian Country

And new coalitions for change are surely needed in the context of corporate appropriations of

the discourses of co-operation in efforts to retrieve public trust lost to the likes of Enron, Andersen, and WorldCom and of the neo-colonialism of the Canadian government's First Nations Governance Act (Bill C-7). Federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Robert Nault claims to "firmly believe" that "the institutions of good governance" can "close the gap" and allow for the successful participation of First Nations young people in "our economy."²⁴ Nault's Governance Act promises sweeping changes to the Indian Act with a view to enhancing financial accountability at the band level, while redirecting federal funding away from "overly political" organizations like the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), making Aboriginal governance more "democratic," and using education to move the Aboriginal agenda away from land claims and restitution for residential schooling to economic prosperity via participation in "mainstream" Canadian society. In a 6 May 2003 statement, Nault trivializes "pockets of resistance," while claiming that the initiative "really arises from the aspirations of many First Nations people," that the government relationship with "Grand Chief Matthew Coon Come" is not a measure of its relationship with First Nations people, and that "the AFN leadership is clearly out of synch with those of the people for whom they claim to speak." What is more, "Many First Nations people are too frightened to speak of their support of the Bill for fear of reprisals." Nault presumes to expose the AFN position "for what it is: an aggressive lobby campaign . . . with an objective of maintaining the status quo for [the Chiefs'] own power base."²⁵

For his part, former Grand Chief Matthew Coon Come responds to media reports of the Minister spying on AFN activities:

The Minister of Indian Affairs has a duty as an agent of the Crown to act in the best interests of First Nations and yet here he is using the power of his office to spy on us. . . . The Minister is

acting like we're enemies of the state when in fact we're trying to tell him what our people want and don't want. He has cut our budget, refused to meet with us and now we find out he's spying on us. Where's his accountability? Where's his transparency? The Prime Minister must recognize he has a rogue Minister who is behaving unethically and contrary to his fiduciary duty. Canadians should not tolerate this kind of conduct and the Prime Minister should step in and take corrective measures.²⁶

Despite Nault's claims to be in touch with First Nations aspirations, according to the AFN web site, of the 201 witnesses that testified before the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs Public Hearings, 191 were opposed and only 10 supported it. In the current case as in the past, for Aboriginal peoples, culture/state relations have been subsumed within Eurocentric understandings and applications of both terms, making Aboriginal peoples virtual or actual wards of the state.

And though the Canadian judiciary has in a series of landmark cases attempted to decolonize the law, they have done so without ever confronting the history of colonialism and the consequent constitutional inequality of Aboriginal peoples in Canada as itself the source of the "unbridgeable cultural difference" that is "codified in western law and in the popular imagination."²⁷ Deferring to mainstream expertise, the Courts reproduce old polarities and taxonomies of difference, attending to a singular and stable "Aboriginal perspective" that does little justice to the diversity of Aboriginal peoples. In the process, the law reproduces Aboriginal peoples as "the problem" while deflecting attention from persistently colonial legal thinking. Instead of addressing a legal system imposed on Aboriginal peoples without consultation far less consent, the Court's reticence about colonial history produces a public backlash facilitated by media simplifications about equality before the law, "race-based prison discount,"

“[a]n incomprehensible law, with judges turning cartwheels to explain it,” and talk of courts being “soft on native offenders” and “bias” that “does no favours for faith in the justice system.”²⁸

In the context of such public ignorance and backlash, it is especially unfortunate that in the 2002 Throne speech, the government is still working within “existing pilot programs” to “close the gap in life chances between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians” and reintroducing “legislation to strengthen First Nations governance institutions” rather than more creatively re-imagining new relationships so as to give real meaning to Canada’s “unique model of citizenship, based simultaneously on diversity and mutual responsibility.”²⁹ Thus the government mediates its power and eschews its own responsibilities while giving the public permission not to know, to forget the colonial legacy of the “civilizing” mission of education, religion, and the law. At the same time as Canada’s Aboriginal peoples face such neo-colonial intervention and backlash, empire is itself being recuperated in mainstream British history and projected onto the United States whose status as an anti-imperialist republic seems more of a historical memory than a current reality.³⁰

The co-operative intellectual can under the aegis of the Indigenous humanities “research back,” as Linda Smith advises,³¹ resist common sense constructions of essential and unbridgeable cultural differences dividing peoples, recover relations of solidarity, and revitalise the co-operative relations among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples that characterized the early years of contact. The Haudenosaunee Confederacy represent a view of difference that challenges colonial racist stereotypes:

[W]hen your ancestors came to our shores, after living with them for a few years, observing them, our ancestors came to the conclusion that we could live together in the same way inside the circle. . . . So our leaders at that time, along with your leaders, sat down for many years to try to

work out a solution. This is what they came up with. We call it Gus-Wen-Tah, or the two-row wampum belt. It is on a bed of white wampum, which symbolizes the purity of the agreement . . . They said there will be three beads of wampum separating the two, and they will symbolize peace, friendship, and respect.³²

But the promise of “peace, friendship, and respect” remained unfulfilled before the imposition of colonial institutions such as the Indian Act that produced new discourses and relations of dependence, excluding Aboriginal peoples from active participation in Canadian nation-building financed by Aboriginal land, labour, and resources.³³ It is here that the co-operative intellectual working with the Indigenous humanities can make a difference.³⁴

Indigenous humanities: A Co-operative Endeavour

Let me clarify what we mean by the Indigenous humanities. The very unfamiliarity of the Indigenous humanities as term and practice—a strategic catachresis, category mistake, or misnaming such as Gayatri Spivak welcomes as the limit of authority and the place of progressive change³⁵--unsettles taken-for-granted mainstream thinking, routines, and presumptions about what counts for knowledge and expertise. In the name of the Indigenous humanities, new coalitions and capacity-building within and beyond the Native Law Centre of Canada, the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, the colleges of Law, Commerce, Arts and Science, and Education at the University of Saskatchewan take decolonizing as their objective and Indigenous issues as a major focus.

These initiatives were born out of the frustration of a disciplinary diaspora that has found welcoming interdisciplinary spaces within a persistently colonial university mainstream that continues to know what is best for Aboriginal peoples. While favouring “native-newcomer” relations as the focus of

research, the administrative mainstream worries about making education accessible to Aboriginal peoples without considering how access can be made meaningful, how the institution might change, or how transformative Indigenous knowledge or capacity might be. So my university and other mainstream institutions remain committed to the discourse of “the problem,” preserving insider expertise, while deferring indefinitely opportunities for real change.³⁶

Workers in the Indigenous humanities, guided by Indigenous academics drawing on Indigenous knowledge and developing new methodologies to decolonize ideas, individuals, and institutions, are committed to perceptual, attitudinal, intellectual, social, and other change. The work is about redefining/redeeming expert knowledge, making inquiry more sociable and accountable, and giving more complex accounting of identities and institutions. The Indigenous humanities represent both theory and practice, a way of putting theory to work in the world, and of transforming our intellectual and imaginative ecologies. The Indigenous humanities represent a creative way of communicating and locating ourselves thoughtfully and spiritually in relation to each other, to the ecology we share, and to forces beyond our control. While laying claim to the rigour and authority of the traditional humanities, the collaborative, cross-cultural, and cross-disciplinary practices of the Indigenous humanities resist persistent paternalism and resurgent neo-colonialism. Using, as it were, the master’s tools to dismantle the master’s house,³⁷ we refuse to relinquish these tools to dominant interests, but reshape and redeploy them to promote co-operatives for transformative ends and collective benefit. We reinterpret to expose the foundational violences of the traditional humanities, their complicity in acts of colonization and co-optation, and unpack a “commitment to humanism” and equality that “co-exists” with a “material practice of inequality” and exposing the “ideologies of justification. . . constructed in law, government, imagination,

and popular culture.”³⁸ We hold mainstream institutions to account by rereading literary, legal, and historical canons; re-centring and revaluing Aboriginal knowledge and heritage as well as local, experiential, and cultural knowledge; attending to multiple and conflicted histories and critical geographies; respecting the authority of the elders and educators, court workers as well as cultural workers; while withholding *undue* deference to male authorities of any culture.

In working together in the Indigenous humanities, we acknowledge that we all have a stake in dismantling colonial structures that have misshaped us all. Decolonizing is important for all of us because colonialism is what has taught us negative strategies of difference, habits of hierarchy and deference, and patterns of commodifying and compartmentalizing that rationalize the most irrational of practices.³⁹ As a result, we share the obligation to resist cults of (postmodern and other) impossibilities and promote possibilities of thinking and dreaming otherwise, of remythologizing who we are and would like to be.

The Indigenous humanities are committed to “sharing the definitional power,” as Mohawk scholar Patricia Monture-Angus recommends,⁴⁰ and to recirculating in multiple sites the historical and cultural archive, including findings of authoritative Royal Commissions, especially the multi-volume Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). In the wake of failed constitutional efforts among Canada’s first ministers to give meaning to the nature and scope of the 1982 constitutional affirmation of Aboriginal and treaty rights, RCAP aimed to fulfil the promise of Canadian federation and to realise constitutional and treaty principles and goals. A persistent irony is that Aboriginal knowledge and resources are often taken to be either too strange or sketchy to be taken seriously, or too compendious to be useful. Indeed, mainstream common sense is infinitely flexible in its capacity to discount alternative knowledge as political

advocacy or special pleading, to distance itself from and to deny the power of evidence of its own complicity and culpability, to define and hence defend the status quo. As then National Chief Coon Come argues, RCAP is a report that has been “buried and ignored by the government of Canada,” even though its “findings have never been discredited. Never impeached. Never refuted.”⁴¹

Co-operative Intellectuals

As key change agents, co-operative intellectuals (like their nineteenth-century precursors facing globalizing industrialization and imperialism, and other forms of political and socio-economic restructuring) are born in resistance to domination, to persistent patterns of inequity and insecurity. Faced with the so-called Condition of England--extreme disparities in power and wealth--as well as new international trade policies and the triumphalism of the World Fair at Crystal Palace (1851) promising progress for the masses, the Rochdale Pioneers reasserted community values, producing new or renewed models of intellectual, social, political, and economic association and action. Unlike Gramsci’s “traditional intellectual” whose distance, disinterest, and detachment are the markers and modalities of effective commentary, the co-operative intellectual--connected, committed, collaborative--brings to bear situated knowledge of multiple realities, sustaining co-operative development by connecting with community aspirations, powers, and human and other resources. It is always a view from somewhere, the work to hand for some people. The co-operative intellectual builds on the legacy of Gramsci’s “organic intellectual” whose “general practical activity” is “perpetually innovating the physical and social world, [and becoming] a new and integral conception of the world.”⁴² Operating in multiple locations, co-operative intellectuals renegotiate centre/periphery and theory/practice relations, for instance, to

sustain co-operative compatibilities instead of the unexamined hierarchies of elite expertise.⁴³ There is power in marginality too and this power can best be exercised co-operatively on the basis of a shared experience of disadvantage.

By naming the co-operative intellectual as both already existing and yet to be, I mean to recognize and respect that which modernity inclined to hide: the social intelligence rooted in communities and their ecologies. I mean to galvanize the far-reaching consequences of such intelligence for community education and action, and for interrelationships that sustain enterprise.⁴⁴ If co-operative sharing of the power to define can be a critical strategy, we need also to confront co-operative roles in a colonial past and ongoing present. For that decolonizing work, we need a critical mass of co-operative intellectuals committed to changing the way we do business inside and outside the academy and the co-operative movement. And that means attending to co-operative members and managers, to the elders, storytellers, professional, practising, and academic teachers (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal).

Postcolonial Co-operative Futures

In asserting the role of the co-operative intellectual and a place for co-operative curriculum and research within schools and universities,⁴⁵ we aim to expand what counts for academic and other value and make cognitive space for re-imagining postcolonial co-operative futures. Such futures will facilitate sustainable Aboriginal community economic development, testing (limited) partnerships between public and private sectors, refusing to uncouple excellence from equity, economic from social and cultural values, while learning from and responding to students and to the Plains Cree Elders' claim that "Education is our buffalo." The Elders challenge us to recognize Indigenous authority sustained by the

knowledge of prior Aboriginal occupancy and the laws given by the Creator whose will was, according to Elder Jacob Bill, “that the White man would come here to live with us, . . . collectively to benefit from the bounty of Mother Earth for all time to come”:

Our ancestors spent their lifetime studying, meditating, and living the way of life required to understand those traditions, teachings, and laws in which the treaties are rooted. . . . Through [their connectedness with Mother Earth], they received the conceptual knowledge they required and the capacity to verbalize and describe the many blessings bestowed on them by the Creator. They were meticulous in following the disciplines, processes, and procedures required for such an endeavour, says Elder Norman Sunchild.⁴⁶

They ask us to remember our responsibilities for a colonial encounter that cost Aboriginal peoples dearly—to remember the territorial confinement, depleted resources, dwindling Aboriginal peoples, and the fettering of the free-ranging buffalo. The Elders challenge us to learn from a history of dependency nourished by respect, responsible use, and good government entailed in relational understandings of humans and their environment--“All my relations;” or *miyowicehtowin*—having or possessing good relations; the laws concerning good relations.⁴⁷

They challenge us to remember that treaties, like trade, were co-operative and to understand why education was enshrined as a treaty right—as a source of sustainability and a hope for agency in the reconstruction of potentially postcolonial futures. The hope is that we can learn together and learn from one another to resist past paternalisms and to produce a sustainable knowledge economy for all of us—one that does not exploit and commodify Aboriginal knowledge. We can do so by rethinking and

refiguring the terms co-operatives live by—and especially concepts of self-help, independence, and democracy—so as to remedy discursive and democratic deficits, rename for new people and times, and renew the “hard, critical edge” of “the social.”⁴⁸

We can learn from James (Sakej) Youngblood Henderson challenging us to “restructure and rethink Canada” so as to “rediscover and unleash the economic potential of treaty economy” or from Marie Battiste who reminds us “we are all marinated in Eurocentrism,” while offering the postcolonial as “an act of hope.”⁴⁹ Or John Borrows’ *Recovering Canada*, making “a declaration of interdependence” and rehearsing the Trickster’s “perspective that falls outside the conventional structure of legal argument and exposes its hidden cultural (dis)order.”⁵⁰ Or Georges Erasmus in his 2002 Lafontaine-Baldwin Lecture reframing the terms of intercultural discourse to renew “relationship between aboriginal and non-aboriginal peoples in Canada” in “an ongoing act of imagination, fuelled by stories of who we are.” To renew the relationship, Erasmus recommends three discursive shifts: “from aboriginal rights to relationship between peoples; from crying needs to vigorous capacity; from individual citizenship to nations within the nation state.” In this message, Erasmus repeats the message of RCAP. Instead of polls, surveys, “unilateral declarations,” or coercive definitions, we need stories and symbols that will fire the imagination to see us, as in the two-row wampum belt, “travelling together on the river of life.” Then we might focus not on Aboriginal neediness but on Aboriginal capacity and achievement in stories of Canada that we might tell to provide for the world “a model of peace and friendship between peoples.”⁵¹

Postcolonial co-operative futures can be produced only co-operatively, building on local

knowledge and practice as the next stage of the open forum that contests economic, social, cultural, and other forms of Marie Battiste's "cognitive imperialism." Re-imagining co-operative futures does not start with *tabula rasa* or *terra nullius*. The territory is already densely and widely populated by co-operative entities and activities still undervalued or actively elided by mainstream history and education. The work of Arctic Co-ops Ltd. and La Fédération des coopératives du Nouveau Quebec, poptel.coop, the Canadian Co-operative Association, the International Co-operative Alliance, Mondragón in Spain, or centres in Saskatchewan, British Columbia, and Wisconsin is, in the current juncture, a commitment to re-imagining. It is a re-imagining as remedy for the "cognitive imperialism" or dominant market mindset that presses some co-operatives desperately to keep up with "progress" and act like imperious corporations rather than democratic co-operatives with an appropriate sense of commitment to economic activity with values added. It is a re-imagining not of a homogenized world, a one-worldism from an elite perspective, or a world neatly segmented as First, Second, Third, and so on. It is a re-imagining sustained by James Clifford's claim that identity is "a politics rather than an inheritance."⁵²

As my linking of cognitive imperialism and free market dogma attests, there is a shared experience of exploitation and obstruction by First World underclasses and colonized Indigenous populations and hence also the need and opportunity to share concepts and practices across apparently unconnected sites in the so-called First and Third World. What we need is a re-imagining of a world constituted by difference and deeply in need of co-operative intellectuals and W.E. B. Du Bois' "intelligent co-operation" as the most fully shared definition of the knowledge economy. In 1930s United

States Du Bois spoke for and from the margins, galvanizing group identity in calling African Americans “to give the world an example of intelligent cooperation” so that in “the new industrial commonwealth,” they might take their places as “an experienced people and not again be left on the outside as mere beggars.” In the role of “intelligent consumers,” they might become “pioneer servants of the common good . . . enter[ing] the new city as men [sic] and not mules.”⁵³

The recentring of several margins together—economic, colonial, racial; co-operatives, Indigenous peoples, emancipated slaves, and similar liberationist movements—creates centrality of another sort. It can and should be a rhizomatic, non-hierarchical place of collaboration; a set of respectful emergent practices that decolonize co-operation while exposing and to some extent expunging the ultra-individualism and conspiratorial collectivism on which colonialism and neo-colonialism so heavily depend and which they so ruthlessly defend. Working together, underlining the possible, and breaking down unproductive barriers, we might agree on terms that will build cohesiveness: Indigenous “interdependence” or African American notions of “community help” as “inter- and intracommunity co-operation” rather than “self-help,” for instance.⁵⁴ We might remember too Angela Harris’s caution that “differences are always relational rather than inherent” and that “wholeness and commonality are acts of will and creativity, rather than passive discovery.”⁵⁵ Then we might better re-imagine what Stuart Hall calls “commonness in difference.” In globalization as a “system for conforming difference rather than a synonym for the obliteration of all differences,” emergent counter-formations produce a “transformed political logic” and “pluralization of language.” So Hall affirms his own “Optimism of the intellect, pessimism of the will” in a striking reworking of Gramsci’s “pessimism of the intellect/optimism of the will.”⁵⁶ Like Hall we might work together to

recast the mantras of the mainstream and squeeze new meanings out of cliché for those whose commitment to change is informed by but not disabled by a recognition of obstacles to change. If “pessimism of the will” suggests the internalizing of defeat in ways ideology promotes and hegemony requires, “optimism of the intellect” claims an entitlement that comes with the searching scrutiny of the status and practice of market rationality. Thus we might retrieve reason for change and for co-operative intellectuals and Du Boisian “intelligent cooperation” to punctuate acquiescence to the current state of affairs. Saskatchewan needs you, and you might even need us, for such transformation!

Endnotes

1. In 2001 Canada slipped to third from first place for the first time in seven years; in 2003, Canada slipped again—this time to eighth place. See United Nations website at <http://www.undp.org/hdr2003/> (Accessed 7 August 2003). Still, the January 2001 report of the Strategic Research and Analysis and the Social Cohesion Network, *Holding the Centre: What We Know about Social Cohesion*, points out that if the UN Human Development Index were applied to the Aboriginal population, “they would rank 48th in the world behind Panama” (10). See Social Cohesion website at <http://www.geog.queensu.ca/soco/pdf/sra-558-dck-e.pdf>. On a similar pattern of inequity in New Zealand, see Graham Hingangaroa Smith, “Protecting and Respecting Indigenous Knowledge,” in Marie Battiste, ed., *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2000), 209-24. And Jessica Gordon Nehbhard registers such inequities in the African American community where “unemployment has remained at least twice the white level, regardless of the level of education or age, during recessions as well as economic booms. White annual income remains higher than Black, at every level of education, even though the education gap between Blacks and whites has narrowed to almost no difference between the two groups.” See her “Entering the New City as Men and Women, Not Mules,” forthcoming in Lewis Randolph and Gayle Tate, ed., *The Urban Black Community*.

2. On “social capital” and its important socio-economic benefits for an efficient society, see Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000). For a version of social capital that attends to power as resource and to the reproduction of inequalities, see Pierre Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” in John Richardson, ed., *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (Westpoint, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986), 241-58.

3. See Census Canada 2001 education statistics released March 2003 at Statistics Canada website <http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/analytic/companion/educ/canada.cfm> . Accessed 7 August 2003.

4. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991).

5. “The Intellectuals,” in Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, ed. and trans., *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 5-23.

6. On postmodernism, see Terry Eagleton, *The Illusions of Postmodernism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996). On current ideological habits of turning “injustice into an inevitability,” see John Ralston Saul, *The Doubter’s Companion: A Dictionary of Aggressive Common Sense* (Toronto: Penguin, 1995). See also Linda McQuaig, *The Cult of Impotence: Selling the Myth of Powerlessness in the Global Economy* (Toronto: Viking, 1998) and Janice Gross Stein, *The Cult of Efficiency* (Toronto: Anansi, 2001). For a compelling mapping of the postcolonial, see the multicultural, multidisciplinary, and multi-volume Diana Brydon, ed., *Postcolonialism: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*. 5

vols. (London and New York: Routledge, 2000). On cultural studies as “pragmatic, strategic, and self-reflective” set of oppositional practices “open to unexpected, unimagined, even uninvited possibilities” and associated in the British tradition with recovering working-class culture and history and understanding the processes of modernity (2-5), see Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, ed., *Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

7. *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 22-23.

8. See his “Communications, Culture, and Co-operatives: Liminal Organizations in a Liminal Age,” paper presented at “Mapping Co-operative Studies in the New Millennium: A Joint Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance Research Committee and the Canadian Association for Studies in Co-operation,” University of Victoria, Canada, 27-31 May 2003.

9. See Linda Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 1999, especially 28-35 and 142-61.

10. Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1998), 1-3.

11. Amy Chua, *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability* (New York: Doubleday, 2003).

12. “The Public Good,” address to International Humanities Forum: Breakfast on Campus, The Inaugural Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada, University of Ottawa, 2 June 1998.

13. On the relationship between corporate success and human rights, see Stuart Rees and Shelley Wright, ed., *Human Rights, Corporate Responsibility: A Dialogue* (Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press, 2000).

14. Smith, “Protecting and Respecting Indigenous Knowledge,” 215-16.

15. Richard Nice, trans., *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market* (New York: The New Press, 1998), vii-ix, 8, 44, 26-29. Elsewhere, Bourdieu has commended the “specific intellectual” capable of forging new relations between theory and practice within her “particular domain of knowledge” by using her authority to comment critically on its conditions of possibility as well as the conditions of possibility for rationality and thus able to devise the means of collective action (667). See his *Universal Corporatism: The Role of the Intellectuals in the Modern World*, trans. Gisèle Shapiro. *Poetics Today* 12 (1991): 655-69.

16. Bourdieu, *Acts*, 6-7; 31-35. For an important corrective to the history of condescension experienced by the co-operative movement in mainstream history, its framing as “a way of making ends meet rather than a way of changing society” (7), see Peter Gurney, *Co-operative Culture and the Politics of Consumption in England, 1870-1930* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

17. *Acts*, 40-67.

18. Quoted in Finn Age Ekelund, *The Property of the Common: Justifying Co-operative Activity*. Occasional Paper 87.02 (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1987), 55.

19. Bourdieu, *Acts*, 85-96.

20. *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), 408-09.

21. *Empire*, 412-13.

22. *Empire*, 22-41.

23. "Where do we go from here?" An Address delivered at the Rosenwald Economic Conference, Washington, BC, May 1933. Reprinted in Andrew G. Paschal, ed. *A W.E.B. Du Bois Reader* (New York: Collier Books, 1971), 146-63.

24. Quoted in Julian Beltrame, "Unfinished Business: Chretien promises one last time to help Aboriginals." *Macleans* 14 October 2002.

25. "Government Pursuit of First Nations Governance Act." Statement by Robert Nault, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 6 May 2003. Communities First: First Nations Governance. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada website http://gpn-fng.ainc.gc.ca/NR_PurFNGM6_e.html. Accessed 15 July 2003.

26. Assembly of First Nations. "Update on Federal Government's Three First Nations Bills, 16 June 2003. Assembly of First Nations website.

<http://www.afn.ca/Legislation%20Info/UpdateThreeFirstNationsBills.htm>. Accessed 15 July 2003.

27. Dara Culhane, *The Pleasure of the Crown: Anthropology, Law and First Nations* (Burnaby, BC: Talonbooks, 1998), 44. Important Supreme Court of Canada decisions that aim to give meaning to constitutional protections afforded Aboriginal rights and title include: *Nowegijick v. The Queen* [1983] 1 SCR 29, [1983] 2 CNLR 89; *R. v. Sparrow* [1990] 1 SCR 1075, 3 CNLR 160; *R. v. Badger* [1996] 1 SCR 771; *R v Van der Peet* [1996] 2 SCR 507, 4 CNLR 177; http://www.sft-ddt.gc.ca/hnav/hnav07_e.htm *Delgamuukw v British Columbia* [1997] 3 SCR 1010; *R. v. Gladue* [1999] 1 SCR 688, 171 DLR (4th) 385, 2 CNLR 252; *R. v. Marshall* [1999] 3 SCR 456, 177 DLR (4th) 513 [*Marshall No. 1*]; *R. v. Marshall* [1999] 3 SCR 533, 179 DLR (4th) 193 [*Marshall No. 2*].

28. See "Race-based prison discount," *Chatham Daily News* 21 February 2003: 4; "A messy prescription for native offenders," *Globe and Mail* 12 August 2002: A12. For a fuller discussion of efforts to decolonize Canadian law, see Isobel M. Findlay, "Working for Postcolonial Legal Studies: Working with the Indigenous Humanities, Special issue on Postcolonial Legal Studies, ed. W. Wesley

Pue, *Law, Social Justice and Global Development* 2003-1.

<http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/global/issue/2003-1/findlay.htm><http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/global/issue/2003-1/findlay.htm>

29.Canadian Government, “The Canada We Want: Speech from the Throne,” 1 October 2002.

Available at Government of Canada web site: http://www.sft-ddt.gc.ca/hnav/hnav07_e.htm. Accessed 10 June 2003.

30.See, for instance, David Cannadine’s *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001) and Neal Ferguson’s *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and The Lessons for Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2003).

31.*Decolonizing Methodologies*, 7 ff.

32.*Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* (RCAP). Vol. 1: *Looking Forward, Looking Back* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1996), 103. On the intense relations and patterns of co-operation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities from contact, see more generally chapter 5.

33.See chapter 6, RCAP vol. 1.

34. Inspired by the theory and practice of Maori scholars Graham and Linda Smith among others, those associated with the Indigenous humanities work and publish in a number of areas. See, for example, Marie Battiste and James (Sakej) Youngblood Henderson, *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge* (Saskatoon: Purich, 2000); Marie Battiste, ed., *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2000); Battiste, Lynne Bell, and L. M. Findlay, Decolonizing Education in Canadian Universities: An Interdisciplinary, International, Indigenous Research Project, *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26.2 (2002) 82-95; L. M. Findlay, Always Indigenize! The Radical Humanities in the Postcolonial Canadian University, *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 31.1 & 2 (2000): 307-26; James (Sakej) Youngblood Henderson, Marjorie Benson, and Isobel M. Findlay, *Aboriginal Tenure in the Constitution of Canada* (Scarborough: Carswell, 2000); Isobel M. Findlay, Working for Postcolonial Legal Studies: Working with the Indigenous Humanities, <http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/global/issue/2003-1/findlay.htm><http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/global/issue/2003-1/findlay.htm>

35.Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

36.Similar patterns of (at best) add-on treatment of Aboriginal knowledge are registered in the K-12 system. On the experience of Cree, Dene, and Métis in northern Saskatchewan and Alberta--where school administrators report, “We follow the provincial curriculum here and don’t see why we should change it” or “the students here have to write the provincial examinations like everyone else”--see J. Tim Goddard, “Ethnoculturally Relevant Programming in Northern Schools,” *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26.2 (2002):124-33. Schooling remains “locked in the late modern period,” where education

is believed to be neutral and testing against dominant values remains central (128). In the process ethno-cultural difference is produced and reproduced in binary patterns that characterize Indigenous knowledge as local, scattered, and political. On the long history in Australia of the “binary of mainstreaming versus cultural relevance,” see too Cathryn McConaghy, *Rethinking Indigenous Education: Culturalism, Colonialism and the Politics of Knowing* (Flaxton, Qld: PostPressed, 2000), 10.

37. Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches* (Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1984).

38. Culhane, *Pleasure of the Crown*, 49. Here we draw on important work by Homi Bhabha and Edward Said. See, for example, Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994); Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1993); Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (London: Penguin, 1978). For a critical reading of Said, see McConaghy, *Rethinking Indigenous Education*, especially pp. 17-26, on colonial legitimacy and disciplinary knowledges. On the particular role of English Studies in colonialism, see, for example, John Willinsky, *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998) as well as Gauri Viswanathan and Victor Ramraj, ed., special issue of *ARIEL* on *Institutionalizing English Studies: The Postcolonial/Postindependence Challenge* 31.1-2 (2000). On the role of the humanities, see the first part of G. Prakash, ed. *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995).

39. On the logic of colonialism, its legitimating discourses and strategies of difference, see also formative work by J. M. Blaut, *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (New York: Guilford P, 1993); Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, trans. Howard Greenfield (New York: Orion P, 1965).

40. *Journeying Forward: Dreaming First Nations' Independence* (Halifax: Fernwood, 1999), 43.

41. “Is It Civilized to Push Indigenous Peoples in Canada to the Edge of Social, Political and Cultural Extinction?” Unpublished written remarks to the Dialogue and Declaration on Indigenous Civilisations: Toward Postcolonial Standards of Civilisation (Canadian Commission for UNESCO, Saskatoon, 22 November 2001), 5.

42. “The Intellectuals,” 9.

43. It is from the “the perspective of the ‘edge’,” from the margins of social contingency and ambivalence, that Homi Bhabha’s “strategic intellectual” intervenes to articulate and empower. See his “Postcolonial Authority and Postmodern Guilt,” in Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler, ed. and introd., *Cultural Studies*, 56-68.

44. On the value of Gaia theory to understanding social, economic, and political formations and co-operative development in Germany compatible with socio-environmental interrelationships and realities, see Brett Fairbairn, History from the Ecological Perspective: Gaia Theory and the Problem of Co-operatives in Turn-of-the-Century Germany, *The American Historical Review* 99.4 (1994): 1203-39.

45. Important recent commentary on co-operative education includes the following: Cheryl Turner, Co-operative Learning, Citizenship and Current Adult Learning Policies, *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 88-85; Ian MacPherson, Encouraging Associative Intelligence: Co-operative Shared Learning and Responsible Citizenship: Plenary Presentation, *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 86-89; Elizabeth G. Cohen, Co-operative Learning and the Equitable Classroom in a Multicultural Society: Keynote for IASCE Conference, Manchester, England, June, 2002, *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 99-108.

46. Quoted in Harold Cardinal and Walter Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan: Our Dream Is That Our Peoples Will One Day Be Clearly Recognized as Nations* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2000), 7, 1.

47. Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 14-16.

48. Stephen Yeo, What Value do Co-operative and Mutual Enterprises in General, and the Co-operative Movement in Particular, Add to the Citizenship Agenda? *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 116. In an address "A Day of Enlightenment: When Universities and Funders Collaborate with Communities on Research, Education and Training that Communities Need, Want and Lead"), former National Chief of the Assembly of First Nations Ovide Mercredi challenged delegates to make universities relevant to his people, reconsider what parliamentary democracy has meant for Aboriginal peoples in Canada, and abandon knowledge products and "self-centred champions of knowledge" for "ways of knowing," while recognizing that "interdependency is here to stay." Cuexpo International, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 8 May 2003.

49. Henderson, "The Promise of Enriched Livelihood: Treaty Economy and Aboriginal CED"; Battise, Postcolonial Methodologies, Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: Toward a Respectful Dialogue." Papers presented at Value(s) Added: Sharing Voices on Aboriginal Community Economic Development conference, College of Commerce, University of Saskatchewan, 2-4 May 2002.

50. *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 57. On his "declaration of interdependence," see especially chapter 6.

51. "Why can't we talk?" In John Ralston Saul, Alain Dubuc, and Georges Erasmus, *The Lafontaine-Baldwin Lectures*. Volume 1, ed. R. Griffiths (Toronto: Penguin, 2002), 103-24.

52. "Traveling Cultures," in Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler, ed. and introd., *Cultural Studies*, 116.

53. Quoted in Jessica Gordon Nehbhard, "Entering the New City as men and Women, Not Mules." Gordon Nehbhard builds on Du Bois' initiatives in co-operative economics in her concept of "subaltern cooperative economic development," where group identity is critical to cooperative economic enterprise to address urban economic conditions for African American communities.

54. Jeremiah Cotton, "Towards a Theory and Strategy for Black Economic Development," in James

Jennings, ed., *Race, Politics, and Economic Development* (New York: Verso, 1992), 24.

55. Race and essentialism in feminist legal theory, *Stanford Law Review* 42 (1990): 581.

56. Stuart Hall, *The Multicultural Question*. Pavis Papers in Social and Cultural Research No. 4. (Faculty of Social Sciences, Open University, 2001), 5-26. Gramsci is in turn citing Romain Rolland. See Gramsci, *Selections from Political Writings (1910-1920)*, ed. Quinton Hoare and trans. John Mathews (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990), 188.

References

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso, 1991.

Assembly of First Nations. "Update on Federal Government's Three First Nations Bills, 16 June 2003. Assembly of First Nations website [cited 15 July 2003]. Available from World Wide Web: (<http://www.afn.ca/Legislation%20Info/UpdateThreeFirstNationsBills.htm>).

Battiste, Marie. "Postcolonial Methodologies, Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: Toward a Respectful Dialogue." Paper presented at Value(s) Added: Sharing Voices on Aboriginal Community Economic Development conference, College of Commerce, University of Saskatchewan, 2-4 May 2002.

Battiste, Marie, ed. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. U of British Columbia Press, 2000.

Battiste, Marie, Lynne Bell, and L. M. Findlay. "Decolonizing Education in Canadian Universities: An Interdisciplinary, International, Indigenous Research Project." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26.2 (2002) 82-95.

Battiste, Marie and James (Sakej) Youngblood Henderson. *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge*. Saskatoon: Purich, 2000.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1998.

Beltrame, Julian. "Unfinished Business: Chretien promises one last time to help Aboriginals." *Macleans* 14 October 2002.

-
- Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- . Postcolonial Authority and Postmodern Guilt. In Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler, ed. and introd., *Cultural Studies*, 56-68.
- Blaut, J. M. *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. New York: Guilford Press, 1993.
- Borrows, John. *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market*. Trans. Richard Nice. New York: The New Press, 1998.
- . The Forms of Capital. In John Richardson, ed., *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westpoint, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- . "Universal Corporatism: The Role of the Intellectuals in the Modern World." Trans. Gisèle Shapiro. *Poetics Today* 12 (1991): 655-69.
- Brydon, Diana, ed. *Postcolonialism: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*. 5 vols. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Canadian Government. "The Canada We Want: Speech from the Throne," 1 October 2002. Government of Canada web site [cited 7 August 2003]. Available from World Wide Web: http://www.sft-ddt.gc.ca/hnav/hnav07_e.htm.
- . *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP)*. Vol. 1: *Looking Forward, Looking Back*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1996.
- Cannadine, David. *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Cardinal, Harold and Walter Hildebrandt. *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan: Our Dream Is That Our Peoples Will One Day Be Clearly Recognized as Nations*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2000.
- Carey, James. *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Chua, Amy. *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

Clifford, James. Traveling Cultures. In Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler, ed. and introd., *Cultural Studies*.

Cohen, Elizabeth G. "Co-operative Learning and the Equitable Classroom in a Multicultural Society: Keynote for IASCE Conference, Manchester, England, June, 2002." *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 99-108.

Coon Come, Matthew. "Is It Civilized to Push Indigenous Peoples in Canada to the Edge of Social, Political and Cultural Extinction?" Unpublished written remarks to the Dialogue and Declaration on Indigenous Civilisations: Toward Postcolonial Standards of Civilisation. Canadian Commission for UNESCO, Saskatoon, 22 November 2001.

Cotton, Jeremiah. Towards a Theory and Strategy for Black Economic Development. In James Jennings, ed., *Race, Politics, and Economic Development*. New York: Verso, 1992..

Culhane, Dara. *The Pleasure of the Crown: Anthropology, Law and First Nations*. Burnaby, BC: Talonbooks, 1998.

Du Bois, W. E. B. "Where do we go from here?" An Address delivered at the Rosenwald Economic Conference, Washington, BC, May 1933. Reprinted in Andrew G. Paschal, ed. *A W.E.B. Du Bois Reader*. New York: Collier Books, 1971.

Eagleton, Terry. *The Illusions of Postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Ekelund, Finn Age. *The Property of the Common: Justifying Co-operative Activity*. Occasional Paper 87.02. Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1987.

Erasmus, Georges. Why can't we talk? In John Ralston Saul, Alain Dubuc, and Georges Erasmus, *The Lafontaine-Baldwin Lectures*. Volume 1. Ed. R. Griffiths. Toronto: Penguin, 2002.

Fairbairn, Brett. "Communications, Culture, and Co-operatives: Liminal Organizations in a Liminal Age." Paper presented at "Mapping Co-operative Studies in the New Millennium: A Joint Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance Research Committee and the Canadian Association for Studies in Co-operation," University of Victoria, Canada, 27-31 May 2003.

—. "History from the Ecological Perspective: Gaia Theory and the Problem of Co-operatives in Turn-of-the-Century Germany." *The American Historical Review* 99.4 (1994): 1203-39.

Ferguson, Neal. *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and The Lessons for Global Power*. New York: Basic Books, 2003.

Findlay, Isobel M. "Working for Postcolonial Legal Studies: Working with the Indigenous Humanities." Special issue on Postcolonial Legal Studies, ed. W. Wesley Pue, *Law, Social Justice and Global Development* 2003-1. Available from World Wide Web:
<http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/global/issue/2003-1/findlay.htm>([Http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/global/issue/2003-1/findlay.htm](http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/global/issue/2003-1/findlay.htm))

Findlay, L. M. "Always Indigenize! The Radical Humanities in the Postcolonial Canadian University." *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 31.1 & 2 (2000): 307-26.

Goddard, J. Tim. "Ethnoculturally Relevant Programming in Northern Schools." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26.2 (2002):124-33.

Gurney, Peter. *Co-operative Culture and the Politics of Consumption in England, 1870-1930*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Gramsci, Antonio. The Intellectuals. In Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, ed. and trans., *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

—. *Selections from Political Writings (1910-1920)*, ed. Quinton Hoare and trans. John Mathews. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, ed. *Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Hall, Stuart. *The Multicultural Question*. Pavis Papers in Social and Cultural Research No. 4. Faculty of Social Sciences, Open University, 2001.

----. The West and the Rest. In Anthony D. King, ed., *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Harris, Angela. "Race and essentialism in feminist legal theory." *Stanford Law Review* 42 (1990): 581.

Henderson, James (Sakej) Youngblood, Marjorie Benson, and Isobel M. Findlay. *Aboriginal Tenure in the Constitution of Canada*. Scarborough: Carswell, 2000.

Henderson, James (Sakej) Youngblood. "The Promise of Enriched Livelihood: Treaty Economy and

-
- Aboriginal CED.” Paper presented at Value(s) Added: Sharing Voices on Aboriginal Community Economic Development conference, College of Commerce, University of Saskatchewan, 2-4 May 2002.
- Lorde, Audre. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1984.
- MacPherson, Ian. “Encouraging Associative Intelligence: Co-operative Shared Learning and Responsible Citizenship: Plenary Presentation.” *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 86-89.
- Martin, Paul. “The Public Good.” Address to International Humanities Forum: Breakfast on Campus, The Inaugural Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada, University of Ottawa, 2 June 1998.
- McConaghy, Cathryn. *Rethinking Indigenous Education: Culturalism, Colonialism and the Politics of Knowing*. Flaxton, Qld: PostPressed, 2000.
- McQuaig, Linda. *The Cult of Impotence: Selling the Myth of Powerlessness in the Global Economy*. Toronto: Viking, 1998.
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Trans. Howard Greenfield. New York: Orion Press, 1965.
- Mercredi, Ovide. “A Day of Enlightenment: When Universities and Funders Collaborate with Communities on Research, Education and Training that Communities Need, Want and Lead.” Cuexpo International, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 8 May 2003.
- “A messy prescription for native offenders.” *Globe and Mail* 12 August 2002: A12.
- Monture-Angus, Patricia. *Journeying Forward: Dreaming First Nations’ Independence*. Halifax: Fernwood, 1999.
- Nault, Robert. “Government Pursuit of First Nations Governance Act.” Statement by Robert Nault, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 6 May 2003. Communities First: First Nations Governance [cited 15 July 2003]. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada website. Available from World Wide Web: http://gpn-fng.ainc.gc.ca/NR_PurFNGM6_e.html.
- Nembhard, Jessica Gordon. Entering the New City as Men and Women, Not Mules. Forthcoming in Lewis Randolph and Gayle Tate, ed., *The Urban Black Community*.
- Prakash, G., ed. *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

“Race-based prison discount.” *Chatham Daily News* 21 February 2003: 4.

Rees, Stuart and Shelley Wright, ed. *Human Rights, Corporate Responsibility: A Dialogue*. Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press, 2000.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1993.

—. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin, 1978.

Saul, John Ralston. *The Doubter’s Companion: A Dictionary of Aggressive Common Sense*. Toronto: Penguin, 1995.

Smith, Graham Hingangaroa. Protecting and Respecting Indigenous Knowledge. In Marie Battiste, ed., *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver: U of British Columbia Press, 2000.

Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 1999.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Statistics Canada website [cited 7 August 2003]. Available from World Wide Web: <http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/analytic/companion/educ/canada.cfm> .

Stein, Janice Gross. *The Cult of Efficiency*. Toronto: Anansi, 2001.

Strategic Research and Analysis and the Social Cohesion Network. *Holding the Centre: What We Know about Social Cohesion*. January 2001 [cited 7 August 2003]. Available from World Wide Web: (<http://www.geog.queensu.ca/soco/pdf/sra-558-dck-e.pdf>)

Turner, Cheryl. “Co-operative Learning, Citizenship and Current Adult Learning Policies.” *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 88-85.

United Nations website [cited 7 August 2003]. Available from World Wide Web: (<http://www.undp.org/hdr2003/>)

Viswanathan, Gauri and Victor Ramraj, ed. Special issue of ARIEL on *Institutionalizing English Studies: The Postcolonial/Postindependence Challenge* 31.1-2 (2000).

Willinsky, John. *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Yeo, Stephen. "What Value do Co-operative and Mutual Enterprises in General, and the Co-operative Movement in Particular, Add to the Citizenship Agenda?" *Journal of Co-operative Studies* 35.2 (2002): 109-27.