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ABSTRACT

Sport is often viewed as an apolitical, positive, socially integrative social practice that can lead to the development of people—socially, economically, politically and culturally. This functionalist rhetoric has led to the recent trend in development initiatives in the past two decades, which has led to the nascent field of Sport for Development. However, this functionalist view of sport has often disregarded the broader socio-historical, cultural and political roles that sport has played. For instance, the use of sport to assimilate indigenous people into the dominant western culture during the colonial era, often at the expense of indigenous peoples’ own values, beliefs, and traditions. Specifically, I follow many critical scholars by suggesting that SFD programs that are conducted in indigenous communities are often planned, implemented and evaluated from a Western worldview, rather than from the worldview of the indigenous community (Darnell, 2010a; Darnell and Hayhurst, 2012; Forsyth and Wamsley, 2006; Giles, 2007; Nicholls, Giles and Sethna, 2010; Smith, 1999). Given this, in this research project I offer a critical commentary on SFD programs that are conducted within indigenous communities and suggest that there is a need to adopt a decolonizing praxis to SFD in indigenous communities. I provide this perspective by reflecting on a journey I took to visit the Suquamish Tribe of the Port Madison Reserve to talk to them about the Salish Tribal Canoe Journeys. I conclude by suggesting that there are key lessons that can be learnt from the Suquamish and the Salish Tribal Canoe Journeys in relation to adopting a decolonizing praxis to SFD in indigenous communities.
CHAPTER ONE

SUQUAMISH CANOE

**Reporter: Jack Hamann:** The canoe house on the Suquamish reservation does not yet house a canoe. Locked in the heart of this 800-year-old Cedar is the soul of the Suquamish Chieftain Kitsap. It is that soul which guides the adze\(^1\) in the hands of Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell, a Māori craftsman and tribal leader from New Zealand.

**Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell:** I sing to and pray to the spirit of the tree, and I sing and pray to the name of this canoe, Kitsap, a great chief. I pray to him to forgive me if I make a mistake.

**Narrator:** He doesn’t make many. He is a 27\(^{th}\) generation boat carver here to help a new generation of Salish Indians.

**Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell:** What I see is the renewal of an art that’s almost lost here, and well if I can help to encourage…

**Joseph Waterhouse:** You’re sitting in the first canoe house here…in 100 years. You know this is the first canoe in Suquamish since 1914.

**Narrator:** Joseph Waterhouse is Matahi’s host; the two boat carvers formed a quick alliance after being struck by the similarities shared by their otherwise distant cultures.

**Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell:** Same patience, same attitude towards trees and canoes. Same attitude so I feel at home.

(Video of Matahi, Joseph and Salish youth carving the canoe from the cedar)

**Narrator:** The strokes are shorter, choppier; they can use the guidance of expert hands.

---

1 An adze is a tool that is used for carving wood. The adze is usually made from a steel blade with a wooden handle.

2 In saying this I do not assume that all indigenous experiences are homogenous. Rather I use these examples to highlight the ongoing struggle that indigenous peoples face on a global scale: a struggle for
Salish Youth: This is for the people here. It’s for the old traditions that have died out.

Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell: When the storm comes the canoe are ready that’s the same with the youth. If you can prepare them for life, their cultural roots deep in the ground, deep in the Earth and relate it to the ocean and their music and their legends, they can face the world. They don't need to drink, they don't need to drug up. My elders sent me here to find part of the solution for the young generations who are alcoholics, drug addicts, who are unemployed, who are homeless. We believe part of the Māori answer lies with the Indigenous people of this land. If we reconnect and share our problems we'll find a common solution. This is part of it (Suquamish Canoe, 1988).
CHAPTER TWO

INTRODUCTION

Indigenous Peoples and Sport

For centuries, indigenous peoples have been subject to processes of colonization. From the early colonial era until the present day, colonial governments have employed cultural practices and policies to acculturate indigenous populations into their dominant western worldview. Colonization was often conducted as a civilizing mission; indigenous cultural practices were considered backward, whilst western ideologies were deemed to be enlightened. This civilizing mission was actuated through the proliferation of these ideologies via social institutions. Through social institutions such as education, and religion, the dominant values of the western worldview were disseminated to the indigenous peoples. As Forsyth and Wamsley (2006) have shown, colonizing governments have throughout history systematically colonized indigenous peoples, forcing them to relinquish their values, beliefs, traditions and cultural practices.

Not only were indigenous peoples forced to relinquish their cultural values, traditions, and beliefs, but it was also through this process that indigenous peoples’ identities were redefined. Hokowhitu (2004) contends that during the colonizing era of the eighteenth and nineteenth century colonial settlers adopted a grand Enlightenment rhetoric to justify the colonization of indigenous peoples. This grand enlightenment rhetoric positioned indigenous peoples as uncivilized in comparison to the civilized colonial settler. Under this veil the indigenous body was inscribed with historically racist and oppressive discourse, a discourse predicated on Social Darwinism. Social Darwinism positioned indigenous peoples and their culture as being inferior to the dominant colonial, western, enlightened culture. Indeed, the
discourse of Social Darwinism views the colored or indigenous body as genetically predisposed
to physical pursuits, rather than intellectual pursuits. Due to this perception of indigenous bodies
and culture as inferior/uncivilized, they were deemed in need of civilizing. One particular
medium of this civilizing process was sport.

During the colonial era of the British Empire from 1583 to the early 1900’s (these dates
differ across different geographical locations), sport played a significant role in the colonizing
and empire building processes of imperialistic Western governments. Although indigenous
people from around the world have diverse histories, experiences, and cultures, many have faced
similar conditions of colonization. Indigenous peoples—including (but not limited to) the
Aboriginal people of Australia, tangata whenua or the indigenous Māori peoples of New
Zealand, the First Nations of Canada, and the Native American peoples of the United States of
America—have all faced detrimental histories of colonization \(^2\). In all of these contexts sport can
be envisaged as a powerful social institution that has created shared values, beliefs and traditions
between the ruled and the rulers (Stoddart, 1988). For example, rugby was used in New Zealand
as a way to acculturate the indigenous Māori people (mostly male) into the dominant British
values (Hokowhitu, 2011; Hokowhitu, 2004). The sport was meant to educate the (assumedly
uncivilized) indigenous Māori people in both physical and moral aptitude. The success of this
assimilation strategy was confirmed when Māori began to succeed in the sport, an example of
the great colonial mission.

---

\(^2\) In saying this I do not assume that all indigenous experiences are homogenous. Rather I use these
examples to highlight the ongoing struggle that indigenous peoples face on a global scale: a struggle for
their voices to be heard, their beliefs and epistemologies to be legitimized and their knowledge to be
accepted in its own right. It is this continual struggle that plagues the Indigenous consciousness. The
struggle for self-determination, the struggle to define and not to be the object of definition, this is the
indigenous person’s reality - ka whaiwhai tonu – the struggle without end.
The case of the indigenous Māori people of New Zealand is not isolated; rather, sport was a focal point of colonization in all of the previously mentioned contexts of Canada, Australia and the United States of America. Indigenous peoples have been subject to assimilation through sport. Anderson (2006) illustrates how early European settlers came to the United States of America and imposed colonial sports onto the Native American peoples. A specific case, the assimilation of the Navajo people, became federal policy under the terms of the Treaty negotiations with the United States government in 1868. Subsequent to these negotiations, the socialization of Navajo youth was conducted through Christian schools that were set up on the reservations. Through these schools colonial sports were used to educate Navajo youth in Western imperialistic values such as individualism, and competitiveness. Many scholars Anderson (2006), Forsyth and Wamsley (2006), Hokowhitu (2004), Rains, Archibald and Dehyle (2000), Smith (1999) have noted the imposition of colonial sports onto indigenous cultures in order to assimilate these cultures into colonial culture. Consequently, these assimilation processes have often resulted in the extermination of indigenous physical cultural practices.3

The Suquamish Tribe

As described in the prologue, the traditional canoe culture of the Suquamish people is a localized example of indigenous culture that has been negatively influenced through the process of colonization. Prior to contact with colonial settlers, the Suquamish relished in the use of cedar canoes for food gathering, hunting, fishing, and traditional canoe voyages. Chief Seattle, an ancestral leader of the Suquamish, has been one of the most prominent commentators on the loss

---

3 I have named these physical cultural practices rather than sports because the concept of sport was not common amongst most indigenous cultures. Rather physical cultural practices such as canoe paddling were used as a means of food gathering and travel (Wikaire & Newman, 2013; Hokowhitu, 2004).
of Suquamish culture. Chief Seattle was just six years old when the first contact between the Suquamish and colonial settlers occurred, when Captain George Vancouver anchored in Suquamish waters in 1792. Over the rest of Chief Seattle’s life he watched his people’s culture fade as it was replaced by the culture of the settler. He watched the transition of his people from their aboriginal ways of life into a life that was brought by the colonial settlers and imposed by the United States government (Suquamish Tribe, 2012). For the Suquamish the changes were destructive, and once again schools were set up on the Suquamish reservations to educate the Suquamish youth on how to lead civilized lives. This history of colonization and assimilation has had major ramifications for the Suquamish people and their culture—a history that still affects the Suquamish to their present day.

In the prologue, taken from a video produced in 1988, Matahi (a Māori elder from New Zealand) and Joseph (a Suquamish leader) talk about the absence of Suquamish canoe culture from the Puget Sound for approximately 100 years. They note that the canoe they are building is the first canoe that has been built in Puget Sound since 1914. Therefore, the construction of this canoe is symbolic in many ways—one could say it represents a form of cultural resilience for the Suquamish against the tides of colonization. Matahi and Joseph also mention that they formed a natural bond with each other due to the similarities both of their indigenous cultures and people share. From this it can be gathered that although both the indigenous Māori people of New Zealand and the Suquamish people of Seattle, Washington are from distant cultures, both of their people share some commonalities inherited from centuries of colonization and a loss of their aboriginal heritage.

Once again, the loss of indigenous culture due to colonial assimilation strategies has meant indigenous populations have incurred numerous consequences that still persist to the
present day. Relative to their majority counterparts, indigenous populations are predominantly overrepresented across many social sectors including high incarceration rates, poor health (high rates of obesity, heart disease, suicide and mental health), poor health literacy, alcoholism, drug use and lower income rates when compared against the overall population (American Indian Health, 2012; Durie, 2004; First Nations Statistical Institute, 2006; Hokowhitu, 2011; Hokowhitu, 2004; Smith 1999; Smith, 1997; Statistics New Zealand, 2006). In the prologue, Matahi mentions many of these social ailments using the metaphor of a canoe. He states,

When the storm comes the canoe are ready, that’s the same with the youth. If you can prepare them for life, their cultural roots deep in the ground, deep in the Earth and relate it to the ocean and their music and their legends, they can face the world. They don’t need to drink; they don’t need to drug up. My elders sent me here to find part of the solution for the younger generation who are alcoholics, drug addicts, who are unemployed, who are homeless. We believe part of the Māori answer lies with the Indigenous people of this land. If we reconnect and share our problems we'll find a common solution. This is part of it. (Suquamish Canoe, 1988)

In this excerpt, Matahi shares how many of the problems that the Suquamish youth are facing today (1980)—social ailments such as alcoholism, drugs and unemployment—are also faced by indigenous Māori youth. However, he also mentions how (re)connection with their indigenous culture, with their cultural roots deep in the ground, can bring indigenous youth back from these social ills. He suggests that through collaboration between indigenous cultures, there is the potential to find a common solution. He also mentions that by instilling a strong sense of cultural identity within the youth, with their cultural roots deep in the ground, they will be ready to face the storms of life. It is these key foundations that guide the present research project.
Since 1988, the Suquamish people have progressed in terms of their canoe culture. At present the Suquamish Tribe has more than 800 enrolled members, with 350 of those members living on the Port Madison Indian Reservation. These 800 Suquamish members have had a lot of success in the revitalization of Suquamish culture, and one particular case can be observed in the ‘Tribal Canoe Journeys.’ The Tribal Canoe Journeys is a multi-tribal cultural event that occurs annually between Native American tribes of the Pacific Northwest. The first Tribal Canoe Journey occurred in 1989 as the historic “Paddle to Seattle,” to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Washington State and the signing of the Centennial Accord recognizing tribal sovereignty. The Paddle to Seattle was initiated by the Washington State Centennial Commissions Native Canoe Project, and revived the Native American canoe culture of the Pacific Northwest. In 1987, a committee of Native American members and the first lady Jean Gardner, as well as Secretary of State Ralph Munro agreed to work towards getting a number of traditional Salish canoes ready for the Paddle to Seattle. Cedar logs were carved at the Lummi Tribes Community College and the Quileute Tribe made carving and paddling part of their Native American cultural education program. However, the start of the journey was difficult given a lot of the knowledge of how to carve a traditional Salish canoe had been lost during the colonial period. Nonetheless, through perseverance, 18 canoes were carved and ready to paddle across Puget Sound\(^4\) from Suquamish to Golden Gardens Park on Shilshole Bay, July 21, 1989, where the Duwamish would host the paddlers to come ashore (Bard, 2011). Approximately 15 Tribes from all over the Pacific Northwest paddled to Seattle, with some coming from as far away as La Push (170 mile journey) (Streitberger, 1989). For those tribes that were coming from far away they would start paddling at an earlier date, and then stop at Tribes along the way. Those Tribes would host the canoe families and then join them the following day to continue to

\(^4\) Please see map in Appendix C for a map of Puget Sound.
the next Tribe on the route\textsuperscript{5}. During the journey the canoe families will have their own support boat, and ground crew working with them, some of which can be funded through grants such as the Potlatch Fund\textsuperscript{6}.

Furthermore, Bard (2011) states “The idea behind the journey was to carve their own canoes, assemble at a rendezvous, paddle across Puget Sound to Seattle on a bright summer day, camp in a park, and spend two days canoe racing on the sound and enjoying time together celebrating cherished features of Northwest Coast culture (p.6). Moreover, Bard (2011) contends, on the 21\textsuperscript{st} July 1989, five thousand people welcomed the canoes to Shishole Bay, a place where Native Americans had not landed in more than a century. Streitberger (1989) also states that for the indigenous peoples that were involved “the Paddle to Seattle was a celebration of their survival as a people, their ties to one another, their connection to the land and water, and the endurance of their spirituality” (p. 3). It was during the celebrations of this first paddle that the Bella Bella Tribe challenged everyone to paddle to Bella Bella in four years time, and thus the Tribal Canoe Journeys began. As shown in table 1 below, the Tribal Canoe Journeys occurred every four years for the second and third journeys before becoming an annual event for the fourth journey Paddle to Puyallup in 1998.

Table 1. History of the Tribal Canoe Journeys, hosts and the year that they hosted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Succession of the Tribal Canoe Journeys</th>
<th>Host of the Tribal Canoe Journey and the year they hosted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Paddle to Seattle, WA ~ 1989 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{5} Please see appendix C for the Map of the 2013 Paddle to Quinault and how the Tribal Journey routes may look. The draft route dates in the top right corner show the approximate dates that canoe families are expected to reach the various Tribal Grounds before continuing the next day.

\textsuperscript{6} The Potlatch Fund is a philanthropic organization that supports and funds many community projects within the Tribal Nations of the Pacific Northwest.
Table 1 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Succession of the Tribal Canoe Journeys</th>
<th>Host of the Tribal Canoe Journey and the year they hosted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Paddle to Bella Bella, B.C. ~ 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Paddle to LaPush, WA ~ 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Paddle to Puyallup, WA ~ 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Paddle to Ahousaht, B.C. ~ 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Paddle to Songees, B.C. ~ 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Paddle to Pendleton, OR ~ 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Paddle to Squamish, B.C. ~ 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Paddle to Quinault at Taholah, WA ~ 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Paddle to Tulalip, WA ~ 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Paddle to Chemainus, B.C. ~ 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Paddle to Elwha at Port Angeles, WA ~ 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Paddle to Muckleshoot at Auburn, WA ~ 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Paddle to Cowichan, B.C. ~ 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Paddle to Suquamish, WA ~ 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Paddle to Makah at Neah Bay, WA ~ 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Paddle to Swinomish at La Conner, WA ~ 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Paddle to Squaxin Island at Kamilche, WA ~ 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Paddle to Quinault at Taholah, WA ~ 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The iconic Paddle to Seattle was the beginning of a period of cultural revitalization for some Native American Nations of the Pacific Northwest, revitalizing canoe traditions that had been
lost for many years. Since this time, Tribal Canoe Journeys have evolved to become an event that attracts upward of ninety US Tribes, Canadian First Nations, and New Zealand Māori to attend. In fact, given the success of the annual Tribal Canoe Journeys had, the director of the Suquamish Health and Wellness Program decided that the canoe could be used as a part of other health programs. This gave rise to the Healing of the Canoe project, which is a culturally relevant substance abuse and mental health intervention that uses the canoe as a vehicle for social change.

The Healing of the Canoe project was developed over the years 2005-2008 subsequent to a community needs survey. The survey identified that there were issues of substance abuse, erosion of cultural identity and low educational achievement amongst Suquamish youth and teenagers. The project was a collaborative venture between the Suquamish tribe and faculty and staff members at the University of Washington. During conversations between the two groups it was decided that a ‘culturally relevant’ program should be developed. The concept of the canoe was identified as a culturally relevant physical, cultural, and spiritual vehicle that the project could utilize in order to combat the long colonial legacy of assimilation that pervaded the Suquamish community. ¹ Specifically the ‘Healing of the Canoe project’ began as an informal discussion between community members from the Suquamish tribe and the University of Washington Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute (ADAI). The Suquamish tribal enrolment is more than 800 members, with approximately 350 tribal members living on the reservation (Thomas, Donovan, Sigo, Austin, Marlatt & The Suquamish Tribe, 2003). The Suquamish Tribe Wellness administrator invited the ADAI staff to discuss partnering on a project with the members of the Suquamish tribe and community. Approval was gained for the Suquamish Tribal Council (STC) to obtain funding for the project and the Suquamish Cooperative Council (SCC) was the appointed advisory board. The SCC was the committee that oversaw all activities within the
community. Thereby from the outset it was a requirement that the research be appropriately conducted within cultural grounding. The project acquired a three-year exploratory and developmental grant and began working as partners in 2008. Also, from the initiation the community guided the whole research process.

The project is unique in the way that it uses a culturally relevant indigenous sport/physical cultural practice as the basis for the program. In this way the program illustrates how indigenous culture can be understood as a strength within indigenous communities and utilized in the development and practice of sport for development programs. Rather than the negative (uncivilized) way that indigenous culture and knowledge has been viewed during colonial times (and arguably to the present day), given the relationship that indigenous populations, worldwide, have had with sport and imperialism. The Tribal Journeys and Healing of the Canoe Projects are key examples of culturally relevant implementation of Sport-for-Development (what will now be referred to as SFD) programs, which stands in contrast to how sport has historically been used within indigenous communities as an assimilatory tool for the Western worldview.

The aim of this research project is to look at the way Tribal Canoe Journeys have been conducted in a culturally relevant way with its use of Suquamish culture and knowledge as strength; whilst also locating Tribal Canoe Journeys within the broader context of Sport-for-Development programs. I suggest that there are many key aspects that can be learned by using a strengths-based culturally relevant approach to the development and implementation of SFD programs in indigenous communities. However, at present there is a lack of this type of practice in the sport-for-development climate. In what remains of this introductory chapter, I will: 1) introduce and explore the emergence of SFD programs as a popular way of facilitating
development in marginalized and developing communities; 2) explicate the need for a decolonizing praxis when working with indigenous communities; 3) discuss how axioms of the Enlightenment era inform SFD practice; and 4) present the basis of this research project by illuminating the need for SFD policy makers, practitioners, theorists and organizations to adopt a de-colonizing praxis when working with indigenous populations in order to combat neocolonialism.

Introducing Sport for Development

In the last two decades, the international community has increasingly identified the power of sport to promote development, peace, health, and education. In 2005, the United Nations (UN) declared the year the ‘International Year of Sport and Physical Education’ and has acknowledged sport as a key tool in dealing with numerous foreign policy issues. As Van Eekereneng (2006) contends “The UN organizations, large international sporting organizations and governments from the Global North seem destined to become the main actors to whom the most others will conform [in SFD]” (p. 11). It is important to acknowledge the contribution SFD is making on a global scale and the impact that this will have on local SFD initiatives in the future (this will be expanded on further in the next chapter).

I follow many critical sport scholars including Coatler (2010a), Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) and Kidd (2008) that have called for a critical approach to SFD to question the dominance of the Western worldview in SFD. However, in order to fully critique Western-based SFD, I will begin by outlining two examples. The first example is the Active Community Clubs, a SFD program based in South Africa that is funded by the Australian Agency for International

---

7 Ideology that is circumscribed within Western ideas and the measure of development, modernization, and progress—or what some critics might point to as the key tenets of (neo) colonialism.
Development that targets poverty. Essentially, the program was initiated after an impact assessment was conducted in 2003. A central component of the program is the delivery of a sport programme (rugby, netball and cricket) to local schools. The program had been delivered for more than eight years through the help of dedicated volunteers and there is an overwhelming belief that volunteering will enhance unemployed youths’ opportunities to obtain employment by gaining relevant experience, and learning job-related skills and values….as such offering a way ‘out of the streets’ (Burnett, 2009, p. 1199). Burnett (2009) contends that there are many major benefits from the program including the increase of social trust between coaches and participants. However, Burnett (2009) also mentions that to date, the program has been largely conducted as a top-down model, and thus following its initial few years, it has been met with mixed success “due to the fact that it lacks community uptake and shared ownership” (p. 1199).

The second SFD program that I want to mention is the Swiss Academy for Development’s SFD program that they ran for traumatized children and youth in Bam, Iran (as support in the post-disaster of the 2004 earthquake). The program used sport (football, volleyball, basketball, gymnastics, karate, and table tennis) as a way to offer youth a stable past time structure; to provide them with a way to channel emotions; improve their mental and physical wellbeing and to promote teamwork and fair play. Coaches for the program were recruited from the local population and were trained by the Swiss Academy. From this example, we can deduce that the whole process is very top-down, where aid is transmitted from the Swiss Academy of Development to the traumatized children and youth of Bam, Iran. Although well-intentioned there is a need to rethink the dominance of a Western worldview in SFD programs and question who is defining the parameters of development such as: 1) who needs SFD, 2) what does SFD look like, and 3) who defines what SFD is.
Additionally, Richmond, Ross and Egeland (2007) show that in the years following the UN’s Decade of Indigenous Peoples (from 1995-2004), indigenous health has turned from a deficit model towards a strengths based approach. Kegler, Rodine, Marshall, and Oman (2003) have described a deficit model approach as a health intervention program that uses a problem (Type II diabetes, teen pregnancy, smoking) based approach. With this kind of approach little attention is given to building strengths and assets. Whereas, in a strengths based approach the program acknowledges a variety of person-specific assets such as positive peer influences, involvement in organized activity, strong relationships and aspirations for the future (Kegler et al., 2003). This change in ideology is important as it acknowledges the socio-historical trajectories of colonial past that still negatively influence indigenous populations. This recognition also takes steps towards changing perceptions of indigenous population problems as attributed to the people themselves. Rather it illuminates that vast inequalities between indigenous peoples and majority populations have been perpetuated through cultural superiority and a failure of the system to meet indigenous peoples goals (Richmond, Ross, & Egeland, 2007). On the whole, these development initiatives have been positioned from a deficit model and healthism approach rather than from a cultural strengths perspective (Walters, 1999). To date, these programs have experienced limited success with Native American communities and there has been little research conducted into using sport as a vehicle for development (SFD) in Native American communities (Maro, Roberts, & Sorensen, 2009; Giles, 2005).

As mentioned earlier, on a local scale scholars have attributed the use of SFD as a way of communicating broader messages concerning health and wellbeing to marginalized/developing communities as well as benefits such as lifelong participation in physical activity (Maro, Roberts and Sorensen, 2009; Giles, 2005). Despite the positive potential SFD initiatives have to enhance
indigenous communities, there has been a lack of co-creation between the researcher and the research community during the development of these initiatives. Often these programs have been conducted in a linear fashion, where indigenous communities have had health and wellbeing information “communicated” at them, rather, than being involved in a process of co-creation between the community and the researcher (Bishop, 1996). As Nicholls, Giles, and Sethna (2010) have illuminated there has been an increase in SFD initiatives in recent decades but the way in which they have been devised still perpetuates colonialism. Nicholls et al. (2010) call for an increase in SFD research, which creates a dialogue between the grassroots/indigenous communities, their knowledge and the creation of SFD initiatives. By breaking down the power/knowledge nexus that privileges the Western worldview, they argue that subjugated forms of knowledge, such as Native American epistemologies, can provide SFD initiatives with a more meaningful approach.⁸

---

⁸ My particular interest in this field is derived from my experience during my undergraduate studies at the University of Otago in New Zealand. It was during my undergraduate years that I conducted an honors research project that investigated the sport of *waka ama* (outrigger canoe) and Māori (Indigenous people of New Zealand) cultural identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand. A relevant aspect of this study was the revitalization of a uniquely indigenous sport from a grassroots level movement in New Zealand. The revitalization project took place during a pinnacle point of a wider renaissance of Māori culture in the 1980’s. During conversations I had with the leader of this revival movement, the aforementioned Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell, he had explained that from the outset the *waka ama* revival movement had begun from a grassroots sporting initiative from the Māori people themselves. A movement that was deeply embedded within the Māori worldview and Māori epistemologies (Wikaire, 2011). It was this key point that also helps to guide the current project, the idea of investigating the adoption of a decolonizing praxis SFD when working in Native American communities. This unique journey enabled me to learn about the potential of grassroots sporting initiatives to have positive effects on indigenous populations. It also allowed me insight into the implementation of indigenous development through sport in contemporary society. Although the initiative may not have been “named” as a Sport for Development (SFD) initiative, it is nonetheless. The *waka ama* movement is a SFD initiative that adopted a unique Indigenous approach to SFD. Whilst allowing the space for local indigeneities to be performed in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand. This experience has solidified the need to research existing SFD programs and methods worldwide, in an effort to understand more about the nascent field of SFD. Another key point my prior research has inspired, is the need to investigate other Indigenous grassroots SFD initiatives. Whilst acknowledging the underlying indigenous epistemologies that inform these grassroots SFD initiatives. It is from this research that I hope to contribute to the overall SFD and Indigenous development fields.
The Need for a Decolonizing Praxis in SFD with Native American Communities

Given the privileging of Western ideologies in current SFD policy and practice, many critical scholars Darnell (2010a), Darnell and Hayhurst (2012), Forsyth and Wamsley (2006), Giles, (2007), Nicholls, Giles and Sethna (2010), Smith (1999) have called for the need to adopt a decolonizing praxis when devising and implementing SFD programs in indigenous communities and in relation to this project, Native American communities. A de-colonizing praxis would require an entire philosophical shift, where rather than just acknowledging indigenous episteme during the devising and implementation of SFD programs, indigenous episteme form the basis of the whole process. In this way, a de-colonizing praxis towards SFD would break down the dominant colonial hierarchies that pervade SFD policy, implementation, evaluation and (re) construction. However, in order, to critique these colonial hierarchies of both, power and knowledge, it is important to understand where these dominant ideologies have come from, whilst acknowledging the extensive philosophical dimensions that inform the current SFD praxis.

Enlightened Axioms and SFD Praxis

There is a dominant myth that plagues Western society, one that equates the concept of modernity with discourses of progress and emancipation (Dussel & Barber, 1995). I will use this concept throughout this document to frame and understand the way that sport has been historically used to colonize indigenous populations - thereby, highlighting the way that sport has been codified to facilitate progressive development within indigenous communities. Whether as an assimilatory tool or to induce social change, SFD has been concomitantly fashioned within

---

9 I will be using the word praxis to outline the way that theory, skills and culture are enacted, embodied and realized. Specifically, a decolonizing praxis refers to the re-centering of indigenous knowledge as the basis of SFD programs.
dominant Eurocentric ideologies. These Eurocentric ideologies can be traced to the period of Enlightenment, a cultural movement of intellectuals in the 17th and 18th centuries that began in Europe and spread later to the American colonies. In essence the Enlightenment’s purpose was to reform society through logical reasoning, by challenging religious evangelism and advancing knowledge through the process of scientific method.

The Enlightenment period rendered Eurocentric knowledge or “enlightened axioms” as the cornerstone of society, which consequently meant that other knowledge (indigenous knowledges) were often regarded as immature and uncivilized in nature. Firstly, consider German philosopher Immanuel Kant’s 1784 essay Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung? (Answering the Question: What is Enlightenment?). Kant describes those who did not prescribe to these enlightened axioms as suffering “Laziness and cowardliness are the causes which bind the great part of humanity in this frivolous state of immaturity” (cited in Dussel & Barber, 1995, p. 20). Indeed under Kant’s definition, knowledge that did not fall within the boundaries of Enlightenment was considered backward rather than progressive. For Kant, the Enlightenment was humankind’s emancipation of human consciousness from a state of ignorance towards a phase of “progressive development” (Porter, 2001).

Another Enlightened scholar who has written extensively on the process of Enlightenment was Hegel. In Hegelian ontology, the concept of development played a central role. As he states,

Universal History represents…the development of the consciousness, which Spirit has of its liberty and the evolving realization that history is established through such consciousness. The development implies a series of phases, a series of determinations of liberty becoming consciousness itself…This necessity or necessary series of pure abstract
In this excerpt, Hegel entertains that development unfolds in a logical and linear dialectic of Enlightenment. Although, Hegelian ontology was originally thought of as steeped in ontological thought, today it is primarily considered as a sociological one with implications for history and alternative knowledge. Newman (2013) contends that the dialectic of Enlightenment has been perpetuated throughout history and informs the foundations of Western thought in today’s society.

Although these residual enlightened axioms are pervasive throughout many Western social institutions, many scholars have critiqued these Eurocentric practices. As Newman (2013) suggests, “…scholars and activists from radical, dissident, feminist, indigenous and critical race paradigms have equally sought to use sport to eradicate the techniques of subjugation and oppression that have too often been brought to life within active body contexts during the juggernaut of Enlightenment (with deference to Giddens)” (p. 3).

In the case of SFD praxis, under this logic it can be observed that we have carried residues of these enlightened axioms and the politics of enlightenment forward to guide the normative methodological practices that are employed by SFD policy makers, practitioners, theorists, and international, governmental and sports organizations. This “normative ethic” denotes SFD as belonging within the parameters of progress, and as a society, is moving towards a state of telos. As these enlightenment scholars have shown the enlightened axioms have proliferated through to our current day practices. It is these enlightened axioms that contend that by setting the (indigenous) body in motion – through sport – the body will be liberated from its
current sick, unhealthy, immature, and illogical state. Although this mantra has all too often negated the historical, colonial and Eurocentric implications of the codification of SFD praxis.

**My Project**

It is from this dominance of enlightened axioms and colonizing logic within SFD praxis that forms the basis of my critique. Using the context of the relationship between indigenous peoples’/indigenous knowledge, sport and development throughout history, I have shown that the use of sport for development has not always been progressive, positive or liberating. Rather, the process has often left indigenous peoples in worse positions than when the development began. Given the current SFD praxis is entrenched within these dominant Eurocentric ideologies, critical scholars Darnell (2010a), Darnell and Hayhurst (2012), Forsyth and Wamsley (2006), Giles (2007), Nicholls, Giles and Sethna (2010), Smith (1999) have called for a de-colonizing praxis when working with indigenous communities, rather than mimicking the same Eurocentric SFD programs that have occurred in the past.

Despite the call to adopt a decolonizing praxis in SFD research and implementation, there is a significant gap in SFD literature concerning the understanding and incorporation of indigenous worldview in SFD initiatives. Research into this area is needed if the true goals of SFD initiatives, such as empowerment, are to be achieved (Darnell, 2010b; Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). Henceforth, the purpose of this study is to investigate the use of an indigenous worldview as a form of decolonizing praxis in SFD. I have sought to achieve this by creating a dialogue between the Suquamish community and the wider field of SFD. Through qualitative analysis, I show how an indigenous worldview can be successfully implemented as the foundation of SFD initiatives in Native American communities. This framing enables a broader understanding of
SFD in indigenous communities, which in turn will enhance the wider field of indigenous development.

In order to provide context for this critique, the next chapter reviews the field of SFD in greater depth. Throughout the chapter I entertain the current functionalist logic of SFD praxis and how this approach has been predominantly developed within the tenets of Eurocentrism. I then explore the main critiques of SFD, from critical and post-colonial perspectives. Following this I investigate the organizational and theoretical foundations of SFD praxis and how there is a need to adopt a decolonizing praxis in SFD. Additionally, I entertain a number of current SFD programs that are being enacted in Native American communities.

Chapter three is an overview of the methodological techniques that I employed during this research project. Specifically I used an indigenous paradigm and utilized a conversational indigenous methodology, between myself as an indigenous Māori woman from New Zealand and the indigenous Suquamish community members that I spent time with in Washington. A conversational indigenous methodology was chosen because it allowed the explicit acknowledgement of the difference between our indigenous cultures (Red Pedagogy and Kaupapa Māori), whilst simultaneously highlighting the similarities. As a part of adopting a decolonizing approach to research I explicate how I have conducted this research project with high levels of consultation between the Suquamish and I. I also define the process of collaborative storytelling as a conversation between two indigenous peoples and the privileging of this methodological approach over traditional Western semi-structure interviewing techniques (Smith, 1999). Lastly, I outline the key tenets of the collection of empirical material.

In chapter four I present the results of my trip to Washington to meet with the Suquamish. In order to illustrate the exact process of this journey, I have written the first half of
this chapter as a narrative. The purpose of writing this half as a narrative is to show the reader how a conversational indigenous methodology works as praxis and the importance of this type of approach when conducting indigenous research. The second half of the chapter is comprised of the collaborative storytelling sessions that I conducted with the Suquamish. I have arranged these collaborative storytelling sessions under the following themes: 1) Historical Connections, 2) Tribal Canoe Journeys and 3) Empowerment. The themes are guided by the priorities of the Suquamish community members that I spoke with.

In the final chapter these results are discussed in relation to the broader context of SFD policy and practice. Following many critical scholars Darnell (2010a), Darnell and Hayhurst (2012), Forsyth and Wamsley (2006), Giles (2007), Nicholls, Giles and Sethna (2010), and Smith (1999) I propose the need to adopt a decolonizing praxis when developing, implementing and evaluating SFD programs in indigenous communities for indigenous communities and SFD practitioners. I have presented this chapter under the following themes: Histories of colonization, indigenous peoples and sport; Tribal Canoe Journeys: Paddling against the tides of (neo) colonialism; Encouraging Self-determination of Indigenous peoples as decolonizing praxis – Lessons from the Suquamish. I end by concluded on the findings and presenting some key limitations of this research project.
CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

In recent decades, rhetoric such as “sport contributes to development” has motivated many organizations and scholars towards the now–bubbling field of SFD where sport is viewed as a site to exert positive social change upon populations (Coakley, 2011). In developed nations, most SFD initiatives are aimed toward communities that are deemed disadvantaged, marginalized, at-risk, or requiring development, including: at-risk youth, indigenous communities, and refugees (Coatler, 2007; Kidd, 2007). In these contexts sport is observed as a medium to exert “positive influence on public health, socialization of children, youths and adults, the social inclusion of the disadvantaged, the economic development of regions and states, and on fostering intercultural exchange and conflict resolution” (Lyras & Peachey, 2011, p. 311).

According to Coatler (2010a) and Kidd (2008) although many of these SFD initiatives claim to have a significant impact on society, to date, these SFD programs have been poorly planned with little empirical evidence to support such claims. Coatler (2010a) has also suggested that there has been little research into the effectiveness of the conditions and processes of SFD in particular settings, such as indigenous communities.

Many scholars including Black (2010), Coatler (2010a), Coatler (2010b), Darnell (2010a), Darnell and Hayhurst (2011), Kidd (2008), Saveedra (2009) caution against the sport evangelist view of SFD as overwhelmingly positive for disadvantaged/marginalized communities. Rather, as history has shown, SFD initiatives have principally been devised in the West, within the context of Western notions of progress and development. Put another way, sport has often been couched within broader notions of the enlightenment and modernity. In this way, sport is often viewed as the great equalizer, a place where meritocracy reigns free; where people
from different walks of life can come together under a common goal. However, as I argued in the introduction has shown historically, this functionalist view of sport has often disregarded the broader socio-historical, cultural, and political role that sport has played throughout history. Although SFD has the potential to promote social change and development in marginalized/disadvantaged/at-risk communities, there is a potential for SFD to be overly romanticized as a solution to social ailments within these communities.

In this chapter, I aim to deconstruct the statement “sport contributes to development” by cultivating a review of previous literature in the nascent field of SFD. I will begin by outlining a selection of key terms and examples of SFD in global and local contexts. Specifically I will look at how SFD programs function under the dominant functionalist discourse, which deems SFD as enabling progress and improvement for indigenous communities. I will then look at some key critiques of SFD and then specifically at post-colonial critiques of SFD. Despite these critiques and the nascent nature of SFD there have been attempts by SFD scholars to foster a SFD theory. Thus, the next section will outline the theoretical framework of SFD Theory, which has been recently coined by scholars such as Lytras and Peachey (2011).

Using the key critiques that have been shown throughout the previous sections I will problematize this current SFD praxis and theory, as it has been devised within a dominant Eurocentric worldview. After this, I will to delve into the use of SFD programs within Native American communities, whilst highlighting how SFD programs have once again been created – often under the pretenses of neocolonialism. As a form of successful decolonizing praxis, I finish looking at how some SFD initiatives are being conducted in culturally relevant ways through the use more community driven and participatory research. I do this by offering a case study of the Suquamish Tribe from Seattle, Washington. In particular, I look at two programs, the ‘Healing of
the Canoe’ program and the ‘Tribal Canoe Journeys’ as examples of successful SFD initiatives that are being enacted in indigenous communities. Throughout this literature review I will highlight how there has been a lack of critical analysis of SFD programs in Native American communities. I will also problematize the positioning of SFD programs as a linear model of transmission of “developmental aid” from the “developed West” to “developing” Native American communities. I conclude by suggesting the need to (re)center an indigenous worldview as the basis of SFD programs in order to develop better praxis from which SFD programs are created— as a way to truly empower indigenous communities.

Sport for Development

In recent years there has been a concerted effort to use sport as a vehicle of social change and (economic and social) development, especially in disadvantaged communities of the world (Kidd, 2008). MacIntosh and Spence (2012) entertain the notion that the concept of using sport for developmental purposes is premised on two approaches. The first approach is denoted as the ‘development of sport,’ whereby the development of sport is centered on developing the sport itself — this approach is particularly concerned with elite amateur sport. The second approach looks at ‘sport for development’; in this way sport is seen as a vehicle to achieve positive social change amongst individuals and communities — it is the second approach that this study is concerned with, the use of SFD (Hayhurst & Frisby, 2010).

However, as Black (2010) contends, the concept of development itself is a ubiquitous term. As many development theorists such as Neverdeen Pieterse (2010) have contended, development and development theory have been largely couched as an offshoot of Eurocentric Western notions of progress and evolution. However, if we are to look critically at the genealogy
of development, and the paradigm from which it has been engineered, this perspective can be questioned. In fact, numerous scholars’ such as Black (2009), Hartmann and Kwauk (2011), and Taylor (2012) have questioned the Eurocentric discourse that pervades development and development practices. Given the dominance of Western thought in the field of development and more recently in the field of SFD, I look to adopt a critical approach to the study of development. Rather than looking for a homogenous SFD paradigm I propose that there are multiple paradigms from which SFD can be conceived. For this reason I shall adopt Pieterse’s (2010) definition of alternative development as introducing alternative practices of development, both participatory and people-centered, and by redefining the way SFD is developed and implemented.

One of the most compelling trends of the international field of development has been the increase in the use of SFD to achieve economic and social goals. There have been many key institutions in the creation and implementation of these initiatives. From non-governmental organizations, to the increasing involvement of government agencies, the use of SFD is becoming increasingly prominent. Notably, multilateral organizations such as the United Nations have identified how sport can be used for development with youth, students and student-athletes, culminating with the ‘Sport for Development and Peace’ movement, which has been described as one of the most encouraging sports initiatives in the last few years (Kidd, 2008). Indeed, the consensus of the nascent SFD field is overwhelmingly positive — as a medium through which social justice can be achieved for marginalized populations.

According to the United Nations (2012) the definition of sport within the context of development “usually includes a broad and inclusive spectrum of activities suitable to people of all ages and abilities, with an emphasis on the positive values of sport” (p. 2). The UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace defined sport, for the purposes of
development, as “all forms of physical activity that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction, such as play, recreation, organized or competitive sport, and indigenous sports and games” (United Nations, 2012, p. 2). The UN uses the term ‘development’ in the context of sport under the following premises:

- Individual development
- Health promotion and disease prevention
- Promotion of gender equality
- Social integration and the development of social capital
- Peace building and conflict prevention/resolution
- Post-disaster/trauma relief and normalization of life
- Economic development
- Communication and social mobilization

Therefore we can observe that the UN objectives concerning the use of Sport for Development and Peace are broad in scope. In acknowledging this fact, it is useful to look critically at how these objectives are being achieved—especially the extent to which these objectives are being implemented and achieved in ways that empower marginalized groups.

Burnett (2009) suggests that SFD is a “contested social construct which encapsulates a wide range of movement phenomena and activities that present various degrees of institutionalization, reflecting unique individualized and cultural meanings as it finds expression in diverse social contexts” (p. 1193). Within this statement, “social change” is viewed as being achieved in the “in-field” application of the SFD program – and this social change is usually viewed as positive. In relation, the term “development” is usually reflected in the perception of progress for the recipients. Consequently, the success of SFD programs is usually measured on ‘tangible evidence’ (health factors or social factors) and as a result SFD programs become majorly results-driven, with a strong focus on outcomes rather than the process.

Levermore (2008) discusses how the role of sport as an “engine of development” has been largely absent in academic analysis of social sciences. Scarce attention has been given to
SFD in any of the key international development texts. To further reinforce this point Levermore (2008) states, “At the time of writing, it was found that from over 70,000 entries in the last 15 years of International Development abstracts, only 12 mentioned sport” (p. 184). Instead of the field of development, most of the literature pertaining to development through sport has come from sports studies academics. Levermore (2008) notes scholars such as Coalter (2005), Maguire (1999; 2000), Armstrong (1997), Giulianotti (2004), Darby (2002) and Chappell (2004) were at the time some of the only researchers who have acknowledged the relationship between sport and development. On the whole, these scholars have written about SFD from a functionalist perspective. Given this, research into the field of SFD had been largely descriptive rather than critical. This is further reinforced by the failure of government organizations, the UN, non-governmental organizations and mainstream development organizations to historically note sport as a key driver in development. Thus, there has been an inherent lack of acknowledgement of sport as a driver of development until recently.

Kidd (2008) discusses the UN’s ‘Sport for Development and Peace’ project. He suggests that in recent years there has been a concerted effort to remobilize sport as a vehicle for sustainable development initiatives. By in large, these development initiatives have been positioned as the transmission of aid from the developed Global North to the developing Global South. Kidd (2008) contends that SFD draws heavily on the idealism and energy of youth, and a growing number of ex-athletes that have formed National Government Organizations and SFD programs. At present SFD programs have been “woefully underfunded, completely unregulated, poorly planned and coordinated” (Kidd, 2008, p. 376). A related problem has been the top-down control; usually SFD programs have little to no community involvement in the creation of these programs.
These types of initiatives are common in many developing countries, including: Australia, Norway, Canada, Norway and the United States. In particular, the United States has launched an initiative through the Department of State entitled the ‘sports diplomacy initiative.’ The ‘sports diplomacy initiative’ is designed to facilitate international development/relations with Lebanon through training in basketball with the aim of reducing social conflict. The initiative is part of the wider US foreign policy to improve its image within the Middle East.\textsuperscript{10} Therefore, we can understand that sport is not divorced from broader political objectives of developed countries.

Other development organizations include the United Nations Children’s Fund (will now be referred to as UNICEF) and the World Health Organization (will now be referred to as WHO). UNICEF and WHO have separately acknowledged how sport and physical activity can improve physical and mental health of children. By noting this they have entered into relationships with National Government Organizations, private interest groups and community-based groups to increase participation in sports. There have been many SFD initiatives worldwide; Levermore (2008) describes the ‘Together for Girls’ in refugee camps in East Africa.’ Many sponsors of these development programs are major corporations such as Nike, BP and Deloitte. For example, BP sponsors the UNICEF ‘Football for Peace’ initiative in Colombia. The initiative assists Colombian children who are affected by the civil war to get back into their communities. The infiltration of BP into these communities is not surprising as it is in its best interest, given its business in Colombia is more likely to succeed in a stable climate.

The issues that these initiatives encapsulate are broad, from alleviating poverty to encouraging economic development. Deloitte has claimed that its actions in South Africa with

\textsuperscript{10} Notably, this strategy has historical links to the way sport was used during the Cold War (please see Wagg & Andrews, 2012 for further details).
sports events have created many employment opportunities for underemployed black communities. For this reason sport has been used as ‘capacity building’, where sport can be used to build physical and intellectual infrastructures. Levermore (2008) also shows how sport has been used to raise awareness of issues in a ‘seemingly’ non-political way; for example educating communities about AIDS/HIV or awareness of child abuse. These types of programs have been used to ‘empower’ marginalized populations. Sport is also viewed as being pivotal in improving the population’s physical and psychological health (WHO, 2003). Sport programs have helped alleviate health ailments such as drug abuse, obesity, violence and alcohol use (Levermore, 2008). The last category that Levermore (2008) explains is the use of sport to support economic development and to reduce poverty. Levermore (2008) finishes by highlighting the gap in literature that addresses the social and economic spheres of SFD.

A central concern of SFD research has been the evaluation of the extent to which sport has facilitated development goals in various contexts (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). The use of SFD in ethnically diverse populations has also been shown throughout this section and has the dominant belief that sport is the new engine of development, and an established remedy to ailments of society such as poverty and poor health (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). It has been the aim of this section to highlight the functionalist view that SFD initiatives have achieved positive outcomes in recent decades. However, there is a need to delve deeper into the critical analysis of SFD. In the next section, I will explore some of the standing evaluations of SFD.

**Critiques of SFD**

Darnell’s (2010a) study illuminates some key critiques of the use of SFD within the global political economy. He uses Gramscian hegemony theory to look at the political and social
implications of the mobilization and implementation of SFD programs. He considers how the implementation of sports programs and the specific customs and values of these programs are influenced by certain sociopolitical and economic conditions (Ingham & Hardy, 1984). Although Darnell’s (2010a) study looks at SFD from the Global North to Global South or Lower or Middle Income Countries (LMIC), these principles could be applied to the Global North (majority population) and Global South (minority populations) in First World countries.

Firstly, Darnell (2010a), drawing from Schuurman offers a detailed discussion of “developmentalism,” in which he states that developmentalism has a variety of dispositions that can be:

- espoused [by] three main perspectives: 1) an essentialist view of the “developing world” and its members as a homogenous group, 2) an unyielding belief in progress and the modernization of society, and 3) the centrality of the nation-state as a focal point and lead participant in the development process (Schuurman, 2001, cited in Darnell 2010a, p. 56).

As Schuurman (2001) shows arbitrary categories of development were defined in early SFD interventions, which separated those who were considered “developed” and those that were deemed “undeveloped.” These kinds of classifications only increased the marginalization of already marginalized groups.

Subsequently, a second wave of development came, where development encapsulated neoliberalism. Worth quoting at length, David Harvey (2005) has described neoliberalism in this way:

Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by
strong private property rights, free markets and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. The state has to guarantee, for example, the quality and integrity of money. It must also set up those military, defense, police and legal structures and functions required to secure private property rights and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets. Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution) then they must be created, by state action if necessary. But beyond these tasks the state should not venture. State interventions in markets (once created) must be kept to a bare minimum because, according to the theory, the state cannot possibly possess enough information to second-guess market signals (prices) and because powerful interest groups will inevitably distort and bias state interventions (particularly in democracies) for their own benefit. (p. 2)

Under this definition, neoliberalism is not just a reincarnation of liberalism but rather a distinctive economic theory in its own right. The ramifications those neoliberal ideologies have had on development in developing countries has been devastating (Rapley, 1996).

Writing in this context, Darnell (2010a) suggests that SFD programs are organized within the global political economy, and the global political economy is organized in such a way, that it exacerbates vast social inequalities. In order to make sense of these pervasive social inequalities, Darnell (2010a) adopts hegemony theory in order to make sense of these pervasive social inequalities. Specifically, he points to Andrews and Giardina’s (2008) emphasis on the importance of understanding sport within the “complexities, ambiguities and specificities of social relations, not as a politically transcendent activity or institution” (p. 57). Therefore, SFD
initiatives do not happen outside of broader social structures including the global political economy.

Another key point that Darnell (2010a) raises is the historic use of sport to produce healthy bodies for the labor force (Ingham & Hardy, 1984). He prescribes that SFD initiatives use sport to support the uptake of “competitive and hierarchical culture and the political economy” by marginalized groups (p. 58). In understanding this point, one must question the true objectives of SFD and whether it is truly empowering, or whether SFD is a way to encourage active neo-liberal citizenship in the global political economy. By adopting these dominant neoliberal ideologies, the SFD rhetoric emulates the capitalist economic system that proposes “human wellbeing can be best advanced by Liberating entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade” (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). Although, as we know not all sport forms are good, not all forms of corporeal liberation are in fact, liberating (Newman, 2013). Saavedra (2009) takes a similar tack, arguing, “Sport carries historical and cultural baggage especially from its hegemonic core” (p. 131).

The use of modern sport in SFD programs carries many contentious issues, as it constantly transmits Western norms and ideologies in the name of progress. Newman (2013) cautions against the lure of modernity’s hyper competitive and hyper rationalized neoliberal system, and the place within this system. If we are to accept that SFD does in fact equal progress, as a function of modernity, then we also accept that those peoples (usually the developing) are in need of acculturalization into the dominant neoliberal citizenship?\(^{11}\) So, the question really

\[^{11}\] Neoliberal citizenship refers to the citizenship that is circumscribed by neoliberal policies. Therefore, neoliberal citizens are citizens that take up neo-liberal policies and institutions (Hindress, 2002). There are many issues that arise from this type of acculturation, namely the way that the organization of social life under a neoliberal regime also denotes the unequal distribution of power. Indeed, like the histories of colonization where indigenous peoples
becomes, are we merely mimicking colonial histories through these SFD programs? If the true premise of SFD is to develop and empower communities, then there is a need to drastically rethink the boundaries of what and what does not, constitute development.

In conclusion, Darnell (2010a) alludes to the notion that we must consider counter-hegemonic approaches to SFD that engages with the political economy. Both Darnell (2010a) and Levermore (2008) have shown the problematic nature of SFD, by questioning the economic agendas of key interest groups of SFD. By questioning these agendas, we constantly need to ask whether SFD is empowering or just facilitating the creation of neo-liberal citizenship? Lastly, Levermore (2008) suggests that a better approach to SFD would be a progressive approach that viewed sport as a way to challenge the neoliberal individualistic achievement that warrants social inequality.

Coatler (2010a) takes a similar approach to Darnell (2010a) by questioning the Western worldview assumptions that govern SFD. He explores the formation of social capital within the UN’s SFD initiative. He comments on the UN’s use of sport as a tool for development in terms of social cohesion and the development of social capital through volunteerism. Coatler (2010a) contends that policy documents have addressed SFD in superficial ways. In 2005 the UN mandated the Year of Sport and Physical Education, turning to sport as a way to reach its Millennium goals. However the basis of using sport stems from the traditional, functionalist rhetoric that sport can teach people values for a ‘civil’ society: “discipline, honesty, integrity, generosity and trustworthiness” (Coatler, 2010a, p. 296). Consequently, Coatler (2010a) asserts that there has been a lack of evaluation, and monitoring of the current SFD programs have further reinforced this superficial approach to SFD.

were “deemed” inferior to the colonizers. Once again through the acculturation of indigenous peoples into a neoliberal society, indigenous peoples may find themselves in a disadvantaged position to their non-indigenous peers.
Additionally, Coatler (2010a) also emphasizes that there has been a shift in the ‘aid paradigm,’ where the role of sport is seen as a way to enable “partnerships, social development, social cohesion, coordination, sharing of knowledge and expertise” (p. 1376). By this, we can deduce that SFD can be achieved through grassroots or bottom-up community approaches. This type of thinking contributes to an overall doxa of SFD as a way to achieve social inclusion and active citizenship. However, the question must be asked, who defines what constitutes “active citizenship” and to whose parameters is “social inclusion.”

Coatler’s (2010a) study is another critique at the functionalist sports policy rhetoric of the SFD movement. He argues against the rhetoric that sport can provide economic aid to a variety of worldwide development problems. The UN has acknowledged the power of sports and is now looking to sport to achieve its Millennium Development Goals. At face value the premise of using SFD is intriguing. Coatler (2010a) argues that new approaches to using SFD “contain a number of dangers” (p. 295). Dangers include: overlooking the socio-political contexts that SFD organizations are working within; “confusing micro-level individual outcomes with community and broader macro-level impacts” (p. 295); and trying to solve broad social problems based on narrowly focused interventions. Based on these dangers, Coatler (2010a) contends that if SFD is to have a potential impact then research needs to evaluate programs on the basis of local development. Rather than research on development that legitimizes the development process for international organizations.

Furthermore, the majority of policy makers within the SFD campaign have viewed sport as evangelical, apolitical, and neutral, a place where meritocracy reigns free. Under these mythopoeic and functionalist assertions, SFD initiatives are an avenue where marginalized populations can ascertain integrative social practices. The outcomes of these SFD programs are
vague and can range from social cohesion to achieving peace at local, national and international levels. Like other social policies, SFD policies are premised on the social rights of citizenship. Coatler (2010a) prescribes how the social and transformative properties of sport have colonial and imperialistic undertones. Drawing upon the work of Giulianotti (2004), Coatler (2010) argues that sport’s institutions have been directly involved in the ‘cultural genocide’ of indigenous peoples culture via the displacement of indigenous sports and games. In terms of Native American populations, is active citizenship and social inclusion achieved by the assimilation of Native Americans into hegemonic Western conceptions of sport? If so, then we could conclude that, yes, SFD is achieving its objectives. However if SFD’s true objective is to empower marginalized communities then I would suggest there is a need to critically think about the taken-for-granted assumptions that inform the formation of SFD practice (Lindsay & Grattan, 2012; Darnell & Hayhurst, 2012).

A Postcolonial Critique of SFD Discourses

Darnell’s (2010b) study takes the critique of SFD further by alluding to the neocolonial nature of SFD approaches. He shows there are two discursive frameworks functioning in the SFD initiatives. The first contends that sport is a universal and socially integrative practice, and second, that development is the transmission of aid from the ‘First World,’ Global North, developed countries/communities to the ‘Third World’, Global South, developing countries/communities. Darnell’s (2010b) study describes the implications of SFD initiatives, where the pinnacle standard of intervention is set within the parameters of white privilege. He states that the results from his study support the critique that SFD initiatives constantly (re)construct a specific set of knowledge: the knowledge of whiteness and the ‘Other.’ Darnell
notes this as important because it perpetuates neocolonialism, through its categorization and
definition of racialized bodies. Through SFD initiatives whiteness is confirmed as the intelligible
expert in relation to the unintelligible bodies of color who are simultaneously grateful for the
blessings of development. Throughout this study Darnell (2010b) calls for the continued critique
of SFD initiatives and attention to the “(re) production of race-based notions of superiority
within development through sport programs” (p. 574). Darnell builds on Li’s (2007) study that
uses Foucauldian perspectives to illuminate how development organizations respond to
“underdevelopment” in Lower Middle Income Countries (LMIC’s). Li (2007) addressed how
global development agencies, namely the World Bank, utilized the SFD initiative to sustain
boundaries of cultural power between the “developed” and the “underdeveloped”. The study
looks at young Canadians’ experiences in the SFD initiative and how intersections of race,
power, gender and class work both with and against the guise of ‘development.’

Darnell (2010b) argues that development constantly overlooks the colonial-informed
hierarchies that have been formed historically. That is not to say that development initiatives are
actively trying to maliciously control or dominate the “undeveloped.” However, the results of
Darnell’s (2010b) study suggest that racial dominance, governmentality and control are integral
to the modernist logic of international development. Darnell (2010b) interviewed a number of
young Canadian volunteers involved in a SFD initiative. Darnell (2010b) found that the SFD
initiative, “…positions ‘Whiteness’ as the standard and those who assume Whiteness as the
stewards of change. In this way, race continues to be one of the social indicators of modernism
and modernity” (p. 414). With these dominant politics at play, whiteness is positioned as a
superior and intelligible mode of thought. While other modes of thought, such as an indigenous
worldview are rendered unintelligible within the discursive frame of SFD. Thus neocolonial
discourses of improvement and progress are solidified within the SFD initiative. Darnell (2010b) goes on to state,

Although sport is not incompatible with a politics of justice and anti-dominance within international development, such deployment of sport requires recognition within the SDP movement of the ways in which the regulated, disciplined, physically fit body is constituted by, and constitutive of, bio-political discourses of success and freedom that are often individualized, dehistoricized, and inequitable. (p. 414)

Darnell (2010b) surmises that it would be beneficial to reconfigure the use of indigenous self-determination in order to disrupt neoliberal policies. He states that the point is not to overly romanticize indigenous knowledge, but rather to see the opportunity for collaboration.

Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) highlight the relationship between politics and power embedded within the dominant ethos of capitalist achievement in SFD initiatives. In essence, SFD initiatives have adopted a top-down approach to development projects, thus opening themselves up to post-colonial, feminist and post-development criticisms. Although SFD initiatives may have been well intentioned in their approach, Darnell and Hayhurst (2012) call for a shift towards the decolonization of sport as a tool for development. Darnell and Hayhurst (2012) approach this theorizing in three ways. They examine the “decolonizing turn in development studies that positions development as a struggle in response to colonizing revelations and in opposition to linear models of deliverance or stewardship” (p. 184). Secondly, they address the colonial residue that is found within current SFD programs and the need for a ‘decolonizing praxis’. Thirdly, they propose a critical methodology for SFD scholarship that supports decolonization. The word ‘decolonization’ in this context refers to the challenging of
colonial authority and the support of self-determination of indigenous communities throughout
development initiatives.

The decolonization of SFD programs is important as it views the process of development
as a sequence of power struggles for equality within the political economy (Pieterse, 1998;
Piertese, 1996). An approach like this is paramount given the relationship between development
and the histories of colonization against indigenous and peoples of “developing” regions.
Scholars have shown that there are certain ideological, political and practical implications in the
historical diffusion of sport as a tool for colonizing developing Nations (Guest, 2009; Kidd,
2008). Saavedra (2009) takes this further by adding, “Sport carries historical and cultural
baggage especially from its hegemonic core” (p. 131). Thus, the use of modern sport in SFD
programs is implicated, as it constantly transmits Western norms and ideologies in the name of
progress. A dangerous assumption that SFD programs make is that sport is a universally friendly
tool, rather than acknowledging that sport is deeply embedded within historical, political and
colonial contexts which have historically marginalized the very groups of people that
development is meant to help.

Another point that Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) show is the role, viewpoint, and action of
the development researcher. In order to challenge the dominance of the Western worldview in
SFD programs the researcher needs to recognize that development programs are implicated in
broader relations of dominance and consent. The authors call on Gramscian Marxism to illustrate
the ways that sport is being used to create social change are not benign—but formed through
dominant relations and dominant ideologies (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). In this way, SFD needs
to go further than just recognizing indigenous ways of knowing, as this just reaffirms the colonial
gaze. The de-colonial researcher needs to adopt an approach that supports local identities and indigeneities in a global context.

Lastly, Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) suggest there are still colonial residues present in SFD programs and research, as there is a focus on the sport within social relations that sustain the power/knowledge dichotomy. The institutionalizing practice of using sports such as football to help developing nations helps to perpetuate colonial power hierarchies. This mentality instills the notion that “developing” communities and nations are unable to help themselves. Through this process, SFD programs ultimately uphold the racial hierarchy of colonization, by maintaining the dominance of whiteness as “normal.” In understanding this, Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) advise the use of a decolonizing praxis in order to combat the normalcy of whiteness.

To this end, Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) discuss the use of a critical praxis of sport for decolonization. This type of praxis has been adopted by post-colonial feminist methodologies to question commonsensical hierarchies. Rather than (re) producing the dominant scientific representations of bodies built on social inequality, Darnell and Hayhurst draw upon McEwan (2009) to suggest that we need to address alternative knowledge and histories. Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) emphasize the need to adopt participatory action research, which is defined as “a participatory process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes” (see Reason & Bradbury, 2008, p. 4). By conducting participatory research the researcher enables communities to have an active role throughout the research process, from the setting of the agenda to the research process itself. Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) propose that participatory action research could be useful in addressing colonial residues that are prevalent within SFD programs.
In conclusion, Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) have shown that a decolonizing approach to SFD needs to be constantly revised. The overarching ideology that sport is a universally friendly tool for development needs closer scrutiny. First, we need to question the fundamental assumptions that SFD policy makers hold that often perpetuate racist colonial undertones. Second, there is a need to question, just who is being empowered through the process of using SFD and whether the implementation of these programs is being conducted in culturally relevant ways. Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) conclude by illustrating that research into the decolonization of SFD has been largely overlooked, and is worth further interrogation.

**A Critique of Organizational Practice in SFD Programs**

Although SFD is still in its nascent years, there have been some efforts by scholars to foster a SFD theory. Notably, Lyras and Peachey (2011) have engineered a version of SFD Theory that is based on five theoretical tenets: 1) impact assessment, 2) organizational, 3) sport and physical activity, 4) educational and 5) cultural enrichment (Lyras, 2007) (outlined in-depth in table 2). The first component, impact assessment, involves cultivating observable outcomes, essentially SFD programs that aim to bring about positive social change can be observed on three levels of analysis – the macro, meso, and micro of society. A macro level would contend institutional change such as changes in policy, infrastructure, socio-economic factors and economic resources that would then effect change in marginalized communities. At a meso level, change would occur in social networks, values and norms, group cohesion, social integration and inter-group relationships. Lastly, at a micro level assessment would look at individual self-esteem, perceptions, stereotypes and empowerment. Lyras and Peachey (2011) implore that first analyzing SFD programs under these impact analyses, would enable more strategic and
systematic practices. Although all of these elements are worthy of lengthy analysis, for the purpose of this section I will concentrate on the organizational behavior aspect.

Table 2: Sport-for-development theory's components of effective sport-for-development (SFD) policy, programme development and implementation (adapted from Lytras, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts assessment</th>
<th>Organizational</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Cultural enrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apply scientific monitoring and evaluation methodology</strong> (validated instruments, detached data analysis and objective interpretation)</td>
<td>Increase social capital through ongoing training of all engaged stakeholders</td>
<td>Apply sport practices based on moral values and principles (existence of vision and philosophy)</td>
<td>Create child-oriented conditions for positive learning experiences</td>
<td>Enrich sport intervention curricula with cultural activities (e.g., arts, music, dance, theatre, poetry, short movie making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assess the impact of SFD programs and policy across time and space</strong></td>
<td>Build the capacity of and empower local stakeholders based on their needs and unique potential</td>
<td>Create inclusive mixed teams (ethnicity, gender, competence level)</td>
<td>Create reward system to reinforce positive attitudes, thoughts and behaviors (Social Cognitive Theory, role playing, cognitive and behavioral approaches, positive role models)</td>
<td>Apply multidisciplinary framework with global and local issues (e.g., human rights, global environment, international relations, peace and cross-cultural understanding, technological literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilize mixed methods approach and collect data from multiple sources of information</strong> (triangulation, reports, pre-post questionnaires, audiovisual data, journals, focus groups)</td>
<td>Foster an inclusive, collaborative environment (e.g., inter-group contact principles: equal status, potential friendship, common goals, institutional support, intergroup corporation)</td>
<td>Merge traditional with non-traditional sports and physical activities (e.g., soccer, treasure hunt, martial arts)</td>
<td>Facilitate conditions for optimal engagement in every sport and non-sport activity (flow and peak experiences)</td>
<td>Make mental and practical associations between sports and real life experiences (e.g., human rights, environmental issues, community-based initiatives, life skills, spirituality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assess organizational components and identify attributes that leverage positive outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Promote the development of innovative SFD programs, products, and services (changes within)</td>
<td>Provide a variety of sport and physical activities to attract and sustain a more representative population</td>
<td>Use real life sport and non-sport challenges to achieve educational objectives (Constructivist Pedagogy and Problem-Based Learning)</td>
<td>Create clusters to initiate community based creative engagement and participation (e.g., community-based sport and non-sport initiatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify organizational components that hinder positive change and development</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate transformational leadership</td>
<td>Utilize the principles of the educational component (Sport-for-Development Theory)</td>
<td>Create groups with similar interests</td>
<td>Utilize Olympism as a framework of inclusion, inspiration and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify and assess SFD related social, psychological and societal indicators</strong></td>
<td>Ensure sustainable resources and institutionalize innovative organizational culture</td>
<td>Encourage coaches and instructors to serve as educators, positive role models and agents of positive change</td>
<td>Empower individuals by assigning preference and interest based roles</td>
<td>Create positive entertaining experiences and facilitate innovation and outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lyras and Peachey (2011) propose how the organizational component of SFD can be viewed through organizational change theory. SFD theory aims to provide a greater understanding of the ways in which SFD can facilitate development and social change. Given this objective, SFD theory acknowledges that this change cannot be sustained without achieving systematic change within the institution of sport. Specifically, SFD theory is premised on the notion that there should be improvement of the “…systemic functions and governing practices, structures, products and services of national and international organisations” (Lyras & Peachey, 2011, p. 315). Additionally, SFD policy and governance should be driven by research and theory and adjusted accordingly to this research.

Organizational change researchers in sport believe that more than one approach needs to be adopted when analyzing SFD programs, because sport is such a complex social phenomenon (Friedman & Mason, 2005; Morrow & Idle, 2008; Slack & Hinings, 1992; Welty Peachey & Bruening, 2011). They suggest that change could be better understood if researchers combine
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many theoretical frameworks – organizational behavior, organizational culture and transformational leadership theory to name a few. However, as Darnell (2010b) and Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) have shown, by adopting theories that are grounded within liberalism, SFD as a field runs the risk of perpetuating neocolonialism. Under the guise of organizational change, the use of these (enlightened) theories portrays notions of race-based superiority of the intelligent “expert” over the unintelligible indigenous person/community.

Furthermore, the sections of Table 2 reflect the neoliberal *doxa* that has been described earlier. In the organizational section of the table reflects more of a business model than an empowering SFD rhetoric. On the one hand, SFD theory calls for the fostering of an inclusive and collaborative environment whilst simultaneously promoting SFD programs, *products*, and *services*. There is also a drive to create synergies with local and international SFD stakeholders. The use of the word stakeholders and the creation of synergies promote many of the key tenets of neoliberalism that Harvey (2005) defined as the “political economic practice that proposes that human well-being can be best advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade” (p. 2).

Additionally, if we take a closer look at the diction of the organizational behavior column in Table 2, it is majorly worded as the neoliberal (neocolonial) *doxa*. For instance, one of the main goals is to “Build the capacity of and empower local stakeholders based on their needs and unique potential” (Lyras and Peachey, 2011). Although this seems straightforward, there is a problematic underlying nature to these statements. One might ask, Who are these key stakeholders? Who defines what constitutes potential? Once again, if achieving this potential were to acculturalize indigenous peoples into neoliberal citizens, then yes, this would be
appropriate. However, if the true goal of SFD is in fact empowerment, then I would suggest that there is a need to rethink the dominant neoliberal doxa that is informing SFD praxis.

Additionally, SFD’s organizational behavior also contends that there is a need to “foster an inclusive collaborative environment (e.g., inter-group contact principles: equal status, potential friendship, common goals, institutional support, intergroup corporation)”. Although utopic, to date, there has been little research into the way that this is carried out, especially in indigenous communities. Another key tenet is to “ensure sustainable resources and institutionalise innovative organisational culture” (Lyras and Peachey, 2011, p. 314). Once again this is good, but there is no method to achieving this. As we have seen throughout history, development and progress has often meant the loss of identity and culture for indigenous peoples.

Other key terms include, “Utilis(ing) inclusive decision making to promote individual and collective actions” and “build(ing) local and global platforms to establish synergies with local and international SFD stakeholders (e.g., universities, NGOs, policymakers, practitioners)”. Understandably, creating synergy between these key SFD stakeholders may be beneficial to the development of SFD in indigenous communities worldwide. At the same time, however, there needs to be a sense of caution when conducting these kind of synergies as there can be a propensity to homogenize indigenous peoples and their diverse cultures. For example, in the case of Native American communities there has been a tendency to categorize Native American people as one homogenous group, rather than many independent sovereign Nations.

As I explored earlier, throughout history the use of sport with indigenous peoples has been contentious, for example rugby in New Zealand with the indigenous Māori to the use of basketball with the Navajo peoples (Anderson, 2006; Hokowhitu, 2004). From this review of
literature the use of SFD seems to perpetuate colonialism in the name of modernity and progress. In acknowledging the prevalent neoliberal doxa in SFD theory and SFD, the need to adopt a decolonizing praxis to SFD when working with indigenous communities becomes more apparent. Overall, the rudimentary analysis that SFD theory has had towards working with indigenous communities is in need of further investigation. Throughout this section it has been my aim to illuminate the problematic and often conflicting use of SFD initiatives. In order to deconstruct the notion that “Sport contributes to development,” the literature in this section have shown that in many cases SFD has not contributed to development at all. Put another way, no matter how well meaning, not all SFD initiatives are good, just as not all forms of corporeal liberation, are in fact, liberating. Rather, as Darnell (2010b) has shown, in many cases of SFD there has been a tendency to (re) construct “enlightened axioms” of SFD, that seek to perpetuate white privilege, colonialism within a neoliberal doxa (Coatler, 2010; Darnell, 2010a).

Essentially, SFD and SFD theory have been positioned from a Western worldview and have contributed to the perpetuation of colonialism as neocolonialism. Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) have taken this further and suggest that there is a need for SFD to adopt a de-colonizing approach. In acknowledging these key critiques in the field of SFD, I will now turn to the use of SFD in Indigenous communities and the use of Community Participatory Action Research and Participatory Action Research. It is important to note how scholars have come to define the key issues that prevail in indigenous communities – because it is often these issues that substantiate the claim that “development” leads to improvement in these communities.
**SFD in Native American Communities**

Many SFD initiatives have used sport as a context to transmit information about broader health and wellness objectives in indigenous communities (Maro, Roberts, & Sorensen, 2009). Despite the positive potential SFD initiatives have to enhance indigenous communities, there has been a lack of co-creation in the development of these initiatives. Given the lack of co-creation, there has been a tendency for SFD initiatives working in indigenous communities to perpetuate Western ideas and measures of development, modernization, and progress—or what some critics might point to as the key tenets of (neo) colonialism. This is because the SFD initiatives have been developed and implemented within the parameters of a Western worldview, rather than within the indigenous communities worldview. As we know, indigenous peoples of the Global South have been subject to the processes of colonization. During the colonial era of the early eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, sport played a significant role in the acculturation of indigenous populations into the dominant western culture (Hokowhitu, 2004). If we fast-forward to the present day, it would seem that we have moved past colonization, and are in a state of “post-colonization.” However, as the critiques of the SFD literature in the past section and scholars (Smith, 1999; Bale & Cronin, 2003; Vasil, 2000) can attest, we are not “past” colonization. Rather, we are in a new wave of colonization, where capitalism is now working in dialogue with old patterns and relations of colonial power. In the context of SFD initiatives within indigenous communities, SFD policy makers need to heed the warning of neocolonialism. I suggest that there is a need to redress the current SFD initiatives that are being devised under the Western worldview and look to how indigenous communities can be engaged in a process of collaboration during the creation of SFD programs. Through a review of the following studies, I
will explore the use of Participatory Action Research (PAR) and the localized form of PAR research known as Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR).

In their study, Ferreira and Gendron (2011) investigated the use of CBPR in the fields of population and public health. The authors provide a review of the historical progression of CBPR, with a focus on the work that has been done with Indigenous populations in the Americas. They outline the methodologies and stages of research that have historically been used in CBPR research. Ferreira et al. (2011) propose some future directions for the use of CBPR when working with indigenous populations.

Ferreira et al. (2011) show how public health institutions that are engaged in CBPR with indigenous communities, do so on the premise of collaboration. Collaboration in the research process prescribes that all parties involved have equal standing. Parties including the community, researcher, academics, and organizations work together to find common solutions to community issues. Thus, the ultimate goal of CBPR research is to improve the lives of the community through research and education. Ferreira et al. (2011) take note of Freire (1970) who has written extensively about conscientization and believes it should be a fundamental goal of cultural transformative action. Freire has illustrated that by educating marginalized communities of the socio-political, historical and economical factors that are influencing their lives, individuals and

---

12 Ferreira et al. (2011) prescribe that Freire and other European antecessors such as Kurt Lewin influenced the term, ‘Participatory Action Research’ (PAR). Baum, MacDougall, and Smith (2006) state, PAR seeks to understand and improve the world by changing it. At its heart is collective, self-reflective inquiry that researchers and participants undertake, so they can understand and improve upon the practices in which they participate and the situations in which they find themselves. The reflective process is directly linked to action, influenced by understanding of history, culture, and local context and embedded in social relationships. The process of PAR should be empowering and lead to people having increased control over their lives (p. 854).

13 Conscientization is the process of developing a critical awareness of one’s social reality through reflection and action.
communities can then develop a critical pedagogy of these factors and take steps to liberate themselves from this oppression.

Ferreira et al. (2011) call upon the work of Wallerstein, Duran, Minkler, and Foley (2005) to show four specific themes that are outlined in CBPR, these are:

1. participation of the community as co-researchers and the role of researcher as co-learner;
2. creation of knowledge;
3. community transformation (praxis); and
4. reflexivity upon power dynamics in the relationship. (p. 157)

We can deduce that CBPR is the collaborative process of engaging in research whereby the researcher and the community are collaborative agents in the research process and the co-creation of knowledge, whilst holding the emancipatory features of social movements.

It is important to recognize the colonial legacies at play within the American socio-historical landscape; mainly, in the way that research has been historically conducted on Native American communities’ rather than with them. These different worldviews are still in use today, and in CBPR research, the Western-trained scientist has often adopted an ethnocentric-positivist approach (Davis & Reid, 1999; Ferreira et al., 2011). This type of approach has tended to proclaim that there is a single reality, rather than a shared reality that Ferreira et al. (2011) highlights. Under this notion, Ferreira et al. (2011) contend that the researcher is also the learner and can learn from the indigenous culture. Alternatively, the community also learns from the researcher, and they work to a mutual and shared understanding of each other’s culture. A matter of mutual benefits the research should be of relevance to both the community and the researcher. Lastly, the whole research process should be designed for the indigenous community’s transformation and acknowledge the core indigenous beliefs and values.
While the positioning of CBPR can be applied to many research contexts, there has been much interest in its applicability to research into indigenous environment and health. There has been an increasing tendency to identify community risk factors as health determinants—such as smoking, unhealthy lifestyles and inactivity. Ferreira et al. (2011) note that community involvement is the foundation of project success. As is the attention paid to key cultural characteristics such as the importance of relationships. Therefore, CBPR is a method that can acknowledge the relationship emphasis of Native American cultures.

Ferreira et al. (2011) then explore the research stages of CBPR, namely—participatory appraisal and design development, ethical concerns and the research process, participatory implementation, action, participatory monitoring and evaluation, and education. The approach offers some key points in the direction of collaborative work—by breaking down the traditional agenda setting nature of the researcher. Whilst also acknowledging that knowledge may flow both ways, the CBPR approach still positions the researcher as culturally superior to the community. By entering into the relationship with preconceived (western) based assumptions CBPR in this context seems to imitate colonialism. In this instance the researcher has inherently positioned themselves as the “developed” experts whilst the indigenous community is regarded as the undeveloped. Darnell (2010a) has shown that historically these types of classifications have only increased the marginalization of already marginalized groups.

Christopher, Saha, Lachapelle, Jennings, Colclough, Cooper, Cummins, Egger, Fourstar, Harris, Kuntz, LaFromboise, LaVeaux, McDonald, Bird, Rink, and Webster (2011) look into a case study of community and university research partnerships. The study investigates the use of CBPR partnerships coupled with prior developed principles for conducting research with Native American communities. The CBPR partnerships were enacted to investigate health disparities of
Native American communities. The seven projects were initiated by the National Institute of Health and involved the collaboration of researchers with key tribal members. The umbrella theme that Christopher et al. (2011) use is the notion that the key principles that have been identified can be used to build trust and break down hierarchies of power and knowledge. The nine principles the authors identify are:

1. acknowledge historical experience with research and with health issues and work to overcome the negative image of research;
2. recognize tribal sovereignty;
3. differentiate between tribal and community membership;
4. understand tribal diversity and its implications;
5. plan for extended timelines;
6. recognize key gatekeepers;
7. prepare for leadership turnover;
8. interpret data within the cultural context; and
9. utilize indigenous ways of knowing. (Christopher et al., 2011, p. 247)

The authors show how these strategies are used to develop research partnerships with Native American communities. The Center for Native Health Partnerships (CNHP) is a center created to address the health inequalities of Native Americans in Montana via CBPR research. A key standard of the center is allowing the research partners time to develop meaningful relationships and trust. The seven community partners are located across the seven reservations in Montana and represent seven culturally and politically sovereign tribes.

The study employs a multiple-case study design with each project treated on a case-by-case basis. The multiple-case study was completed with seven university-community partnerships. Subsequent to group phone calls, open-ended questions (survey) on five topic areas were sent to the community members and partners. The participants in partnerships submitted examples of the themes from their local contexts. The areas of interest were—Blackfeet Child
Asthma and Healthy Homes Partnership; Testing a Culturally Appropriate Commercial Tobacco Cessation Intervention; and Pediatric Environmental Health Care Provider Initiative. Throughout the studies, Christopher et al. (2011) showed how the nine principles were salient in the research partnership process. It was shown by the case studies that by employing these principles to a CBPR approach many of the studies had short-term success. The authors conclude by encouraging additional studies to be conducted in the field of CBPR when working with Native American communities.

Kegler, Rodine, Marshall, Oman, & McLeroy’s (2003) study looked into the use of HEART in OKC—‘Healthy Empowered and Responsible Teens of Oklahoma City’—to address teenage pregnancy within Native American populations. The program used a series of youth focus groups to develop an intervention program. The focus groups identified nine key strengths and deduced that these strengths may be transferable to other similar projects. The nine key assets were as follows:

1. Aspirations for the future
2. Constructive use of time
3. Respect for culture
4. Skills for meaningful employment
5. Decision-making skills to promote good health
6. Healthy family communication
7. Positive peer role model
8. Positive relationships with non-parent adults
9. Service to others (Kegler et al., p. 142, 2003)

The authors suggest the use of a strengths based approach was fruitful as the focus on a strengths based approach was beneficial to the community. The key assets that were identified facilitated the bases of the intervention programs in the community. The focus on key assets also had a secondary benefit for the community. Rather than a focus on adolescents as individuals with
problems, the program focused on the good aspects, thus facilitating adolescent’s growth into healthy, capable adults. Although this study comes from strengths based approach, it is still underpinned by key fundamental western assumptions.

In summary of this section, the limited research that has been done has been important in breaching the gap between colonial forms of implementation and strengths-based, culturally relevant forms of development. Kegler et al. (2003) have shown that there has been recent paradigm shift away from a deficit-model approach, towards strengths and assets model approach. This shift though, is only in its early years and there has been little research into the use a strengths and assets approach to SFD initiatives in Native American communities. Once again, the studies that have been conducted have often come from a western worldview rather than an indigenous worldview. The last section will examine the use of a culturally relevant SFD initiative in the Native American Suquamish Tribe from Seattle, Washington.

Toward a Culturally Relevant SFD: Lessons from the Suquamish

As mentioned in the introduction, the traditional canoe culture of the Suquamish people has been negatively influenced through the process of colonization. Thomas, Donovan, Sigo and Price (2009) have investigated the use of CBPR with the Suquamish tribe. Thomas et al. (2009) draw from previous work (Beals, Manson, Mitchell, & Spicer, 2003; Manson, Garroutte, Goins, & Henderson, 2004; Smith, 1999; Sue & Dhindsa, 2006; Taualii & Forquera, 2006; Whitbeck, 2006) and acknowledge that research to address health disparities has been used in a less than effective way within Native American communities, which has often resulted in more harm than good in these Native American communities.
Despite the shortcomings, there has been some success in the use of CBPR and Tribal Participatory Research (TPR). First, Thomas et al. (2009) begin with quotations from Suquamish community members that they have worked with,

“We’ve been researched to death and it doesn’t even benefit us”
“Researchers are like mosquitoes; they swarm in, take what they want and swarm out”
“We’ve been doing these things for thousands of years; it’s just that nobody wrote it down”
“We’ve always done ‘research’; we just called it common sense” (p. 165).

These quotes acknowledge that historically the Suquamish have been subject to the colonial rhetoric of the researcher going into an indigenous community and to save (civilize) that community. Thomas et al. (2009) describe how research has been traditionally conducted within Native American communities by a mainly Eurocentric, western researcher. Like Ferreira et al. (2011) and Christopher et al. (2011) have shown, there has been a tendency for the researcher to go into the community, set the agenda, extract knowledge and leave without much thought of reciprocity with the community. The author’s claim that disconnect between the researcher and indigenous communities has been caused by such interactions. CBPR has been positioned as an approach that can bridge the gap between the community and the researcher. Under this assumption the researcher is able to collaborate with the community to select an issue and then stage an intervention that is culturally relevant. Thomas et al. (2009) name off principles, which should guide the research—partnership, empowerment, community control, mutual benefit, holism, action, respect and communication. They also suggest, however, that these principles need to be situated within a local context in order for them to have meaning. The resulting approach they define is Tribal Participatory Research (TPR).
TPR draws from many principles of CBPR but extends them to working in specifically Native American contexts. The key underlying principle of TPR is that Native American tribes and communities are sovereign nations in their own right. Therefore a TPR approach illuminates that the tribe and tribal council should help guide the research project at every part of the process. This approach may even involve the regulation of the project by tribal research review boards, tribal research codes and involve tribal institutional review boards (IRB). In a number of conversations the researchers had with tribal members the nine principles outlined earlier were clarified.

For empowerment the community-based researchers shared the following, “I think the more CBPR that are conducted in Indian country will lead through [sic] the process to more community empowerment. Having the research review board for our tribe has been really empowering to our tribe, our people” (Thomas et al., 2011, p. 173). Thomas et al. (2011) highlight how the themes in this interview exhibit the respect the researchers have to tribal sovereignty and authority of the Native American population. Another principle that was shown in the data was holism. The community-based partners shared the following, “So the process with that we met with [sic] the community people. So we met with the tribal historian, members of the canoe family, the teachers in the community, Elders in the community” (p. 175). This is an example of a culturally responsive way of engaging with the whole community when enabling the devising of an intervention project.14

14 Specifically the ‘Healing of the Canoe project’ began as an informal discussion between community members from the Suquamish tribe and the University of Washington Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute (ADA). The Suquamish tribal enrolment is more than 800 members, with approximately 350 tribal members living on the reservation (Thomas, Donovan, Sigo, Austin, Marlatt & The Suquamish Tribe, 2003). The Suquamish Tribe Wellness administrator invited the ADAI staff to discuss partnering on a project with the members of the Suquamish tribe and community. Approval was gained for the Suquamish Tribal Council (STC) to obtain funding for the project and the Suquamish Cooperative Council (SCC) was the appointed advisory board. The SCC was the committee that oversaw all activities
In order to build a rapport within the community the researchers spent a lot of time participating in non-project-related activities and community events. They also worked alongside the SCC in developing research protocols that would be effective. Over the course of time, the Post Gamble S’Klallam Tribe joined the project. The *Healing of the Canoe* project was used to address youth substance abuse and need for a sense of cultural belonging among youth as primary issues of community concern. The healing of the Canoe partnership seeks to address these issues through prevention and intervention with youth, while tapping into existing community resources. The project was initiated subsequent to the Tribal Journeys event that was held in 1989. The Tribal journeys are a multi-tribal cultural paddle from Suquamish to Seattle. Tribal journeys have since then become an annual event that is drug and alcohol free and based on ancestral traditions (Thomas et al., 2009). The *Healing of the Canoe* project is still ongoing, and an important reference for community-driven, grass-roots initiatives. To date, the *Healing of the Canoe* project has achieved the following goals described by Burhansstipanov et al. (2005):

1. Investing time to create the partnership team and project;
2. Allocating the budget equitably among the partners;
3. Developing partnerships with leaders who have decision-making responsibilities from each organization;
4. Providing salaries to tribal partners and project staff;
5. Implementing active, effective communication among all members of the partnership (including becoming aware of real barriers to communication and setting realistic expectations);
6. Alternating meetings between academic and tribal settings;
7. Sharing raw and summary data related to the CBPR project;

within the community. Thereby from the outset it was a requirement that the research be appropriately conducted within cultural grounding. The project acquired a three-year exploratory and developmental grant and began working as partners in 2008. Also, from the initiation the community guided the whole research process.
modifying standardized evaluation procedures to be culturally acceptable and respectful of the local community; and

following both tribal and researchers’ protocols for disseminating and publishing the findings. (p. 291).

Indeed, the preceding goals show how the project is an example of a functional and respectful university — Native American partnership. Given this success, the Suquamish Tribes Wellness committee has expressed an interest in developing a culturally relevant substance and mental health intervention-teaching tool that could be implemented in the community. Over the next two years the researchers and community members planned to support and nurture a collaborative project and assess the needs strengths and resources of the Suquamish tribal community. In doing so, the project team will use a community readiness model—the model was based on interviews with key community members and cultural experts to assess the community’s level of readiness to a specific issue.

By way of conclusion, Thomas et al. (2009) propose that the relationship between universities and Native American tribes has been problematic in the past; and as Chief Seattle (1854) of the Suquamish tribe stated, “Day and night cannot dwell together. The Red Man has ever fled the approach of the White man, as the changing mist on the mountainside flees before the blazing morning sun” (Suquamish Website, 2013). The authors proclaim that they are beginning to break down this historical legacy of mistrust through the adoption of CBPR and TPR.

**An Indigenous Epistemology as Basis for Developing a Decolonizing Praxis**

Throughout this literature review it has been my aim to complicate Coakley’s (2011) wide-held axiom, “sport contributes to development.” As Black (2010) has shown, the concept of
development itself is a ubiquitous term – on the whole development connotes an image of positive progress. When development is combined through a medium like sport, then, it is seen as one of the most encouraging initiatives in recent decades (Kidd, 2008). This functionalist view of sport, has often lead to the perception that sport is an apolitical, neutral, universally friendly and socially integrative tool for development. Sport has been viewed as a tool useful for teaching people socially accepted morals to participate more actively in society. There is also the preconception that SFD programs can provide “aid” from the “developed” Global North to the “undeveloped” Global South. However as numerous scholars such as (Coatler, 2010a; Darnell, 2010a; Darnell, 2010b; Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011; Li, 2007) have critiqued SFD programs. In many of their studies they have implored the need to explore the complex power relations that are at work. Notably, the problematic way that SFD programs are set within the discursive parameters of white privilege. In acknowledging this, Darnell (2010b) denotes that the (re)production of race-based superiority within SFD programs sustains the boundaries of racial privilege. In other words, the very system that claims to bring development to marginalized communities may in fact cause further marginalization. Additionally, Darnell (2010b) proposes that SFD researchers have constantly overlooked colonial-hierarchies, which have been historically formed. Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) call for a shift towards the decolonization of SFD to counter colonial dominance. Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) suggest there is a need to go further than just the acknowledgement of indigenous ways knowing – as this just reaffirms the colonial gaze. In the review of SFD theory it became apparent that SFD has widely been positioned from a neoliberal doxa, where SFD initiatives, policy and governance seek to maintain the capitalist order.
By acknowledging these critiques, it becomes clear that many SFD programs that are being conducted in Native American communities perpetuate colonialism. I then outlined the use of CBPR and PAR research in Native American communities. Although both of these approaches work towards the (re)centering of indigenous knowledge, they still work from a western ethnocentric approach – where the researcher is inherently culturally superior to the community. Lastly, Kegler et al. (2003) proposed a shift away from a deficit model approach (health intervention program that uses a problem — teenage pregnancy, smoking — to develop the program) to strengths-based programs (uses the specific strengths of a community – positive relationships, organized activity — to devise the program). Although programs reflecting this shift are only in their early years, they show promise.

Lastly, the Suquamish Tribe has achieved a vast amount of cultural revitalization in the past three decades. In connection to the prologue, the revival of canoe culture was instigated by the Tribe in 1988, and encouraged by one of my elders, Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell. In 1989 the Suquamish Tribe were a part of the first ‘Tribal Canoe Journey’ paddle to Seattle in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Washington as a State and the historic signing of the Centennial Accord recognizing Tribal Sovereignty. Since 1989 the ‘Tribal Canoe Journey’ has occurred annually. I then outlined Thomas et al.’s (2009) study that looked at the use of TPR with the Suquamish Tribe. TPR draws from many of the same principles as CBPR but localizes them within Native American communities. Thomas et al. (2009) have shown a successful way of conducting research with (in) Native American communities that works towards the (re) centering of an indigenous worldview.

In conclusion, in order to progress the (re) centering of an indigenous worldview in the practice of SFD it is necessary to develop an indigenous methodology for the exploration of the
indigenous worldview in SFD programs. In what follows, I argue that decolonizing qualitative research can offer a set of empirical strategies from which we might better explicate the spiritual and cultural connections that make indigenous sport a powerful and effective medium when working with indigenous communities. Toward this end, I set out to (re) center an indigenous worldview as the basis from which SFD programs are created — as a way to truly empower indigenous communities.
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to advance our understanding of SFD initiatives in Native American communities in North America. In the previous chapter I explored a review of literature on SFD, analyzing the way that sport in the context of “development” has been perceived as inherently progressive. From the critical analyses it has become clear that the way SFD initiatives have been constructed and conducted in indigenous (and marginalized) communities has not always been in the community’s best interest, and certainly not on terms established by members of the community. Rather, this “progress” has often come at the expense of the indigenous communities’ own traditions, culture and beliefs. As I have endeavored to make clear thus far, there has been a lack of research overall that addresses the use of an indigenous worldview as a strength rather than weakness within SFD initiatives in Native American communities. In particular, there has been a lack of research that evaluates and critiques the fundamental Western worldview that informs SFD policy, and that addresses current SFD programs, such as the Tribal Canoe Journeys, that are working successfully in Native American communities.

This qualitative study was undertaken in an effort to complement the existing research of indigenous development through sport. I argue that a qualitative approach can recognize the socio-historical, political, and cultural factors that impact upon SFD initiatives. In this chapter I outline the qualitative procedures that I used to investigate the implementation of an indigenous worldview in SFD programs.
Paradigmatic Foundations

Lincoln and Denzin (2011) remind us that qualitative inquiry is a field of inquiry that traverses a wide variety of disciplines. This traversing often means that a qualitative researcher is faced with the choice of multiple frames of interpretation. Given this, it is important that the paradigmatic foundations of a project are deliberated. Denzin and Lincoln (2005, cited in Silk, 2011) define a paradigm as the research bases’

“…axiology (questions of ethics in the social world), ontology (the nature of reality and the nature of the human being in the world), epistemology (how one knows the world and the relationship between the knower and the known), and methodology (the best means or practices for gaining knowledge about the world)” (p. 25).

Illuminating the paradigmatic foundations of the researcher is important in any research project, as they form the boundaries of the research project. The paradigm that this project aligns with is the participatory, or postmodern, paradigm. Postmodernists reject the notion that there is one grand metanarrative of the world. Instead, postmodernist scholars tend to understand the world as fragmented into multiple realities that are in working in complex dialogue. These realities are constantly being (re) negotiated in response to broader social, political, historical and economic forces. The changing of reality enables a change in representation. Consequently, these changes facilitate the confusion of what is ‘true’ and/or ‘authentic’ and what are models of the world, or simulacra.

This research project is situated within this paradigm because it involves the acknowledgement of an indigenous Suquamish worldview, not as grand alternative metanarrative, but as an example of the multiple realities of the world. Unlike interpretive research, these multiple realities only become valuable when they are situated within the socio-
historical conditions of their genesis. I outline the metaphysics of this paradigm in regards to the present study in order to demonstrate the ontological, epistemological and methodological foundations of my research.

Schwandt (2007) contends that to speak of ontology is to refer to “The worldviews and assumptions in which researchers operate in their search for new knowledge” (p. 190). Thus, I will adopt Guba and Lincoln’ (2005) definition of a postmodern paradigm that denotes that knowledge creation is participatory and co-created by the mind and the given cosmos (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Therefore knowledge and knowledge creation can be termed a subjective-objective reality. Heron and Reason propose that the “Knowers can be the knowers when known by other knowers” (as cited in Guba & Lincoln, 2011, p. 102). This means that worldviews are based on participative realities. (As shown through the literature review, in SFD programs there has been a tendency to adopt a western worldview, both historically and currently, for research into/with indigenous peoples. This has been the same for SFD programs throughout the process of development, implementation, evaluation and then (re) implementation. These western assumptions are problematic in nature given the negative historical legacy that colonization has caused indigenous peoples. Thus, this project is aimed at (re) centering Native American ways of knowing as the foundation for the creation of SFD programs—it accepts that knowledge creation is collaborative. By acknowledging that the worldview and reality of the Suquamish Tribe may be different to my own, I sit within the postmodernist paradigm. Although there may be similarities in our indigenous worldviews, there may also be differences.

Epistemology deals with the nature of knowledge, or how we come to know what we know. Some postmodernists adopt a subjective epistemology where individuals make multiple meanings and the researchers’ meanings merge within the research process (Markula & Silk,
Moreover, a postmodernist epistemology is holistic in the way that it “Replaces traditional relation between ‘truth’ and ‘interpretation’ in which the idea of truth antedates the idea of interpretation” (Heshius, 1994, p. 15). Guba and Lincoln (2005) also state that postmodernists have a “Critical subjectivity in participatory transaction with the cosmos; extended epistemology of experiential, propositional, and practical knowing; co-created findings” (p. 195). Given the nature of this research project is to (re) center an indigenous worldview within SFD this sits within the postmodernist epistemology. A postmodernist epistemology would also not contradict the position that knowledge, like culture, is living. Guba (1990) takes this further by issuing that “realities are taken to exist in the form of multiple mental constructions that are socially and experientially based, local and specific, and dependent for their form and content on the persons who hold them” (p. 27). In this research project I have proposed that the Suquamish Tribe and their culturally relevant SFD programs are more sustainable and effective than generic SFD programs. The reason for this could be because the Tribal Canoe Journeys is predicated on an indigenous paradigm because it takes into account the wealth of knowledge that the indigenous community has that has been developed and authorized on their own terms, and how that indigenous knowledge can be mobilized as strength in the development of SFD programs.

As I showed in the literature review, the way that SFD initiatives have been developed, implemented and evaluated has been within a Western worldview. In order to deconstruct this worldview, and as a project of decolonization, I now outline an indigenous paradigm. In order to fully grasp an indigenous paradigm, I describe some key tenets of Red Pedagogy (Native American pedagogy) and contrast those with the Kaupapa Māori approach I have utilized in the past. Although I do not contend that these are an exhaustive and grand metanarrative of an
indigenous paradigm, they do function as a starting point for understanding, and each which will inform and guide my empirical pursuits moving forward.

**Indigenous SFD: Indigenous Methodologies as Decolonizing Praxis for SFD**

Throughout the first two sections of the literature review I aimed to expose the functionalist assumptions that underpin SFD initiatives. Confronting these ideologies that have historically oppressed indigenous peoples is a step towards a (de)colonizing process in SFD. Rather than indigenous knowledges being *objects* to be studied. A decolonizing approach to research reverses this process by making Western knowledge the object of critique (Smith, 1999). Louis (2007) contends that the (re-)centering of indigenous knowledge naturally challenges Western research paradigms and allows a space for the indigenous voice to be heard. Therefore, I contend that one of the first steps towards adopting a decolonizing praxis within SFD would be to conduct research on SFD programs using Indigenous methodologies. The two indigenous methodologies that I will draw upon to inform this study are Red Pedagogy and *Kaupapa Māori* theory. While both draw upon different epistemological legacies, both share a common commitment to decolonizing praxis, which seeks to decolonize social life in order to enable self-determination of Indigenous peoples.

**Red Pedagogy**

Grande (2004), an indigenous Quechua scholar, has written extensively about Red Pedagogy. Grande’s (2004) book entitled *Red Pedagogy, Native American Social and Political Thought* is book about a form of ‘revolutionary critical pedagogy’ that allows the space for diverse indigenous values and beliefs to be legitimated through education. Red Pedagogy was
born out of the dissatisfaction Native American peoples had with the historical-cultural
domination of western values in the United States education system. The book builds upon the
history of the United States, in which Native American populations had faced subjugation
through cultural and population genocide (Grande, 2004).

Although attempts had been made by Western theorists to enact critical pedagogies in
Native American education, there are points of tension. A central tension has been the framing of
critical pedagogies within the Western cultural frameworks of education. A second tension is the
inability of Western scholars to theorize the dual citizenship of American Indians as U.S citizens
and as members of sovereign, independent Native American Nations. Without this recognition
education initiatives have incorrectly relegated the Native American population into a
homogenous subgroup, with little recognition of their diverse sovereignty. In acknowledging
these details, Grande (2004) highlights that it is necessary for an indigenous approach to
education, an approach that acknowledges and legitimizes the various sovereign, independent
Native American nations and their epistemologies. With this in mind, it is fruitful to remember
that the project is continually forming and reforming itself as the realities of Indigenous people
change. However, if used in a culturally appropriate way, Red Pedagogy can lend itself to the
devising of new counter-hegemonic and decolonizing approaches to SFD. Grande (2000) defines
Red Pedagogy in this way:

Red Pedagogy is that which maintains: (1) the quest for sovereignty and the dismantling
of global capitalism as its political focus; (2) indigenous knowledge as its epistemological
foundation; (3) the Earth as its spiritual center; and (4) tribal and traditional ways of life
as its sociocultural frame of reference. (p. 54).
Although I showed in the literature review that some SFD programs aimed to acknowledge indigenous epistemology when working with Native American communities, there were key differences in their approach. While laudable in their intent, if SFD (and the health promotion initiatives) are to truly be decolonized then there is a need to understand the key tenets of a Red Pedagogy that Grande so aptly defines. For instance, indigenous knowledge should be the foundation upon which any research or program is formed. However, in most of the studies mentioned in the literature review, indigenous knowledge has not been held as the epistemological foundation. Rather, these studies have operated primarily from a deficit model approach within health promotion. Therefore, in order to fully decolonize the research project, there is a need to re-center indigenous epistemologies at the foundations of both theoretical and empirical endeavors. I contend that the Tribal Canoe Journeys can serve as examples of SFD initiatives that are culturally relevant.

*Kaupapa Māori Theory*

In prior research, I have drawn upon another indigenous perspective—a Kaupapa Māori framework. According to Bishop (2005), researchers in New Zealand have historically developed a tradition of research that has perpetuated colonial power imbalances, thereby undervaluing and belittling Māori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonizers and adherers of colonial paradigms. Furthermore, research about Māori people has been traditionally conducted in an individualized way (Bargh, 2009). As such, the research has primarily benefited the researcher. Often without any thought of reciprocity for Māori dreams and aspirations, data was extracted and used, leaving the researched feeling exploited and used (Smith, 1999).
Smith (2002) describes the Kaupapa Māori research as “the philosophy and practice of being and acting Māori” (p. 1). Irwin (1994) adds to this notion by proposing Kaupapa Māori research is the research which is culturally safe, involves mentorship from elders, is culturally relevant, and is undertaken by a Māori researcher, not just a researcher that happens to be Māori. Such a framework has been identified as increasingly important in research about Māori people. It assumes the taken-for-granted social, political, historical, intellectual and cultural legitimacy of Māori people, in the orientation that Māori language, values, culture and knowledge are accepted in their own right (Smith, 1999). Put in simple terms a Kaupapa Māori approach can been likened to a form of “localised” critical theory. One of the main premises of a Kaupapa Māori framework is self-determination (Smith, 1999).

Furthermore, Smith proposes that Kaupapa Māori research is a “local theoretical position that is the modality through which the emancipatory goal of critical theory, in a specific historical, political and social context, is practiced” (Smith, 2000, p. 229). However, where a Kaupapa Māori approach diverges from critical theory is in its genesis, in its being conceived within a Māori world view. By acknowledging this, I acknowledge that my whakapapa (genealogy) as an indigenous Māori person takes precedence over the western academy. According to a Māori worldview, the world is holistic and cyclic, and through whakapapa, Māori are connected to the universe. Thus, Māori are connected to the past, present and future through our whakapapa as direct descendants of the heavens (Smith, 2000). Therefore, we can understand that the research process is not divorced from this worldview; rather, by understanding ourselves as part of the wider cosmos, the universe is transformed into a moral space of which we are a part.
Additionally, Pihama (2001) describes the use of *Kaupapa Māori* theory in the following words:

*Kaupapa Māori* theory is simultaneously local and international. Local, in that it is necessarily defined by *Māori for Māori*, drawing on fundamental *Māori* values, experiences and worldviews. International, in that there are many connections that can be made through a process of sharing Indigenous Peoples theories. (Pihama, 2001, p. 102)

Pihama (2001) shows that *Kaupapa Māori* is local and international and has connections to Indigenous peoples worldwide. These connections have guided this research project, and as I show in my collaborative storytelling section of the next chapter, these connections are an important part of the co-creation process.

Lastly, some key tenets of *Kaupapa Māori* theory that will guide the (re) negotiation of my identity an indigenous-outsider researcher are:

- *Manaaki ki te tangata* – collaborative approach to research, research training and reciprocity. Reinforces the view that research should be collaborative and reciprocal process and acknowledged that learning process is from both parties.
- *Kānohi ki te kānohi* – This principle is about meeting people face to face. By meeting face to face, people are allowed the self-determination to accept the research or not.
- *Whanaungatanga* – This is the principle of relationships. *Whanaungatanga* is the process of establishing family relationships, by culturally appropriate means. In doing this, the researcher is engaging in an unspoken commitment with the community. A relationship that will not finish once the research project has.
• *Mana–mana* refers to finding ways to share knowledge without being a “show off”.

This is important in the research process, to care for the communities’ knowledge and also to represent the community in a way that is appropriate.

These four principles are some of the many underpinnings of a *Kaupapa Māori* framework. They inform my identity as an *Māori* researcher and have helped to guide my negotiation within the research processes enacted in a North American context. The reason that I have explored a *Kaupapa Māori* approach in a research project that is predicated on Native American cultural practices is because I have utilized a conversational indigenous methodology. A conversational indigenous methodology is important for this project because it acknowledges the collaborative potential between an indigenous *Māori* worldview and Suquamish worldview.

**Towards a Conversational Indigenous Methodology**

Embracing indigenous epistemologies is an important part of the indigenous methodological practice. Although I have proposed umbrella terms of indigenous methodologies—Red Pedagogy and *Kaupapa Māori*—it would be prudent to understand that there is no singular definition of each methodology. Although both of these approaches come from different indigenous cultures, for the boundaries of this research project it would be beneficial to work towards an indigenous paradigm. In order to do this, I outline some key parallels between the two approaches. First, both methodological approaches were created out of indigenous researchers’ and scholars’ dissatisfaction with the cultural superiority of the Western worldview within the academy, and the education system. Second, Red Pedagogy is premised on the following notions: (1) the quest for sovereignty and the dismantling of global capitalism as
its political focus; (2) Indigenous knowledge as its epistemological foundation; (3) the Earth as its spiritual center; and (4) tribal and traditional ways of life as its sociocultural frame of reference (Grande, 2004, p. 54). Similarly, all of these key tenets could be applied to a Kaupapa Māori framework. As Pihama (2001) describes

“Kaupapa Māori theory is simultaneously local and international. Local, in that Māori necessarily defines it for Māori, drawing on fundamental Māori values, experiences and worldviews. International, in that there is many connections that can be made through a process of sharing Indigenous Peoples theories” (p. 102).

Therefore, through the use of a conversational indigenous methodology I acknowledge the inherent knowledge that both I, as an indigenous Māori person of New Zealand and the Suquamish community hold.

A conversational indigenous methodology was chosen because it allows the explicit acknowledgement of the difference between our indigenous cultures (Red Pedagogy and kaupapa Māori), whilst simultaneously highlighting the similarities. Upon conducting this research on the Tribal Canoe Journeys of the indigenous peoples on the Pacific Northwest coast of the U.S, I offer a “radical utopian space” of SFD in the face of predominantly functionalist assertions of SFD. One key similarity that informs this project is spirituality. Spirituality is identified by Native American and Māori scholars alike as a particular point of crisis in research that goes beyond the predicaments of neoliberalism. As Grande (2000) states the spiritual is “rooted in the increasingly virulent relationship between human beings and the rest of nature” (p. 354). Smith (1999) adds to this by contending that,

“The essence of a person has a genealogy which could be traced back to the earth parent . . . A human person does not stand alone, but shares with other animate . . . beings,
relationships based on a shared “essence” of life . . . [including] the significance of place, of land, of landscape, of other things in the universe. . . . Concepts of spirituality that Christianity tried to destroy, and then to appropriate, and then to claim, are critical sites of resistance for indigenous peoples. The value, attitudes, concepts, and language embedded in beliefs about spirituality represent . . . the clearest contrast and mark of difference between indigenous peoples and the West. It is one of the few parts of ourselves which the West cannot decipher, cannot understand and cannot control . . . yet (p. 74).

As an indigenous person working within the Western academy, my first priority will always be to my whakapapa (genealogy). Therefore, the research that was produced through this project was conducted with high consultation the Suquamish community and I. In order to combat historical processes of the “othering” of indigenous peoples through incorrect representation, I consulted with the indigenous peoples throughout the entire research process and beyond. The concept of whakapapa (genealogy) was also an important part of bridging the space between researchers and indigenous communities, and must be carefully articulated. These relationships are fraught with historical colonial legacies, legacies in which indigenous peoples have been the objects of study rather than co-creative participants in the research process. Therefore, I adopted the process of collaborative storytelling to actualize a conversation between the two indigenous methodological approaches, red pedagogy and Kaupapa Māori.

Collaborative Storytelling as a Conversation between Two Indigenous Peoples

Collaborative storytelling conversations, described below, were conducted with Suquamish tribal members, organizational leaders of the Tribal Canoe Journeys and myself. The
collaborative storytelling were conducted at the Port Madison reservation in Seattle Washington. The Suquamish people traditionally lived along the Kitsap Peninsula. Many of the present Suquamish live on the Port Madison Indian Reservation in the reservation towns of Suquamish and Indianola. Western-framed interviews prescribe the researcher as the “storyteller,” in which they collate and generalize the information to patterns and commonalities that they have identified to suit the defined research agenda (Bishop, 1999). According to Bishop (1996), the Indigenous Māori people of New Zealand have voiced much concern over indigenous peoples’ lack of power and control in the research process. These concerns lie with the research issues such as initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability. Smith (1999) states that Western research, “... is research which... ‘Steals’ knowledge from others and then uses it to benefit the people who ‘stole’ it” (p. 56). The notion of stealing knowledge from Indigenous cultures, with no qualms about reciprocity or accountability to their communities, means that indigenous people have become increasingly concerned about divulging knowledge as this knowledge could be misconstrued.

In order to counteract such concerns, I approached interviews using a collaborative storytelling technique. As described by Bishop (1996), collaborative storytelling addresses concerns indigenous people have of research into their lives. This is achieved through the process of recognizing that other people who are involved in the research process are not just informants but are participants, with meaningful experiences, concerns and questions (Bishop, 1996). About a collaborative storytelling approach Bishop (1999) states, “Collaborative stories are selected, recollected, and reflected on by research participants (including the researcher), then merged to create a collaborative text—a mutually constructed story created out of the lived experiences of all participants” (p. 4). Thus, collaborative inquiry is aimed at unearthing the
complexities of human experience rather than commonalities. These stories offer an alternative version of truth and as a result different stories provide the diversity of truth to be heard, rather than one dominant version (Bishop, 1996). Moana Jackson proposes that collaborative storytelling allows to the participants the ‘power to define’ what knowledge is created and how it is created and defined (cited in Bishop 1996, p. 24)

Specifically, the collaborative storytelling technique in terms of this research project encompasses the principle of relationships. Where I as the researcher became involved in the process of mutual storytelling and restorying, the knowledge that I held was merged with the knowledge of the Suquamish in order to create new stories. This relationship creates a setting where both stories are heard within the cultural and discursive worldview in which they function. As this is an empowering process, I adopted an approach that enables the participant, who has been silenced for so long, a space to tell their story.

**Empirical Experiences**

Collection of empirical material took place from June 4th – June 11th between Suquamish Tribal members and I. The research setting has been chosen because of a relationship I have with Māori elder Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell from New Zealand, who has a personal connection to the Suquamish people. Matahi’s relationship with the Suquamish tribe began when he travelled to Washington State from New Zealand in the 1980’s in order to help the Suquamish people revive their canoe culture (as shown in the opening script of this thesis). The collaborative storytelling sessions were conducted with eight members of the Suquamish community In these interviews we talked the Suquamish cultural values and epistemologies that are used as the basis of these programs. This will be important in developing an indigenous decolonizing praxis for
SFD and will be explored further in the next chapter. Each of the Suquamish Tribal members have been given pseudonyms that have been outlined on table 3, on page

By connecting localized discourse of resistance to broader discourses and themes within SFD, I aim to deepen the understanding of SFD in indigenous communities. Smith (2000) describes how true emancipation takes place when indigenous groups “take hold of emancipation and attempt to make it reality on their own terms” (p. 229), which means that research is always based on the terms of kinship, autonomy, home and whānau (family). Through the process of collaborative storytelling I aim to dialogically create knowledge between the Suquamish community and myself by sharing my experiences paddling in Aotearoa (New Zealand), and speaking with them about their tribal canoe journeys. Essentially, the tribal canoe journeys are sites where the indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest of the U.S have taken hold of their own emancipation. By folding these indigenous pedagogies, theories, epistemologies, praxes and methodologies together, I aim to render strategies of resistance that are unique to the Suquamish people’s achievement of their own emancipation as an example of a decolonizing praxis of SFD.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

The Journey to the Suquamish and Quinault Nations

On the 4th of June 2013, I boarded the silver waka rererangi (airplane) that would take me to Seattle, Washington. I was embarking on my journey to the opposite side of the country, away from my current residence in Tallahassee, Florida. It was in Washington that I had planned to visit with members of the Suquamish and the Quinault Indian Nations. Safe to say, I was both nervous and excited to be embarking on this journey. Nervous, because I was outside of my comfort zone travelling to a place I had never been, to meet people that I had never met with the exception of a few email exchanges and phone calls. But, in the same breath, I was a ball of excitement, and deep down I knew that I should trust my intuition and trust my elder Matahi and his advice that if I ever found myself in America, I should visit the Suquamish like he had almost twenty-five years ago. After three separate flights, the waka rererangi (airplane) touched down at Sea-Tac airport, Washington. As we disembarked, anticipation filled me as I walked to the baggage claim. At the baggage claim, I suddenly realized I had no idea what my host, Bobbie, looked like. I had talked to Bobbie on the phone, where he had asked if I was a descendant of Hongi Hika, one of the most revered ancestors of my Iwi (Tribe), Ngapūhi. It seemed Bobbie knew a great deal about us, te iwi Māori (Māori people) and te Āo Māori (Māori world), but as of yet I did not know how that could be so. He had just said he would be there to pick me up, and informed me that it was okay, he knew how it went, how we looked after each other—being Māori and Suquamish.
I stood nervously waiting at the baggage claim looking around at a sea of strangers’ faces. Bobbie must have spotted me standing next to the baggage claim, because I heard a voice ask from behind me, “are you Renee?” Immediately I felt a connection to Bobbie as we gave each other a harirū (embrace). It felt as if we were whanaunga (family) from opposite sides of the Pacific Ocean. As we gathered my bags, Bobbie informed me that if we hurried we would be able to make the 9pm ferry from Seattle to Bainbridge Island. If not, we would have to drive for an extra hour to get home. So we hurried out of the airport into the car park to Bobbie’s blue Volkswagen beetle, chucked my bags in the back and were off. As we hurtled towards the Bainbridge Island ferry Bobbie told me about himself. It turned out that he was in fact a highly respected elder in Suquamish and had been the elected Chief of the Suquamish Tribe at the time of the Paddle to Seattle in 1989. He told me of how he had a connection to Aotearoa (New Zealand, which will be now referred to as Aotearoa) and had travelled there numerous times; his connection was so strong that on his arm he displayed a Tā moko (Māori Tattoo) from Aotearoa, whilst on his other arm he also displayed a tattoo of his Suquamish heritage. It turned out that Bobbie had formed strong ties with a number of Māori elders of Aotearoa and through these relationships he had paddled with them in the waka (canoe) at Aotearoa’s annual Waitangi celebrations.

We continued our journey through the streets of Seattle, relishing in sharing conversation with each other. Fortunately we made the ferry with five minutes to spare, and drove onto the deck. Once onboard Bobbie took me to the top deck to take photos of the ferry leaving Seattle. As we departed from the Seattle dock, the winds of Tāwhirimātea (God of the weather/wind) blew, as if he was blowing us across Puget Sound, blowing us home to Suquamish. I asked whom the mountain was that stood looking over Seattle and Puget Sound. Bobbie told me that
that was Mt. Tacoma and as we fare-welled Seattle, Bobbie spoke of how the city had originally been Suquamish land. However, during the first waves of white settlement Seattle had been deemed a good trading post; thus, the Suquamish had been pushed out. In fact Seattle had been named after a highly respected ancestor of the Suquamish tribe, Chief Sealth (Seattle). As we shared more stories we found many commonalities between our otherwise distant cultures, connections that we found through shared experiences of the colonial histories of our peoples. It was through the sharing of our colonial histories that we wove a thread of understanding between our two peoples and our two cultures.

Once we made it across to Bainbridge Island, we got back into the car and drove off the ferry towards the Port Madison Reserve, towards Suquamish. As we passed over the Agate Pass Bridge, Bobbie told me that this was where the Suquamish got their name, because it was there in Agate Passage that the salt water and fresh water merged and made “clear salt water”. It was the Lushootseed\textsuperscript{15} name of $d'suq \, wub$ (Suquamish) that meant “people of the clear salt water”. This was also the place of “Old Man House,” which was the site of the major ancestral Suquamish winter Village and served as the center of the community, a house for community living and major events (Suquamish Tribal History, 2012). This house served the people for generations (approximately 2000 years) before being burnt down in 1870 by the United States Government following the death of Chief Seattle.

\textsuperscript{15}\textsuperscript{15} “The Suquamish dialect of Lushootseed falls under the Salish Family of languages. Lushootseed is the language spoken by the Native tribes throughout the Puget Sound Watershed. At one time, there was a distinct dialect for each family within a tribe, however through reservation relocation, meaning the act which put all villages of a tribe onto one segment of land; these dialects for the most part have disappeared. What remains are two recognized dialects, consisting of Northern Lushootseed spoken by the Snohomish, Swinomish of the Skagit river and Whidbey Island and the Sauk-Suiattle of the Sauk River and Suiattle River tribes, and Southern Lushootseed, spoken by the Skykomish, Snoqualmie, Steilacoom, Suquamish, Duwamish, Puyallup, Nisqually, Sahewamish, and Muckleshoot from Green and White River tribes. Due to the Assimilation through Education Acts, all Lushootseed dialects are on the verge of extinction” (Suquamish Tribe, Lushootseed Language, p. 1, 2012).
Once we drove onto the reservation our first stop was to visit the newest member of Bobbie’s family, the Stilag\textsuperscript{w}it. We pulled up to Bobbie’s second house along his family’s ancestral road and I was introduced to the Stilag\textsuperscript{w}it Canoe. It was here that a key connection between Māori and Suquamish was highlighted further; it was our connection to the canoe. It was here that I was able to touch and see the canoe, and see that like Māori, canoe were not just “physical objects” to the Suquamish; they were part of our whānau (family). Following meeting the Stilag\textsuperscript{w}it we went to Bobbie’s home that was built on the same driveway that his two son’s homes, and those of another relatives, were. After we got home and I was introduced to Bobbie’s daughter, we spent the remaining few hours talking about our families and cultures.

The following day, Wednesday the 5\textsuperscript{th} of June, Bobbie took the day off work to show me around. His manākitanga (hospitality) showed just how caring and giving he and the Suquamish were. We started the day with a home cooked breakfast and then headed down to meet the Sport and Recreation coordinator at the Suquamish Recreation center. It was here that I met Chrissy, the coordinator of the center. Chrissy walked me through the structure of the organization and then gave me a tour of the center. I noticed that a Māori treasure hung alongside the Suquamish artwork on the walls of the center. Chrissy showed me through the different aspects of the center and where the youth would come after school. During the tour, Chrissy and Bobbie reminisced about the time they had spent in Aotearoa and spoke of the hospitality that they had received from our Māori peoples while there. Our tour ended with Chrissy showing me photographs of her children and remarking that I should go and meet them at the Suquamish Early Learning Center.

After our meeting with Chrissy we headed up to the Suquamish Early Learning Center to meet Chrissy’s children. Upon arrival in the foyer of the center a Suquamish elder was leaving,
carrying his traditional drums; he told Bobbie that he had just finished a session with the children. Bobbie then introduced me, and I told the elder who I was and where I had come from. I also told the elder that my elder was Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell, who had come here many years ago. At this piece of information the elder exclaimed that he remembered Matahi well, and recollected a memory of the time when Matahi was running on the highway when one of his thongs broke; however, instead of stopping Matahi just kept on running. We shared laughter at the thought of Matahi running with one thong on his foot, and gave each other a harirū (embrace) before Bobbie and I headed into the center. In the center I met Chrissy’s children and many other Suquamish children. In many of the rooms the children played with traditional Suquamish drums, and you could see that the center was a culturally relevant practice.

After we left the center, we headed to the ‘House of Awakened Culture’. The House of Awakened Culture is a 13,169 square foot wooden longhouse that was modeled after its predecessor, the ‘Old Man House’. Like Old Man House, the House of the Awakened Culture is located on the waterfront in Suquamish. The House was constructed prior to the 2009 Tribal Journey that the Suquamish hosted and is described in the Suquamish Foundation as being “at the center of our cultural resurgence” (Suquamish Foundation, p. 2, 2012). The 2009 Tribal Journey was the 20th anniversary of the 1999 Paddle to Seattle and hosted over 10,000 people. Furthermore, like its predecessor ‘Old Man House’, the ‘House of Awakened Culture’ serves as a community center. Some community building activities that take place at the House include: Lushootseed language classes, traditional weaving and carving, youth canoe trainings, regalia making and song and dance practice.

We looked around the House and I took photos of the canoe that were housed in the canoe shed next to the House. It was here that I was introduced to Bobbie’s family canoe, the
Tana Stobs. The House also had a large outdoor area in the front that had grass, and Bobbie also showed me the salmon baking oven and the clam pit they used to cook their traditional foods. The house overlooked Puget Sound, and as we walked to ramp that led down to the edge of the sound we looked at the eagle totem pole that had been erected at the front of the House. We stood and looked out over the sound, reminiscing about how the Suquamish were a water people and how for thousands of years Puget Sound had sustained their people with its plentiful bounty of seafood. We laughed as we thought of how the early white settlers had thought that they were saving the Suquamish by trying to assimilate them into their western culture, when in fact, the Suquamish way of life had sustained them for thousands of years, and they had never been in need of saving.

We left the House of Awakened culture to visit one of the most revered ancestors of the tribe, Chief Seattle. Chief Seattle’s grave was a grand site. His grave was housed within a large circular construct that had some of the words of his famous speech\textsuperscript{16} in 1854 engraved around the outside. A marble headstone stood at the back center of the circular construct and there were two canoes that stood at either side of the headstone. At the front of the grave people had left many offerings, such as shells, beads and cedar. As we left the gravesite, I remembered the teachings of my elders and asked Bobbie when we got to the gate if there was a water tap nearby. He told me that there was one just over there, and said “oh yeah, I remember you guys do the water blessing, that’s good you got to stick to the teachings”. We walked over to the water tap and washed our hands and flicked water over ourselves in order to cleanse ourselves from being in such a sacred site.

Our next stop was the Suquamish museum. In the museum I met another Suquamish lady who had been integral in the inaugural ‘Paddle to Seattle’ in 1989. We briefly spoke and she told

\footnote{16 Please see appendix B for the full version of Chief Seattle’s 1854 speech.}
me of how she had been very young at the time but had been in a key leadership role in organizing the paddle. Following this meeting we walked through the Suquamish museum and watched the ‘coming forth’ video, which explicated some of the Suquamish history. Then, Bobbie introduced me to another friend who worked at the museum, James. James was just about to do a tour of the museum, so Bobbie and I decided to wait and listen to it. While we waited we watched a video on the history of the Suquamish and looked around the museum at the various exhibits. Of all the exhibits the cedar baskets were one that took my attention, and Bobbie informed me that the museum collection was mostly made by his grandmother. He described the cedar tree as the tree of life. It was used by the Suquamish for food, to make canoe, clothes, adornments and baskets. In fact, the process of weaving was so intricate that some baskets could be woven so tightly that when liquid was carried in them, the wood would swell and become watertight. We stayed and listened to Joey as he explained some more history of the Suquamish to a group of school children before heading to our next engagement—the elders walking group.

The elders walking group took place at the House of Awakened culture. We arrived just before twelve but the elders were still at lunch, so we decided to head to their lunch at the Suquamish Tribal center. I was introduced to a number of elders by Bobbie and they were interested that I had come all the way from Aotearoa. It was a brief meeting but I was glad to have met with them and a few of the elders wanted to talk further about the tribal canoe journeys. On the wall of the lunchroom was a map that showed the walking track from Suquamish to Quinault. Although some of the elders still paddled in Tribal Journeys, many of them were also participating in a virtual walk to Quinault. Over the past few months the elders had been tracking their walking progress and had planned to get to Quinault by the time of the landing on the 1st August 2013. We went back to the elders walking group where I met with the community
nutritionist, Kelly, and the two community health nurses Lauren and Sally. Kelly and Lauren were non-Suquamish and but had worked in the community for a number of years; Sally was Suquamish and had grown up on the reservation. We walked with a few of the elders both inside and outside of the House of Awakened culture and I told them about my project, and they shared some of their experiences with the Tribal Canoe Journeys. While interviewing Kelly later in the week she told me that,

We have the [elders] walking group that meets on Wednesdays. We just started that…a few months ago and people had been asking us for a while and we finally got permission to use the community house for it and so we're actually trying to incorporate the Tribal Canoe Journeys into that, by doing a virtual walk to Quinault and back. So we've already gotten to Quinault as a group so we wear pedometers while we walk for that hour every week and we add up everybody's steps and figure out how many miles we've walked collectively and then we track it on a map and our original goal was to get to Quinault by the time the canoe's arrived but now we're already there and now we're walking back. So when we get back we'll start walking to Bella Bella\(^\text{17}\), which is next year's journey, so we'll be walking on water. But that’s a longer trip so we'll get started on that right away.

The next stop was Bobbie’s firework stand where I met his youngest son Darcy, before continuing onto the Suquamish ‘Clearwater Casino’. We walked through the colorful array of machines to the cafeteria where we got a bite to eat\(^\text{18}\). At the cafeteria I met Bobbie’s older son, Jason. Jason was a manager at the casino and lived in the house next to Bobbie’s. I told Jason all about my project and elder Matahi. He remembered Matahi and said that the canoe Matahi carved with Joseph Waterhouse and some of the Suquamish was the ‘Spirit Hawk’ and was

\(^{17}\) Bella Bella is a First Nations community on the coast of British Columbia in Canada.

\(^{18}\) I must say that throughout my whole stay I did not pay for a thing, apart from some souvenirs that I brought. Rather, Bobbie and my Quinault family paid for everything, and I was also given a number of gifts.
housed down in the shed next to the House of Awakened Culture. We talked a lot more about canoe culture and who we were in relation to our cultures, and then organized a paddle in the Tana Stobs canoe for that evening. I also met the CEO of the casino while Bobbie and I finished our lunch. After lunch we headed home and stopped into Bobbie’s firework stand, where we met Bobbie’s younger son Alex.

We decided to head home to meet Bobbie’s daughter, who was getting home from school, and to also grab our paddling gear. On our way to the paddle we called in at Alex’s house and met Alex’s partner and their young daughter. It turned out that Alex was quite the hunter and had an impressive number of animals he had killed on display in the house. From black bears to 1200-pound elk, the animals were large and quite a sight to see. Then, we headed off for our paddle out in front of the House of Awakened Culture in Puget Sound. Before we left Bobbie’s home, we stopped to grab the paddles and the eagle feathers that we would hang on the front of the canoe.

When we arrived we met a number of other community members that were going out for a paddle on the youth canoe. As Bobbie introduced me, and who my elder was, one of the members of the other canoe greeted me and showed me the spirit hawk canoe that Matahi had helped to carved almost twenty-five years ago. As the rest of our crewmembers arrived we first helped to launch the youth canoe and then we launched the Tana Stobs canoe. I sat at the second seat from the front of the canoe on left side of the canoe, with nine other crewmembers, two of which were children that had come out onto the water with their father for the paddle. Before we launched, Jason attached the eagle feathers and paddle to the front of our canoe and we made our way out into Puget Sound.
Jason was the skipper of our canoe and directed us into the wind on our paddle out. Once again Tāwhirimātea (God of weather/wind) was battling us, blowing hard against our paddles and hitting the water, causing the spray to hit us. On the paddle out Jason got us to do some hard “hit outs” in pairs. This consisted of the pair sitting adjacent to each other paddling the canoe for forty strokes, just the pair alone. At the end of those forty strokes the next pair would then start their strokes. Once all of the pairs had completed their respective forty strokes, the whole crew would all paddle together again. We did this a few times on our paddle out, battling against Tāwhirimātea (God of weather/wind), for around 20 minutes before Jason turned the canoe around.

After the turn we rested for a couple of minutes before paddling back and just as we went to paddle back to the House of Awakened culture the wind completely died. We laughed at the thought that Tāwhirimātea had just been toying with us, and rather than coasting along with the wind on our way back, we were going to have to pull a bit harder. On our way back Jason noted that there was a Bald Eagle sitting on the top of one of the trees. As we paddled we watched as a hawk tried to scare the Eagle away from his nest by dive-bombing him.

It was quite a sight. As we paddled I felt rejuvenated; this was the first time that I had paddled in a Traditional Salish canoe and it was my first time paddling since I had moved to America in August 2012 I really felt truly blessed to have been given the opportunity to paddle in the Tana Stobs canoe and could now feel my wairua (spirit) brimming, a feeling that I had not had for a while. Once we returned to the dock we got out of the canoe and I gave everyone a handshake (an old habit that I had from my outrigger canoe paddling) before we moved the canoe off the water. We carried the canoe up the ramp to its resting place beside the canoe shed.
Once we had finished this, Jason and Bobbie asked me if I wanted to try paddling on a single canoe. I relished in the opportunity to paddle in one of their smaller canoes, so I put on a lifejacket and Bobbie and Jason carried the canoe to the water for me. Although I had paddled in single outrigger canoes I had never really paddled in a canoe with no ama (outrigger float from waka ama), so I was a bit unsure at first. However, Jason helped me to get into the canoe and showed me how to brace myself to keep balanced. Before I even dipped my paddle in the water Jason told me just to sit first and feel her (the canoe). Then, when I felt ready and felt a connection I should start paddling. I sat there for a few minutes taking deep breaths and feeling the canoe, then I took a stroke and felt her lift. I paddled cautiously and surely and with each stroke she helped me to move through the water, I trusted her. Together we had overcome our first challenge of getting to know each other, but the next one was to make it between the poles that held up the pier.

As I came up to the pier I felt her with me, and cautiously angled to make it through the gap. With a couple of strong strokes we were through, and I kept paddling excited, that we had made it through our second challenge. As I continued paddling I thought that I should probably turn around when I felt I could, the final challenge. I decided that I was too close to shore and that because she was a bit longer than the canoe I was used to, we would need a bit more room to make the turn. So I paddled out a bit further and then tried to make the turn, and she responded straight away. It took a little longer than I was used to and for a minute I thought that I should have paddled further from the shore, but she continued to turn and we made it back around. Now with our trust and bond formed we glided back to the ramp, our spirits together. We pulled up to the ramp and Jason caught us, then Bennie and Jason helped to carry her back out of the water, my new sister. As we moved up the ramp the youth canoe came back in as well.
Once we had put all of our gear away, the youth had now come off the water. Bobbie asked Jason and James if we could sing some songs together before we left. So we assembled in front of the House of Awakened Culture and the group sang songs in a circle to the beating of the Suquamish drum, looking out over the vast Puget Sound. The second song that they sang was a children’s song that was lead by one of the Suquamish youth that had paddled with us. While they were singing, a few of the youth were led over by one of the Youth leaders and they took off their shoes to dance. We immediately moved our shoes out of the circle and the girls started to dance. When this song was finished, Kelsey, the youth leader, asked if I wanted to go inside the House of Awakened culture, I agreed and we moved inside, where the crew sang another song. It was a beautiful sight seeing the song sung inside as it echoed around the walls with the totem poles that depicted many Suquamish traditions. We finished up the session with going to get some food together at the farmers’ market.

At the farmers’ market I was introduced to a few other Suquamish community members and we ordered some Indian fry bread tacos. Bobbie also introduced me to an elder that had a stall selling wooden carvings. After introducing who I was, it turned out this elder also knew Matahi and recollected good memories of him. I was in awe of his carvings and one was a green flute with flowers on it. He told me that the flute was for the grandmothers, and that I could have it. I told him that I would take it home and play it for Matahi, and the remainder of the evening was spent relaxing and talking at Bobbie’s home.

On Thursday 6th June, Bobbie headed to work for the morning and I spent the morning with Sally at the Suquamish Tribal Offices. I met with a number of different people and started to conduct interviews. My first was with a tribal elder Rob, whose experiences with Tribal Canoe Journeys started in 2001 and 2002. Although Rob’s experience with Tribal Canoe Journeys had
begun rather recently, his experience paddling in canoe dated back to his childhood days when he would paddle in the Northern regions of Washington with his family in canoe races. I also conducted an interview with Sally about her experiences with the Tribal Canoe Journeys and as a small girl growing up in Suquamish. The last interview for the day was with Michelle, who works for the Suquamish Tribal Center and was present during Matahi’s trip to the Suquamish in 1988.

After the interviews I was invited to join the Suquamish elders at their daily lunch, and I enjoyed a number of great conversations about the Tribal Canoe Journeys and their experiences. I had met one of the elders on Wednesday and he was known as a community photographer. At the lunch he showed me a number of albums from different events that the Suquamish had been involved with. While looking through the albums with his sister Joanne, who was also a tribal elder, she invited Bobbie and I to her home that afternoon. Her husband, Alan, was an artist and expert canoe carver while she was an expert weaver, so she wanted to show me their artwork.

On our way to their home, Bobbie wanted to take me to visit another expert carver from Alaska. We came into his canoe shed while he was in the midst of carving a traditional Alaskan Umiak, he told us how this canoe would traditionally be covered in the hide of seals and walruses. When Bobbie explained who I was and my connection to Matahi, the carver exclaimed once again that he knew Matahi. He then invited us inside to look at more of his artwork; amongst the beautiful pieces he pulled a paddle out from behind the “dancing man” art piece. I thought to myself: wow, this paddle looks a lot like our waka ama paddles from back home, and sure enough he informed me that Matahi had given him this paddle almost 25 years ago. After a brief conversation we headed off to visit Joanne and Alan at their home.
As we drove up the driveway to Joanne and Alan’s house we observed four three-tarpaulin canoe houses. As we walked up to their house we were greeted by a large Totem pole. We knocked and Alan came to the door and invited us in; their home was intricately adorned with artwork and seemed to breathe culture. The first part of their home that I was shown was the woven artworks that Joanne had made, which sat stunningly on the wall. Then to the left, sitting on the small table, was a sculpture entitled the “Burden Lady.” Alan made the Burden Lady because many “Nineteenth and early twentieth century photos depict Native women, mostly elderly, carrying burdens of firewood using a tumpline” (Pasco Studios, p. 1, 2012). We then moved further through the house to look at the other artworks. As we moved into the living room there sat a number of miniature canoe mantelpiece. Alan told us that before he carved a canoe he would do a miniature model of the canoe before he carved it. After this, Joanne brought over a book that had been written about Alan’s artwork and then gifted the book to me. I was once again taken aback by the generosity that the Suquamish had for me, who was, by some accounts, a stranger. We then moved outside to look at the Salish style canoes that Alan had carved. The remainder of the day was spent running family errands, eating fresh seafood (geoduck) and going for a swim at the local pool.

On Friday I travelled to Quinault for two days, an experience that for the bounds of this thesis I will not entertain in detail because the thesis is predicated on a Suquamish perspective. However, of notable mention during my stay in Quinault include: being privileged enough to go to the 2013 Paddle to Quinault Tribal Canoe Journeys landing site; attending the High School graduation of the Taholah Chitwhins; paddling on the Quinault river on one of the family canoes; and learning how to weave a cedar bracelet, headband and roses before returning to the Suquamish on Sunday 9th of June. The remainders of my interviews with the Suquamish were
conducted at the Suquamish Tribal Center on Monday 17\textsuperscript{th} June before I flew back to Tallahassee.

In the following section I will switch from this narrative to explicate the interviews I conducted with the Suquamish on Thursday the 6\textsuperscript{th} of June 2013 and Monday the 10\textsuperscript{th} of June 2013. In order to synthesize the empirical material into a form that is easier to read I have organized the collaborative storytelling sessions into key themes of: Historical Connections; Tribal Canoe Journeys; and Empowerment.

**Collaborative Storytelling Sessions with the Suquamish**

The first collaborative storytelling sessions took place at the Suquamish Tribal Center on the Port Madison reserve on Thursday 6\textsuperscript{th} June. On the morning of these sessions Sally picked me up from Bobbies house and I spent some time with her doing a number of errands before going to the Suquamish Tribal Center. Once we returned to the Suquamish Tribal Center Sally introduced me to Rob, a Suquamish Tribal elder who worked at the Suquamish Tribal Center. After Sally explained who I was, she asked Rob if he would be willing to talk to me about his experience with the Tribal Canoe Journeys, to which Rob granted. Rob invited me into his office and after explaining who I was, where I had come from and my affiliations to Matahi, Rob agreed to speak with me and that I could record the session. The session was initiated after Rob signed a consent form (and I gave him a copy) and lasted for around thirty-five minutes. Following the session Rob pointed to a number of necklaces that he had made that hung on the wall of the office and asked me if I would like one. We stood there for a few minutes as he explained the differences between them, and I finally settled on a red, black and white necklace.
that had beads made as a paddle at the end. We finished the session with a _harirū_ (embrace) and I headed back to see Sally in her office.

Once sitting back in Sally’s office we began to talk about the journey, and how she had mentioned to me at the elders house about her grandfather and his canoe. While we were talking about this, I decided to ask her if she would mind if we could conduct a collaborative storytelling session together, to which she agreed. Once again after signing the consent form (I gave her a copy also) we started our session, which lasted for around twenty minutes. The session ended, as Sally had to meet some of the elders to do an exercise session, however, she said she had many other people that she would like me to speak with and took me to meet with Michelle.

Moreover, Sally introduced me to Michelle and explained who I was and whether Michelle would be willing to speak with me about the Tribal Canoe Journeys. Michelle agreed and invited me into her office. After speaking with Michelle about who I was and where I had come from, Michelle agreed to talk with me about the Tribal Canoe Journeys. After she signed a consent form (I offered Michelle a copy but she declined) our thirty-minute session got underway. It turned out that Michelle knew Matahi well and was present during his stay at the Port Madison Reserve in 1988. Michelle told me that she had been in her mid-twenties during that time and that Matahi had even given her a necklace during his stay. We finished our session by talking about our families and then Michelle took me back to Sally who was in the Tribal Center gym. Sally then took me to see Kelly and we arranged to talk on Monday 10th June when I returned from Quinault. Given it was 11am and the elder’s lunch was about to start Sally took me to spend some time with them before Bobbie arrived to pick me up for the afternoon. During the elders lunch I talked to a number informal discussions with the elders about the Tribal Canoe Journeys.
The second round of collaborative storytelling sessions took place on the morning of Monday 10th June. The first session of the day took place at Bobbies house in his living room. The session was approximately thirty minutes long, however, because Bobbie and I had spent a lot of time talking about the project prior to the session (as mentioned earlier in this chapter) we did not need to go over who I was and what the project entailed. Bobbie signed a consent form (I gave him a copy for his records) and we began the session. We finished the session because we had to meet Kelly at 11am. Bobbie then took me to the Suquamish Tribal Center to meet with Kelly. Kelly is a nutritionist at the Suquamish Tribal Center and ran many of the community health programs. Kelly was also the initial correspondent when I contacted the Suquamish Tribal Center with my proposed research project. After she signed the consent form (and I provided her with a copy) we conducted the collaborative storytelling session and then she took me out to meet Bobbie.

After this, Bobbie took me to meet Grace, who worked for the Suquamish Department of Housing. Grace was a Suquamish elder who was revered within the Suquamish community for her weaving skills. Grace had also been a part of the Tribal Canoe Journeys and the revitalization of Suquamish culture. Bobbie asked if Grace would speak with me about the Tribal Canoe Journeys, to which Grace accepted. Grace and I moved to a room that was quieter to conduct the collaborative storytelling session. Once again before we began the session I asked Grace if she felt comfortable signing a consent form, and provided her with a copy also. Once we finished the session, I gave Grace a harirū (embrace) and then I waited for Bobbie in the waiting area. Grace told me to ask the receptionist if I needed anything.

Then, Bobbie arrived and took me through to my next meeting with the Pearl and Frank, the coordinators of the Healing of the Canoe Project. Both, Pearl and Frank worked on the
Healing of the Canoe project and were Suquamish Tribal members. Prior to the start of the collaborative storytelling session Frank, Pearl and I talked about the many politics of conducting this type of research. It was during this talk that we spoke about the politics of indigenous research and the problematic way it had been done in the past (where knowledge had been extracted by non-indigenous researchers with little or no reciprocity for the indigenous community). I assured both Frank and Pearl that my intention was to enter into a conversation with the Suquamish about the Tribal Canoe Journeys as an exemplary tool of decolonizing praxis for SFD. We also talked about the potential for publications, in which, we established that if any publications came from this research. Then, key Suquamish Tribal members will be co-authors on the piece. Once all of this had been established we signed the consent forms (and I gave them a copy) and started the session. The session lasted for forty minutes and ended with Pearl, Frank and I talking about how there could be a potential for us starting a cross cultural exchange once I returned to New Zealand. As a key for the collaborative storytelling session community members please refer to Table 3.

In what follows, I have organized the collaborative storytelling sessions into themes—themes that have been guided by the priorities that the Suquamish community members raised during our collaborative storytelling sessions. The following themes were extrapolated from the various collaborative storytelling sessions: 1) historical connections; 2) tribal canoe journeys; and 3) empowerment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of community member</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Frank is a Suquamish Tribal member and currently worked on the Healing of the Canoe Project. Frank grew up paddling with his family from an early age. Frank was the skipper of the Suquamish youth canoe for this years paddle to Quinault.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of community member</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Kelly works for the Suquamish Tribal Center as a nutritionist for the community health center. She has worked with the Suquamish Tribal Center for a number of years and was organized many community health initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie</td>
<td>Bobbie was my homestay and family while I stayed at the Port Madison Reserve. Bobbie is a Suquamish Tribal member and was the elected leader of the Suquamish Tribe for 12 years. During his tenure as Tribal Leader he was involved in the start of the Tribal Canoe Journeys - Paddle to Seattle in 1989.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Grace is a Suquamish Tribal elder and was recognized within the Suquamish community as a master weaver. Grace had been directly involved in many aspects of cultural revitalization. She currently works for the Suquamish Tribal Center in the Department of Community Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Michelle worked for the Suquamish Tribal Center and remembered Matahi during his stay with the Suquamish in 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Rob is a Suquamish Tribal member who works for the Suquamish Tribal Center. He had skippered a canoe in the Tribal Canoe Journeys since 2001 or 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Sally is a Suquamish Tribal member who works for the Suquamish Tribal Center as a nurse and community health worker. She has worked for the Suquamish Tribal Center for a number of years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Connections**

*A civilizing mission.* As shown in the introduction, indigenous peoples have been subject to processes of colonization in which colonial governments employed myriad cultural practices and federal legislation to assimilate indigenous peoples into the dominant Western Culture.
Often considered a “civilizing mission,” indigenous peoples and culture were viewed as backward, whilst the White settlers’ culture was regarded as “enlightened.” The Suquamish could be considered indigenous peoples that have been negatively affected by the processes of colonization, and during many conversations that I had with Suquamish community members, they spoke about their personal experience with a colonial history. First, in a conversation I had with Grace, a Suquamish elder who had grown up in Suquamish and was regarded as a highly skilled cedar bark weaver, she shared her thoughts on the effects of colonization on her Suquamish ancestors:

That must have been horrific for our ancestors, absolutely horrific to have lived in paradise and then have…to stand there and sit there and go through hell. And they had to witness that change. … I cannot even imagine what that would be like, to have your home, your language, your belief, everything taken away. Everything. So yeah, my hands up to my ancestors, they really sacrificed a lot to reserve, go ahead, sign the treaty, and reserve some land for the coming generations, which I am one of. So I definitely appreciate that. And I cannot understand the sacrifices, but I certainly understand the concept of losing everything to the point of even, you know, their children were picked up off of the street and taken to the boarding schools. So yeah, it had to have been just absolutely horrific (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

Grace shares her thoughts on the experiences of her ancestors, conveying that they were forced to relinquish their home, language, and beliefs in the face of government legislation. She also speaks to the forced removal of Suquamish children from their families as they were taken to often-religious boarding schools to be assimilated. Furthermore, in another conversation I had
with Michelle, she also explained her thoughts on the colonization of indigenous or Native peoples:

I think that with a history of, of Native people, or people of color, not just Natives being abused and genocidal techniques happening in our history. … so twenty-five years ago when I was wounded and hurt because my grandmother was taken from Indianola spit to boarding school. You know, she was the last speaker in our family and she wasn't allowed to speak native history. So she was taken from her mother and father and my parents, my mother was taken from her because she had so many hurts and didn't know how to deal with them (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

Michelle talks about a history of genocide and abuse of native peoples, which have caused wounds to open. These wounds have meant that both the direct recipients of colonial abuses and the future generations of Suquamish have suffered. Additionally, in many other sessions, Suquamish community members recollected how the Suquamish had once been a great canoe nation.

**The Suquamish, a pre-colonial canoe nation.** Many Suquamish community members noted that in pre-colonial days, the Suquamish considered themselves a canoe nation. One story in particular occurred during a conversation I had with Bobbie while he told me about the historical connections the Suquamish had to the canoe and travelling on the water, or what Bobbie termed their “ancestral highways:”

…[T]he pride of what we call travelling on our ancestral highways, this particular culture here in western Washington did not involve horses or automobiles or things with wheels.

We didn’t have oxen carts, we didn’t even have oxen. When we would travel in this area,
pre-contact, before the coming of any of the Europeans we travelled by canoe. And we did a thing called portage sometimes. If there was a short distance between two points, instead of paddling 80 miles to go around a peninsula, we would sometimes roll our canoes on logs and stuff and do a portage thing where you save 80 miles of paddling by packing the smaller canoes here and there. Now our canoes are like your [Māori] canoes, some of them were built for specific tasks. If you needed to haul a whole bunch of people and go carry on a battle somewhere else then we needed the big ones. But as you saw at our friends’ house the other day, some of them were like a little pick-up truck, or even a little Volkswagen where just two or three people are going fishing or going this. And those are the types of canoes that could be portaged easy enough if you had a little place to cross. And once again, the time it took to get somewhere. We didn’t have this funny little thing called a clock, so nobody cared, you know, if it’s going to take us three days to paddle there. Okay. Now in this day and age of tribal journeys, they say, ‘can you be in Skokomish on the 19th?...and then can you be in Jamestown on the 21st?’ As tribal journeys travels through time, we have now embraced the clock and those people are ready to host us so we have to be there at a specific date. In pre-contact ancestral times, if the wind, the tide or whatever held us up a day, it held us up a day, it was okay. But that’s the reconnection to our tribal ancestral highways that is, you know—my main thinking is, what would my ancestors have done today? If a certain set of circumstances arises, what would they have done? And that’s a good guide (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

Bobbie unearths a great deal of information in this quotation about the Suquamish connection to the canoe and how in pre-colonial times the canoe was their main mode of transport.
Additionally, during a conversation with Suquamish Tribal elder Bob, who is Suquamish but had grown up on the Lummi Reservation. During our session he talked about his early experiences with Chief Seattle Days. He also talked about the loss of culture that Suquamish had endured due to their colonial history, and about his connection with canoe culture:

Bob: My families always been from this area [Suquamish] but I kind of grew up in the Lummi Reservation. Then when I moved down here there really wasn’t anything that was native, you know there really wasn’t any traditional dancing. I mean we had Chief Seattle Days but people always frowned upon [that] because it was the plains style of dancing. And we would always ask our Mom, you know, how come this is so? And she would say, well your Grandpa he worked in what is now Jackson Park, but it used to be a Navy Ammunition Depot and through WW1 and WW2, the Vietnam War this was considered a red zone. But way back when my Grandfather worked they had to give up their Indian identity to work for the government so my Mom said during the hard times of WWII you gave up all your identity just so you could have a government job (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

From all of these conversations we can see that the Suquamish peoples have been subject to a history of colonization, a history that meant the ancestors of the Suquamish were forced to relinquish their homes, values, beliefs, cultural practices and language. As Bob and Michelle also note, it was their grandmothers and grandfathers that were required to give up their Suquamish identity, either to work for the government or through the assimilatory practices of boarding schools. Additionally, many of the Suquamish community members noted that prior to colonization, the Suquamish had been a canoe nation. For many, the canoe carried their culture and many of the Suquamish cultural practices were centered on canoe culture.
Tribal Canoe Journeys

Tribal Canoe Journeys began with the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Washington State in 1989, which also coincided with the signing of the Centennial Accord recognizing tribal sovereignty. The iconic ‘Paddle to Seattle’ was the beginning of a period of cultural revitalization for some Native American Nations of the Pacific Northwest, revitalizing canoe traditions that had been lost for many years. Since this time, Tribal Canoe Journeys have evolved to become an event that attracts upward of ninety US Tribes, Canadian First Nations, and New Zealand Māori to attend. Therefore, in this section I will address: 1) the canoe races that occurred prior to the start of the Tribal Canoe Journeys in 1989, 2) the beginning of the Tribal Canoe Journeys, and 3) the difference of the impetus behind Tribal Canoe Journeys in relation to the canoe racing and what makes Tribal Canoe Journeys unique.

Canoe races prior to the tribal canoe journeys. Although Tribal Canoe Journeys began with the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Washington State, there were elements of canoe culture prior to the Tribal Canoe Journeys. In many conversations I had with Suquamish community members they spoke of canoe races in which they used to participate. The canoe races first emerged in the mid to late 1800’s and by the late 1940’s the canoe had become an extremely sleek craft that bore little resemblance to other traditional Native Indian fishing or travelling canoe. Each year on the Salish coast, a summer festival of canoe racing is held, in which Salish Tribes compete against each other for prizes. In a number of my conversations with the Suquamish they spoke about the canoe races. In my conversation with Grace she spoke about some Suquamish participation in the canoe races in relation to the Tribal Canoe Journeys:
In the early days [prior to Tribal Canoe Journeys] we had racing canoes. Barb Santos was involved in travelling up into Canada and taking kids and our racing canoes up into Canada to participate in their canoe races up there. But there are also people who do not race, but are interested in the traditional style of canoes. So we had an opportunity to get some of our traditional style canoes back and more people, and more and more and more people, are involved, of all ages are involved in the canoe journeys (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

Grace shows that although there were canoe races that took place earlier than the Tribal Canoe Journeys. However, these canoe races were predicated on competitive racing rather than the revival of the traditional canoe culture of the Suquamish. Thus, the Tribal Canoe Journeys have meant that the traditional canoes of the Suquamish have been brought back, and more people have become involved in the Tribal Canoe journeys.

Other Suquamish community members also spoke of their experience with canoe racing. Sally describes the canoe that her Grandfather had during her childhood, and the kind of culture that was prevalent during some of those canoe races:

Yeah, my grandfather used to have a canoe in the front yard, and it was one of the last ones that I remember. That was in, grandpa was born in 1899 I think,...... that was how they travelled. He talked a lot about the family going places in the canoe. Then when I was young in the early sixties, we would come here to Chief Seattle days and would always have the racing canoes there and I remember one year, the Suquamish didn't have a canoe in the races and one year they just decided that we didn't have enough sober people to man the canoe and that was heartbreaking (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).
Rob also spoke of paddling during his youth in racing canoes:

Well when you actually look back, canoe journey is kind of an offset of regular canoe paddling. We’ve always had the canoe paddling, the races, 11 man races, [and] 1-man races. Those are much different canoes to what we have now, but the racers, I grew up paddling in an 11 man canoe, that my Grandfather, my Father and Mom all paddled in with me and my brother, and this was a 110 year old canoe. That’s how we grew up, we didn’t think of it as canoe journeys but we would race in 5 or 6 places in Canada.... it didn’t catch on really until the 80’s down here and then the Tribal Canoe journeys really caught on down here. Although we still the racing but now everyone really focuses on the canoe journey (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

As Rob shows there were elements of canoe racing for some families, particularly those of the Northern regions of Washington and into Canada.

**The start of Tribal Canoe Journeys.** During another conversation I had with Michelle, a Tribal elder from a neighboring tribe who was present during Matahi’s visit in the 1980s, I heard about how the traditional canoe culture had been absent from Suquamish for a number of years before the Tribal Canoe Journeys. She spoke of how Matahi had helped to revive the canoe culture in Suquamish:

[Matahi] was here when my first child was just an infant and coming from a people where our culture had to be hidden for so many years and being able to say that he [Matahi] was one of those people that enlightened us and helped to bring back the canoe to Suquamish (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).
Furthermore, at the time of the first Tribal Canoe Journey known as ‘The Paddle to Seattle,’ Bobbie was the Chairman of the Suquamish Tribe. In a conversation I had with him, he told me about his experience of the beginning of Tribal Canoe Journeys:

...I was the elected leader of the Suquamish tribe in about 1985 to 1989, for three or four years the first go-around. And it was during my tenure as the chairman of the Suquamish tribe that the Washington State centennial committee got together and wanted to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the state of Washington. So it was with myself and Barbara Lawrence and Emmett Oliver, there were a lot of people that talked about having canoes meet the tall ships and that stuff. So we met with Booth Gardner, I mean Booth Gardner’s wife Jean Gardner, and Monroe from Bainbridge, and all of the people that wanted to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the state of Washington. So we started a little bit of the ideas, with other folks, of getting the Tribal Journeys started. So it was in 1989 that the Suquamish tribe hosted the Paddle to Seattle.

At that time I was working both as a helper on a line crew in the city of Seattle and at the same time I was the chairman of the tribe in Suquamish, and I remember the very first, …we hosted the paddle to Seattle, the next day the canoes left Suquamish and arrived in Golden Gardens in Seattle, and that was the first Tribal Journey where our good friends from Quileute, and I think there were six large canoes or wakas (canoes) arrived in Seattle with a flotilla of smaller race canoes, or waka amas you guys call them, to go to Seattle. And I remember that day taking the line crew from Seattle city light down to golden gardens to visit the Native [traditional Salish] canoes that were all down there, and the Duwamish tribe was helping host that first one. It was during those times that Frank Brown from Bella Bella made the challenge to Suquamish to say in 1993 Bella
Bella challenges you all to come and enjoy the hospitality of the Bella Bella people up North. After that, it switched in 1997; I think it went to Ahousaht, but it stopped in Songees, outside of Victoria, British Columbia. And the Tribal Journeys were gathering lots of energy, so it was at a four-year cycle. So that’s ’89, ’93, [and] ‘97. And then by ’97 we were having such a fun time we decided that it would become an annual event versus an every four-year event. And then each different tribe started hosting (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

As Bobbie states, the first Tribal Canoe Journey took place in 1989 with the ‘Paddle to Seattle’ to celebrate the 100th year anniversary of the state of Washington. From these humble beginnings, the challenge was set forth from Frank Brown for the next Tribal Canoe Journey to paddle up to Bella Bella in Canada in 1993. So the Tribal Journeys became an event that occurred every four years, up until 1997 when the Journey had become so large that they decided to make it an annual occurrence.

Additionally, during my conversation with Sally she talked about the start of the Tribal Canoe Journeys:

Now, the [Tribal] Canoe Journey that started in the eighties and it’s required to be clean and sober and if you're not then the elders will make you go before them and talk about it. So it's really cool. I had somebody tell me just the other day that people that have problems with substance abuse are really drawn to the canoe journeys and that's the first step in becoming clean and sober and that's really beautiful (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

Sally talks about how there are many other outcomes the Tribal Canoe Journeys have helped to produce, for instance encouraging sobriety amongst its peoples. Due to its ability to strengthen
cultural belonging and identity amongst its participants, an issue that many Suquamish community members identified as the underlying reason for other social ills including drug abuse and alcoholism. Bob also spoke to how the Suquamish canoe culture has grown over the years since Tribal Canoe Journeys began, stating:

Then when I moved down here we had one or two canoes that used to paddle [in the Tribal Canoe Journeys] but people didn’t really understand it. We used to practice starting the end of April and go all the way through all summer long. I remember on the first paddle a bunch of the community members jumped in a canoe and paddled for about 5 minutes and they were done, so you know it’s that training. But Tribal Canoe Journey’s are always evolving into something bigger and bigger (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

Bob shows how the Tribal Canoe Journeys are always evolving and strengthening from year to year since their inception in 1989 as the paddle to Seattle.

**Impetus behind the Tribal Canoe Journeys.** Tribal Canoe Journey’s began in the 1980s and can be regarded as a major stepping-stone towards the revitalization of canoe culture for the Suquamish and many other Native American Nations of the Pacific Northwest. As the last section showed, there were elements of canoe culture that have still remained throughout colonization in the form of canoe races. However, a key distinction should be made concerning the impetus behind the canoe races and the Tribal Canoe Journeys. In a conversation I had with Bobbie he talked about the impetus behind Tribal Canoe Journeys:

Renee: Yeah. So would you say Tribal Journeys is a lot about family and relationships, with the canoe…
Bobbie: It sure is. The first time I got involved with Tribal Journeys, I think it was ’97 on the way to Akalut, my son and my daughter, my daughter was paddling on the canoe, my son was driving the support vehicle, and my wife and I decided to go to Victoria and go up to see what’s going on there.....we saw the families, the different canoe tribes or the iwis, and it was just such a feeling of togetherness, and the goal of paddling a canoe set up a whole—...every stroke that you take on this journey is one less stroke somebody else has to take as we all collectively, as families, go towards the goal of arriving at...

Suquamish,...or this year we’re going to Taholah to Quinault. Once this family starts and generates that energy of the common goal and hardship—and it’s not real hardship, it’s a personal hardship if your arms and legs are tired and you don’t know if you can paddle anymore, then you, if you’re driving a truck and it’s a hot day and you’re hauling all the tents and sleeping bags to the next location, everybody donates a little something to the culmination of the trip. And we’re all hungry and tired, and then the host tribe will feed us and we’ll get some rest, and then the sense of family comes out. And like I was talking to you yesterday, how it’s a time of, now it’s almost become a time of reunion. Here, some twenty years later, the older ones are passing on sometimes, or else, like some of our chiefs are not paddling anymore, but they’ll show up at the final event so that they can be part of the reunion.

Renee: No, that’s good. So what would you say is different, if you think about other more generic and institutionalized sport programs, what would you say are the key differences between that and Tribal Journeys?
Bobbie: My recent experience with a volleyball club for my daughter, which is what now, 2013? Was that before my daughter could play volleyball, before she could even try out for volleyball, I had to pay $5 to join an amateur athletic association. So because I support and nurture my daughter’s endeavours I paid the five bucks. But I just thought to myself that the institution, like Madison couldn’t play volleyball unless she belonged to the institution. And I don’t know how that plays out in like, uh, a lot of my friends at work have youth that are going on, that have excelled in American baseball and they’re following the dream, you know. And that is, American baseball is funny because you start off in these little leagues, then you switch to high school varsity, junior varsity, then if you’re lucky you go to college and then after college you go to the minor league farm system, and from the minor league farm system you make it to the bigs. A huge, convoluted way for a young baseball player to make it to the bigs with a huge weed-out process. And I’m sure; maybe for New Zealand and stuff that rugby might be a similar scenario. You start with the club and you work your way through this maze and it’s all institutional. Tribal journeys and our waka ama, our canoe races, our war canoe races that we go from community to community. Tribal journeys are more cultural, spiritual and a healing process. Tribal journeys are always drug and alcohol free. And that’s the way that it’s been you know, for people in recovery it helps them. Now, there’s another waka ama culture or canoe racing culture that is still drug and alcohol free, but the impetus behind that drug and alcohol freeness is fitness, so that—I know these canoe families will start their canoe racing season and they’ll race, and they get paid to win their races, so there’s
a small stipend for a weekend. A young fellow can make a couple hundred bucks\textsuperscript{19} over the weekends ‘cause if he’s a share of an eleven-man race canoe he gets twenty bucks, if he wins the singles he might get thirty or forty, if he wins doubles, if he goes with mixed six-man and he’s a skipper on a youth canoe, there’s a different way where—over the course of the weekend, a lot of paddling later, he can make a couple hundred bucks. But this is not part of a minor league team or any of that; it’s just an independent fellow out paddling his canoe for money. Those fellows at the end of the season will celebrate and maybe have a few beers or something. So the impetus behind that is fitness versus the spiritual portion those tribal journeys bring (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

Additionally, Grace also commented on the impetus behind Tribal Canoe Journeys:

Yeah, yeah. And it’s not, it’s like you say; it’s not a program that was officially built specifically to come in and impose. It was, like you say, it was really native culturally driven by a few people. And more and more tribal members and community members are participating now, so it’s worthwhile but it’s so beyond worthwhile (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

As both Bobbie and Grace show, the impetus behind Tribal Canoe Journeys is different to canoe racing because it is majorly driven by culture. That is not to say that the canoe racing should be disregarded, but to note the family/cultural/spiritual values that drive Tribal Canoe Journeys and makes the journey unique.

On another note, and building from Grace’s comment that the Tribal Canoe Journey was not brought to impose beliefs, it is important to mention that there have been many “generic” SFD programs brought into Suquamish that have aimed to do quite the opposite. Pearl, a

\textsuperscript{19} The discussion of the monetary incentive is discussed in greater detail in the discussion.
coordi

coordinator of the Healing of the Canoe project in Suquamish, spoke of this during a
conversation I had with her:

Renee: Yea I definitely agree a lot of health initiatives are often from that deficit model
approach and it really attributes that problem as being the communities problem, rather
than (pause)

Pearl: So [the answer is, when talking SFD programs] is just move away from your
community.

According to Pearl, rather than looking at the strengths the community has, the answer is to
move away from the community in order to find a solution.

Additionally, during my conversation with Bobbie, he told me about the concept of “our
brother’s keeper.” Our brother’s keeper denotes the transition of tribes from dependency upon
the government to becoming self-governing entities. As Bobbie describes, in the early days of
this transition period it was easier for indigenous communities to let the government make
decisions for them because they feared making the wrong decision:

Renee: [talking about deficit model approaches to SFD] Deficit model and making
decisions for indigenous communities rather than empowering them to make their own
informed decisions.

Bobbie: So yeah, we become—one of the, Vine Deloria Jr., he wrote this thing called
‘our brother’s keeper.’ And when we first started self-governance in the tribe, and I’m
sure in New Zealand and different iwis, in Canada where they’re saying okay guys, here
is some money to perform your duties of your iwi, of your tribe. And in some cases they
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were scared to take the money and make the decisions because they might make the wrong decisions. It was easier for our keeper to make those decisions for us, which is silly because we should be in charge of our own destiny.

Therefore, as Bobbie contends, in the early days of the transition of the tribe to a self-governing entity the Tribe was often scared to make decisions, thus, often falling back to the “Keeper” to make those decisions for them. However, as we will see in the next section, during our conversations it became clear that the Tribal Canoe Journeys are an example of empowered decision making by the Suquamish and other neighbouring Tribes.

In conclusion of this section, from the various conversations from Michelle, Bobbie, Rob and Grace it was made clear that prior to the start of the Tribal Canoe Journeys in 1989 there was a form of canoe racing in the Pacific Northwest. However, as numerous members have shown there is a different impetus behind the canoe races in comparison to the Tribal Canoe Journey. In particular the emphasis behind the canoe races reflects many facets of neoliberalism, such as competitiveness, prizes, individualism and fitness; whereas the Tribal Canoe Journeys are predicated on values such as cultural revitalization, cultural belonging, togetherness and family. In acknowledging this, many of the community members noted that since the Tribal Canoe Journeys began they have seen a strengthening of the Suquamish culture, therefore in the final section I will address the notion of empowerment through the use of Suquamish culture as a strength.

**Empowerment**

The empowerment section has been organized into six parts, which are: 1) using indigenous culture as a strength; 2) the strengthening of Suquamish culture since Tribal Canoe
Journeys began; 3) the strengthening of youth identity through culture; 4) healing with each generation; 5) spirituality of culture; and 6) tribal journey moments. However, all of these parts have overlapping themes that will become evident as the reader progresses through the section.

Using indigenous culture as strength. Another key theme that the Suquamish community members talked about in the last section is how the Tribal Canoe Journeys uses culture as a strength from which to build “development programs.” During many conversations I had with Suquamish community members, the notion of using indigenous culture as a strength surfaced a number of times. For instance, during a conversation I had with Bobbie we talked about the difference between Tribal Canoe Journeys and programs that are positioned from a predominantly deficit model approach:

Renee: Yeah. So another key difference with more generic sport for development programs, Tribal Canoes Journeys isn’t built off a deficit model approach. And by deficit model I mean, say an outside researcher comes in and surveys a whole bunch of people and says oh, you’ve all got diabetes. So we are going to build a program off of this problem, and attribute this problem as being yours rather than looking at these histories of colonization and all those kind of things. Do you think a Tribal [Canoe] Journey’s are the opposite of that? Really, like it uses the strength of your culture?

Bobbie: Yes, I agree with you that yes it does. We have—Tribal Journeys, in some cases Tribal Journeys is something as basic as being drug and alcohol free, that it gives a particular addict one day. If we can get that addict to try one day of sobriety, that’s a huge amount of healing. And for tribal journeys that has helped a lot of people. Sometimes the
end of tribal journeys for some of our canoe families sounds like an AA meeting. But if that’s the healing that needs to go on then that’s that. But it was never—tribal journeys, it went from as basic as drug and alcohol free to holistic eating and what you could eat…. So the tribal journeys, you’re right. The only time I have seen is like some of the universities will come in and say, what is this model? What are you folks doing? But they didn’t bring the model in, they come to see what we’re teaching our children. And for a lot of families, and for a lot of canoe families, it’s not just the time of tribal journeys. It is an on going process of healing. And for a lot of families, and for a lot of canoe families, it’s not just the time of Tribal [Canoe] Journeys. It is an on going process of healing.

Furthermore, during the conversation I had with Grace, she also talked a lot about using the strength of culture within Tribal Canoe Journeys:

Grace: The strength, it comes from—it runs both ways. It runs through the person, physical, mental and spiritual strength, and then total understanding of what being in a canoe and on the water means, which is just life changing. And it also runs deep in that tribal members now understand, or certainly understand a little bit on a deeper level, what their ancestors did. What they faced, what strengths they then derived from being in a canoe on the water in all types of water. Stormy weather. I know canoes have been out there in really, really rough water. They’ve been out there on just clear glass, flat water. They’ve used the sails. I mean it just has been a really broad reaching experience for canoe pullers. And subsequently that filters into their families and becomes a further teaching tool for how important and how strong the culture is.
Renee: I mean through you guys and through the canoes and the different cultural activities the ancestors live out into the present day, which is such an important part. You spoke of connection, and we have a lot of the same, like when we’re in the canoe the spirit and the paddling and the connection to the water, the connection to each other, do you guys have—well, I mean it’s a really spiritual, healing process as much as a sort of physical side. Do you think that that would be from building it from the cultural, the Suquamish culture or the different respected nations rather than sort of these programs that are brought in that focus on diabetes, like you have this problem of diabetes…

Grace: Right. And I don’t—you know I suspect that there are people taking care of the diabetes program, I suspect that there are another set of people that are more involved and concerned with a healthy, culturally based—you know I cannot even say “lifestyle,” it’s a perceived way of being. It’s how you see the world and if you are shown enough cultural truths, then you will pick those up and understand them and incorporate them into your life, and then become that cultural aspect. That just becomes part of who you are. You’re driven, you’re either driven to take language classes and you’re just passionate about learning your language, or you’re passionate about cedar weaving, or you’re passionate about wool weaving, cedar carving, bent wood—I mean, any cultural identity is available to you. All of them are available to you. Pick them up, try them all, what fits you the best, what you’re just born to do, then you will continue with. So culturally, yeah, there are programs that will address many topics, issues, and they will always be there. And that’s a good thing for people who can walk in and get information. But again, this is who we
are today, so that is available to us, and the Suquamish tribe is certainly great about providing these programs.

In conclusion of this part, both Grace and Bobbie illustrate how the Tribal Canoe Journeys use the strengths of Suquamish culture to build the initiative from. By using this type of approach, there is a shift away from deficit model approaches that often position indigenous culture as a problem that needs to be solved. Instead the Tribal Canoe Journeys has allowed a space where the Suquamish (and other Native American nations of Pacific Northwest) can celebrate and revitalize their culture and beliefs. In the next section, I will explicate how Suquamish Tribal members spoke of how Suquamish culture has strengthened since the Tribal Canoe Journeys began in 1989.

**Strengthening of Suquamish Culture since Tribal Journeys began.** Using Suquamish culture as a strength rather than a weakness is an important part of the genesis of Tribal Canoe Journeys for the Suquamish peoples. Many community members commented on the strengthening of Suquamish culture since 1989 during our sessions. They also commented on the seemingly paradigmatic shift that has occurred over the past decades concerning Native American culture. Specifically, some community members noted that how Native American culture has now become “cool/politically correct”. As Michelle states:

So we come from a big family here on this [Suquamish] reservation and culture keeps us grounded so each generation gets better and easier and I think its evolved into a spot where even where being now being Indian [or Native American] its now cool/politically correct. Whereas, many years ago people of color were just scum of the earth, but then some time it flipped. Where we have empowered ourselves to a point where people
notice and want to be a part of [our culture]. So I think that its evolved to a point where we are who we are, we're not going away and here we are, love us or leave us.

Furthermore, Bobbie spoke of the strengthening of Suquamish culture since the beginning of the Tribal Canoe Journeys:

Renee: So would you say that tribal canoe journeys are—like, from the ‘80s, and you guys experienced quite a big cultural revitalization in that period?

Bobbie: Yes. In some cases, like when I spotted the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the fibreglass wakas, their fibreglass canoes, I said hmm, I wouldn’t mind having some kind of canoe—a dugout canoe. In the early 1980s with your friend [Matahi] that came from New Zealand, we tried to get one of those canoes together. And I knew the challenges of getting a log large enough to carve a dugout canoe was above my financial resources at the time. So I finally saved up enough money to buy one of the fibreglass ones. So once we got the fibreglass one then we wanted the dugout one but we didn’t know how to make a dugout one. So we borrowed from all the resources in neighbouring tribes, to Canada, to Skokomish, to Quinault. And we learned and taught each other how to, the revitalization of making a canoe. At the same time, our weavers, the cedar hats came out, the cedar vests, the regalia out of the wool weaving that is there. And songs. Songs that other tribes had been holding and carrying for us, we started sharing songs. Some songs belong to each individual tribe, but some songs can be shared. And by the time—a huge cultural revitalization.

I also talked to Grace about the strengthening of Suquamish culture:
Renee: Yeah it’s beautiful; it’s beautiful to see. Have you found, I mean from the 80s when it first started, like paddle to Seattle, to now, it’s just strengthened and strengthened.

Grace: It has and it’s a strengthening of the culture now, with threads of course back to our ancestors. But strengthening the culture now is just as important as it was 300 years ago and what life was like then, 1000 years ago and what was life like then. And this is what it is for us now. So we’re very proud of the fact that our culture Suquamish is making efforts and succeeding at many aspects of understanding what it’s like to be a Suquamish. We’re certainly on the brink of losing everything, all of our cultural identity, but with the canoe journeys it has brought back the awareness and the participation in canoe carving, paddle carving, weaving with cedar and wool, the language is now in our school, and just a little more understanding and respect within the tribe is certainly becoming apparent. So yeah, from the 80s, from the first paddle to Seattle and Bella Bella challenge, the journeys have certainly carved their way into our community and it’s been a very healthy, positive change, yeah, it’s a good direction.

So, fortunately now, since the Paddle to Seattle and Bella Bella all of these opportunities have come back and the resurgence of a lot of the culture is now with us, and we’re understanding more and more with every canoe journey what all of that means and how all of it ties together, and it’s all based around the journey and the lifestyle, what that means. And why? Why do we go? Why do we, you know, pack up gear and take off for three weeks every summer? And it’ll be different for every single person that you talk to, but overall it’s for natives to come together and just be proud and celebrate in being a
canoe nation. Still. I mean we’re not gone, we do not live in old museums. We are a living culture.

Grace also talked about the cultural revitalization but added that it is up to the Suquamish and other Indian nations to now “stand up and pursue the culture.” She shared with me:

You have to actually get up at some point and do it. You know, it’s—and the more you pursue that, the more you pursue whatever little aspect, slice of the culture that is near and dear to your heart, you will just learn more. It’s like information comes to you. You seek it out, but whatever is your interest, that information will stick with you because you’re interested in it.

From all of these conversations with Michelle, Bobbie and Grace, it is clear that since the beginning of Tribal Canoe Journeys the Suquamish culture has been strengthened (in relation to how it was negatively affected through colonization).

**Strengthening youth identity through culture.** As the Suquamish culture has been bolstered since the Tribal Canoe Journeys began, many community members spoke of how the youth are growing up with a better understanding of their culture and identity. Michelle reflected on how her children and how they had been raised within the Suquamish culture:

Michelle: My kids were raised in the canoes, Matahi brought that back and him and Joseph Waterhouse carved that canoe so we were also immersed into that and my kids were born into that. So they have their culture, they live it, they sing it, they pull and now I have grandchildren so my grandchildren are involved in the canoes.

Renee: So you see the youth growing up really strong?
Michelle: Our kids don't have, there are sayings/jokes where you hear people say oh I had to walk 5 miles uphill both ways to school barefoot, times were so hard. And you know they may not have been that hard, but having a culture and keeping our kids around it. It’s a really fine line walking, being who we are and never ever allowing anybody to take that from us again. But we still have to walk in both worlds, and it’s difficult because our kids also have to walk in both worlds.

Rob also spoke of the strengthening of youth identity through cultural belonging and understanding through a reflection on his first year participating in Tribal Canoe Journeys, which also culminated in the first year that many of the youth had ever paddled in a traditional Salish cedar canoe:

My experience with Tribal Canoe Journeys started in 2001, 2002. We initially had 12 kids build this canoe in Canada. Actually it was one of my boys who was part of the group, so that’s what got me started in it and we went to Canada and witnessed it starting and then the halfway point and then when it was completed we brought it home and had a big ceremony here.

Then the first year we left here and went to Quinault actually, where they’re going this year. But being the first cedar canoe that a lot of the kids had been in they didn’t know how powerful a canoe could be and they were experiencing all kinds of weird things. They were so, they couldn’t work out what was going on, but by the time they got into Neah Bay the kids were just in a shambles and it was just the power of the canoe that they hadn’t experienced, they didn’t realize we had to pull the canoe out of the water for two days.
Bobbie went on to talk about how the Suquamish youth are growing up embedded within their culture and are strong in their identity. He reflected on his son, Jason:

“You get young men like my son Jason, who knows in some cases the teachings better than myself, and if certain protocols in certain houses on how, this is the way we do it here. Or in Suquamish we even have our ways where we’ve been chastised by other tribes saying, well that’s not the way we do it at home. And then we have to take ownership for whatever we did and say that’s the way we’re going to do it today. Nobody is expert on Māori, nobody’s an expert on Suquamish or what being a canoe cultural person is. There are a lot of experts out there, but at the end of the day it’s our grandmothers and our grandfathers and our aunties and our uncles. They’re the experts; we’re just the learners.

Bobbie traverses a lot of ground, but talks about the strength of the youth who are growing up in the revitalized Suquamish culture. He also mentions the inherent knowledge that is held within communities, knowledge that is often held with the elders, or “our grandmothers and grandfathers.”

**Healing with each generation.** Throughout the empowerment section we can see that as the Suquamish culture has strengthened, cultural identity and belonging within the Suquamish has also strengthened. The Tribal Canoe Journeys has been an important part of this process, a process of healing that strengthens with each generation. Michelle reflected on the fact that when she was growing up, she did not have access to programs or events like the Tribal Canoe Journeys. As she explains:
We didn't have the programs that we have today mental health, substance abuse all those
type of programs that we have that are just right out here in front of our fingertips for people to get help if they want it, we just hid our emotions. So we had a lot of alcoholism and drug abuse and domestic violence and things like that. Personally my family endured, so my grandmother wasn't allowed to speak [Native Language] and she was an alcoholic when she died in ‘67 and my mother never really was an alcoholic but she endured a lot of domestic violence and stuff from being institutionalized because she was taken from my grandmother. My mom was always able to keep us kids with the family, so every generation gets better, and we want better for our kids and with the canoe stuff I had hurts and pains and I can say that I haven't been a perfect parent, but I also had my culture to grab at, to pull me back because my spirit had already felt those. So when I needed them, I was able to go for them.

Michelle talks about the healing that comes with each generation, a healing of the past and the colonial legacies that have negatively influenced future generations of Suquamish. Pearl also talked about the notion of healing the past, in a number of focus groups that she conducted while working on the “Healing of the Canoe” project:

We had a lot of people tell us early on, a lot of elders would say. Well it doesn't seem like the youth know how to act; they're not being respectful. Then when they were talking especially in the elder focus group, then the focus became maybe they haven’t learned how to, maybe there was (confidential issue)/trauma in their families past and they're not as connected to that cultural part. There family wasn't able to pass down those things of how to do it.
As Pearl shows, the colonization of the Suquamish has meant that some youth have grown up outside of Suquamish culture. She went on further to say,

Everyone (Suquamish community member focus group) identified (confidential issue) in the community as a problem, but one of the interesting parts was that not only did they say that there was (confidential issue) but that was a symptom of a larger problem of a lack of cultural belonging and that that was the issue that needed to be addressed so once we addressed that issue and we had people feeling like they are involved then we won't have this issue of (confidential issue). So it was really inspiring to see how thoughtful people were, and these were people from the age of 18 all the way up to in there 60's who all consistently were saying the same thing. So that was when we started developing the curriculum [for the Healing of the Canoe project].

Therefore, both Michelle and Pearl talk about the healing that is occurring with each generation through acknowledging the ramifications that colonization has imposed upon the Suquamish peoples. In particular, Michelle noted how since the time when her Grandmother was not allowed to speak her Native tongue, and then to the present day, there has been a lot of healing. Michelle denotes that with each generation things get better, and this is in part due to initiatives such as the Tribal Canoe Journeys. Through this imposition of Western culture, certain ties to Suquamish culture and identity were severed, of which spirituality was a part.

---

20 This project uses the Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) model to work in partnership to plan, implement and evaluate culturally grounded interventions to reduce health disparities and promote health in both Tribes. Suquamish and Port Gamble S’Klallam have identified youth substance abuse and the need for a sense of cultural belonging among youth as primary issues of community concern. The Healing of the Canoe partnership seeks to address these issues through prevention and intervention with youth, while tapping into existing community resources (HOCP, 2013).
**Spirituality and culture.** The notion of spirituality was a dominant theme throughout all of the conversations I had with Suquamish Tribal members. Although the strength of these spiritual connections was negatively affected by colonization, they have persevered through the years for the future generations of the Suquamish. During a conversation I had with Michelle, she spoke of the importance of spirituality:

Michelle: It keeps us grounded, you know we have teachings and it makes us almost feel whole and complete and it keeps us grounded emotionally, because our spirit and our mental health needs to strong basically. We have to eat correctly to be happy and to give back to her, the canoe, to take care of her, to guide her. Emotionally we have to be grounded and strong with our emotions and learn how to control them, and spiritually [it] just lifts our spirit for our people. We we're sound and all those four areas it carries us to give back and to give to generations to come, so that they can touch that also.

Renee: [The] Spiritual side and spiritual connection of being in the canoe and you know our people have known that for centuries and it’s so good to see it coming back

Michelle: That's right, and that’s why its so important to always teach our kids and give it to our kids because we don't know today where this world will take them. But if they have that feeling there, even if they're doing bad in their lives, but if they have that feeling there then all they have to do is reach down and grab it. We as people is to give it to our children, grandchildren.... that’s our responsibility to give it to them so they can have it.
Renee: Exactly, because they're going to face these situations, they're going to be in them so if they're well equipped they can face them.

Michelle: Absolutely, that’s our jobs as parents.

Furthermore, during my conversation with Pearl and Frank, Frank talked about the spiritual connection to the water and the canoe and the importance of this for identity and cultural belonging:

Oh yea, so Pearl was there from the beginning, I've just been [with the Healing of the Canoe project] since 2010. I think this is my third year with the program. So my memories were going to Bella Bella [1993] the biggest canoe journey at 14 and knowing that there is such an emphasis on our culture, on our history and on knowing who we are and on spirituality. Its not said often enough that our culture is our spirituality, you know people in America always want us to separate out culture, religion and spirituality, but for us its one in the same well at least for me and the way that I was raised. So, having a strong spirituality a strong culture and a strong connection to the community, these people that are mentors to me while I'm learning about who I am through pulling all day. Our culture, learning who I am what does it mean to be Suquamish, what does it mean to be a canoe nation, really was empowering and really was a protective factor, later on I became a youth prevention worker and went to all these prevention trainings and it was nice to be given the vocabulary to describe of what we already knew and that's a big part of what the Healing of the Canoe Project is, its about applying the right words into what we know already and showing that it is a science based thing and a best practice thing and showing that it works. Because we've known it but nobody would fund it just based
on our word. So learning what a protective factor is, and so one day I saw a pamphlet that said a strong Indian identity can protect your family and I was like of course that makes so much sense.

An identity to hold onto when things get rough, you know that we have that to hold onto. You know, going on the journey it helped me to keep out of trouble and that's my life's ambition is to bring other people in and to show them the canoe journey and that's why I'm a skipper of the canoe and that's why I could make my own family canoe but I've always just been a skipper of the youth canoe because I see it as my job to help the youth to connect to the culture and to have the same experience that I had and so (name) asked me to help facilitate the healing of the canoe because it was very much what I believe in.

As Frank shows, a strong cultural identity can protect a person and prepare them for the storms of life. He also mentions that culture and spirituality are analogous to each other; culture is spirituality, just as spirituality is culture.

Rob also talked about the element of spirituality that is involved during canoe paddling. He stated:

Rob: As a skipper I can feel the canoe as it moves through the water, and back in 08 when we paddled to Duncan we were paddling along, it was our last day there and we were paddling with the tide and the wind was with us and the canoe just wanted to veer off to the right and we were like no, where are you going and we realized that the Canoe just wanted to go home which was in Suquamish, which was over right next to the border and we were far away about 875 miles away but she wanted to go home. I actually had to take my crew and shift the strongest people on the left side to keep it steady. You know, the canoe really has its own spirit, and I can feel it and I always go down and we had it in
the repair shop and it was so lonely and had no paint on it in this dark room, and we would always think that it was so lonely down there. But, the canoe takes care of us when we are on the water, let’s see I’ve been on the canoe for 12 years and we’ve actually attempted to tip it over but it doesn’t want to be tipped over. We’ve had one of my nephews stand on the railing...and the canoe didn’t tip.

Renee: Māoridom (Māori worldview) ancestors, looking after us always – stand do our mihi (greeting) that would be the first mihi (greeting) that I would do would often be to the canoe that brought my ancestors to Aotearoa (New Zealand) from the great homeland Hawaiki (Homeland of the Māori people), I can hear similar things through what your saying.

Rob: Yea there is a bond there that takes place and if you pick it up and hold onto it then it takes care of you and you take care of it.

Additionally, during my conversation with Grace, we talked about how the Tribal Canoe Journeys provide an important spiritual connection to the ancestors:

Renee: I mean through you guys and through the canoes and the different cultural activities the ancestors live out into the present day, which is such an important part. You spoke of connection, and we have a lot of the same, like when we’re in the canoe the spirit and the paddling and the connection to the water, the connection to each other, do you guys have—well, I mean it’s a really spiritual, healing process as much as a sort of physical side.
Grace: I think initially it was perhaps not spiritual because so much of our culture had been lost. So understanding what that meant, you have to experience it to really even begin to get a grasp of what that means. But once the people were in the canoe and had travelled for a few weeks, they certainly began, I mean you cannot be on the water—it is a different world that the focus is different. You depend on the other people in the canoe. You depend on the canoe. You depend on the paddle. You depend on the movement of the water. And you become aware that oh my god, yeah, this is a different world. And with that your focus changes. And then, I think the spirituality begins to become a little clearer. And with each journey it deepens and broadens and the whole entire concept of being on a canoe journey, for each individual, will change. And that is just because of the accumulation of experiences. And as long as we have an emphasis on cultural teachings and cultural identity, then that’s what people will experience and it becomes part of them again, and they own it and they’re proud, and they have found a larger family to be with, have an identity with. And that’s what culture is.

As Michelle, Frank, Rob and Grace all show, spirituality, culture, and identity are all intertwined, and the Tribal Canoe Journey has facilitated the strengthening of those connections since its inception in 1989. The notion of spirituality is particularly important because for some cultures, such as the Suquamish spirituality is integral to culture and cultural beliefs. Furthermore, spirituality was negatively affected through colonization; therefore for some Tribal members the Tribal Canoe Journeys enables a space for the revival of the spiritual aspects of Suquamish culture.
**Tribal journey moments.** Each year Tribal Canoe Journeys culminates with the landing of all of the canoes on a specified day, and then several days of protocol. As Sally explains:

There is several days of protocol, so at the end of the journey in the afternoon/evening the host tribe and the visiting tribe all get together and do song and dance and the furthest away tribe goes first [at the landing] and then the host tribe is the last one. It’s a really big deal.

During the Tribal Canoe Journey days of protocol, tribes from all over the Pacific Northwest will share in each other’s culture. During this time, different canoe families, or Tribal groups, will sing, dance and share with each other. Bobbie commented on this and the notion of “tribal journey moments”:

…there’s a fellow up north… his name is Frank Nelson, and we call him Chief Frank Nelson. He calls them tribal journey moments. And those are truly tribal journey moments when the entire gathering will get together and sing one song together and it’s called the tribal journeys song. And you can Google any of these events, the one at Squaxin Island, the one up at Swinomish, you can see when we get together to sing grease trail song the sense of pride and unity amongst our peoples. What do they say, uhh, priceless. I don’t know if you’ve ever seen the commercial but they say this, this, this. And we have those priceless moments that—Chief Frank Nelson and I have a running joke, and we call them tribal journey moments.

I saw one once, we were in Suquamish and we were doing a landing, we were doing the protocol of the landing, and there was a young Tulalip boy, I don’t even know his name, but when the Tulalip canoe came in he was on the beach. And one boy, about eight years
old, in front of 2000 people, sang a welcoming song to his canoe. And those are the moments that are touching, that you can’t recreate.

Another one was Faith, my daughter, in Lower Elwha, they were singing the S’Klallam love song, [and] you heard the S’Klallam love song the other day. Well, those fellows from Lower Elwha were kind of singing it in the wrong way, the men are supposed to start with this one particular chorus and then a woman is supposed to sing. And a woman is supposed to sing that song. My daughter was in the stands at Lower Elwha up in the audience, and she sang the verse and she did it by herself in front of a thousand people. And the emcee comes running over and shoves a microphone in her face and she gets a little shy, but she knew how the song should go. It’s kind of handed over to the women and the women hand it back over to the men, it’s one of those fun songs, and she knew the way that it was supposed to go. And it was truly one of those touching, touching moments. And pride. As a father, I see my daughter correcting these fellows on the teachings and she wasn’t doing it in a bad way, she was doing it in a good way.

So those teachings, you know, and this is truly, we get together and we discuss the teachings. I do it with the Maori folks and what our grandmother would have said. I heard you over the course of the three or four days I’ve been with you, what would the aunties do with these young boys? And how would they—and we understand, we know what these teachings are. When we get scolded like that then we take a step back and re-evaluate who we are, and how we got to be the way we are without our aunties scolding us. And that’s the connection that institutions don’t have. If that little voice in your head gives you that teaching.
Grace also talked about the prevalence of culture and the space that Tribal Canoe Journeys allows for cultural teachings to be celebrated:

… all of this, all the journey stuff, all the teachings and stories and songs and cultural stuff, you cannot learn in public school. You cannot buy a book and learn this. This is a lifetime pursuit and it’s right here in my community, and your community, and at Quinault and all of these places that pride themselves in being native when, like I say, we were all on the brink, we were all on the brink of just going extinct. So your grassroots theory is true.

As Grace shows the Tribal Canoe Journeys provides a space for indigenous culture to be celebrated, experienced and shared between peoples, she also states that this is the knowledge that you cannot learn in books. Rather, culture must be experienced.

In conclusion of the empowerment section, it has become clear that: 1) Tribal Canoe Journeys has been devised through the utilization of the Native American culture of the Pacific Northwest, 2) the Tribal Canoe Journeys is a specific space where Suquamish culture, values and beliefs are celebrated, 3) since the Tribal Canoe Journeys began in 1989, a revitalization of Suquamish culture has also occurred, 4) through the Tribal Canoe Journeys Suquamish cultural identity and belonging has strengthened, 5) the Tribal Canoe Journeys has provided a platform for Suquamish community members to reconnect to the spiritual aspects of the culture, and 6) there has been healing with each generation of the Suquamish from the ills of a colonial past, of which, the Tribal Canoe Journeys is a key part.

*******

I have covered a lot of ground in this chapter. In the beginning I aimed to provide the reader with an account of my journey into the Suquamish community and the importance of
building relationships in that process. Notably, throughout the narrative and in many of the collaborative storytelling sessions with the Suquamish community members, they remembered my elder Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell. Over the second half I have presented the collaborative storytelling sessions that I had with various Suquamish community members about the Tribal Canoe Journeys under the key themes of: Historical connections; Tribal Canoe Journeys; and Empowerment. In the next section I shall synthesize the empirical material of this chapter within the broader context of SFD and look at how the Tribal Canoe Journeys can be viewed as a form of decolonizing praxis.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

Throughout this thesis I have aimed to critically examine the concept of SFD in indigenous communities. Often, sport has been regarded as an apolitical, neutral vehicle that can teach people values for a ‘civil’ society: “discipline, honesty, integrity, generosity and trustworthiness” (Coatler, 2010a, p. 296). In many developed nations, SFD initiatives are targeted towards “developing” marginalized, disadvantaged and indigenous communities. In these contexts sport is viewed from a functionalist perspective that deems sport as a vehicle for positive social change. However, many scholars including Black (2010), Coatler (2010a), Coatler (2010b), Darnell (2010a), Darnell and Hayhurst (2011), Kidd (2008), and Saveedra (2009) have cautioned against the sport evangelist view of SFD as an overwhelmingly positive force. Rather, as I have pointed to throughout this thesis, SFD initiatives have often neglected to acknowledge the complex socio-historical landscape of SFD and the communities in which such programs intervene. This has meant that SFD initiatives in indigenous communities have often been positioned within a Western worldview rather than within the worldview of the indigenous community in which they are based. Given this, many scholars including Darnell (2010a), Darnell and Hayhurst (2012), Forsyth and Wamsley (2006), Giles (2007), Nicholls, Giles and Sethna (2010), and Smith (1999) have called for the need to adopt a de-colonizing praxis when devising and implementing SFD programs in indigenous communities. Thus, this chapter will discuss the Suquamish Tribal Canoe Journeys as an example of a SFD program that adopts a unique approach to decolonizing praxis. Through the synthesis of key points from the literature

21 A de-colonizing praxis would require an entire philosophical shift, where rather than just acknowledging indigenous episteme during the devising and implementation of SFD programs, indigenous episteme form the basis of the whole process.
review and the collaborative storytelling sessions that I conducted with some of the Suquamish community members, I will demonstrate this point. I have arranged this section under the following themes: Histories of colonization, indigenous peoples and sport; Tribal Canoe Journeys; paddling against the tides of (neo) colonialism; encouraging self-determination of indigenous peoples as decolonizing praxis; and lessons from the Suquamish.

**Histories of Colonization, Indigenous Peoples and Sport**

As shown in the introduction, indigenous peoples have for centuries been subject to the processes of colonization. Since the early colonial period and until the present day, ethnocentric colonial governments have employed many cultural and legislative practices to assimilate indigenous peoples. Through avenues such as education and sport, indigenous peoples have been assimilated into the dominant Western culture, often with the result of severing ties with their own indigenous culture. This severing has had many negative effects on indigenous peoples’ identity, health and wellbeing. During many conversations with the Suquamish community members, they spoke of the extensive effects that these colonial histories have had on their ancestors, as well as how these negative effects have been perpetuated through to the future generations.

As Grace shared when talking about the ramifications of colonization on the Suquamish ancestors, “That must have been horrific for our ancestors, absolutely horrific... to have your home, your language, your belief, everything taken away. Everything” (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013). Furthermore, Michelle also expressed discontent when recalling these colonial travesties, calling them “genocidal techniques”. It was these genocidal techniques that led to Michelle’s grandmother being taken to boarding school and then, once there, she was
denied the right to speak her Native tongue and speak of her Native History. Additionally, Suquamish elder Rob spoke of these tactics when recalling his experiences of the Chief Seattle days as a child. When he asked his mother why his people were dancing in the “plains style of dancing” instead of the Suquamish style. His mother had told him that his Grandfather had been forced to “give up [his] Indian identity to work for the government ...so [he] could have a government job”. In all of these cases the Suquamish ancestors were forced to relinquish their identity, culture, and beliefs. They speak to the assimilation of their ancestors through often-violent genocidal techniques that were imposed upon the Suquamish in order to “develop” them. In these instances, the culture or lifeblood of the Suquamish was removed through assimilation tactics, and replaced with Western-based practices. It was through this removal that the Suquamish culture and the traditional Suquamish canoe culture were on the verge of extinction throughout much of the 20th century.

Lastly, as Bobbie mentioned during our conversation, the Suquamish were historically considered a canoe nation. Rather than having oxen and carts, early Suquamish travelled by canoe on “the pride of what we call travelling on our ancestral highways” (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013). Bobbie talks about how Suquamish culture is bound within canoe culture, and in the pre-contact period the Suquamish (as well as many other Native American Nations of the Pacific Northwest) would travel their ancestral highways by canoe. Through the process of colonization the Suquamish ancestors forewent much of their identity, culture and beliefs, all of which were inextricably bound to the traditional Salish canoe. As the negative effects of a colonial history have carried forward, future generations of Suquamish have also suffered. It is important to understand this point as we move forward into the next section,
because for the peoples that lost so much during colonization, it is important that these same
mistakes are not made again through SFD policy and practice.

**Tribal Canoe Journeys: Paddling Against the Currents of (Neo) Colonialism**

In 1989 the inaugural Tribal Canoe Journey took place at the 100th anniversary of the State of Washington. The iconic paddle was the beginning of a period of cultural revitalization for some Native American Nations of the Pacific Northwest, revitalizing canoe traditions that had been lost for many years. Since this time, Tribal Canoe Journeys have evolved to become an event that attracts upward of ninety US Tribes, Canadian First Nations, and New Zealand *Māori* to attend. Many of the Suquamish Tribal members that I spoke with talked about the start of the Tribal Canoe Journeys, and the important role that Tribal Canoe Journeys has played in revitalizing Suquamish culture. In this section I would like to connect the relationship between Tribal Canoe Journeys and some of the key post-colonial and critical critiques of SFD. Through the explication of this relationship I intend to show how the Tribal Canoe Journeys can provide a space for decolonization rather than neocolonialism.  

I join many critical scholars Coatler (2010), Darnell & Hayhurst (2011), Darnell (2010b), and Saveedra (2009) in the questioning the prevalent ideology (in SFD circles) that sport is a universal tool for the development of marginalized, disadvantaged and indigenous communities. In the case of indigenous communities, sport has often carried certain ideological, political, and practical implications for the indigenous community that Western scholars and practitioners are attempting to ‘develop’. Rather, than encouraging the self-determination of indigenous peoples,

---

22 Just to reiterate, neocolonialism refers to new colonial practices that tend not to be recognized as such by the Western community. In other words, neocolonialism refers to new forms of colonization that go by the names of “development programs,” “aid”, or other forms of “peace keeping” missions.
SFD initiatives have often resulted in neocolonialism by constantly transmitting Western ideologies and norms under the guise of “progress.” Like the early days of colonization, these cultural and legislative practices have pushed indigenous peoples further away from their culture and identity in the name of modernization and progress. If we look back upon the introduction at the SFD program the *Active Community Clubs program* that targeted poverty in South Africa. In this SFD program sports such as rugby, netball and cricket were delivered in local schools. However, Burnett (2009) stated that the program had limited success because it was conducted as a top-down model rather than as a collaborative project. Furthermore, the program claimed that it provided unemployed youth the opportunity gain experience and life skills as a way “out of the streets” (Burnett, 2009, p. 1199). In essence this SFD program provides a forum for the dissemination of Western ideologies, and are underpinned by the logic of neoliberalism. 

Moreover, Darnell (2010a) states, SFD initiatives use sport to support the uptake of “competitive and hierarchical culture and the political economy” by marginalized groups (p. 58). Under these pretenses, the use of SFD in indigenous communities carries the key tenets of neocolonialism because they constantly and systematically perpetuate Western measures of progress, modernization and development. Therefore, we must question whether SFD is truly empowering or, as some scholars have suggested, designed to facilitate the acculturation of indigenous peoples into neoliberal society. Thus, the use of SFD in indigenous communities must be conducted with caution, as Saveedra (2009) asserts: “sport carries historical and cultural baggage from its hegemonic core” (p. 131). To date, there has been limited research that has looked at the dominance neoliberalism in SFD programs and subsequently this dominance as a form of neocolonialism.
Given all of this, scholars such as Darnell (2010b) and Smith (1999) have called for a decolonizing approach when working in indigenous communities in order to disrupt the historically formed colonial hierarchies. Therefore, decolonization in SFD in this context refers to the challenging of colonial authority and the support of indigenous communities throughout development initiatives. Moreover, Darnell (2010b) contends that it would be beneficial to reconfigure the idea of indigenous self-determination in order to disrupt neoliberal policies. He contends that the point is not to overly romanticize indigenous knowledge, but rather to see the opportunity for collaboration.

The Difference Between the Canoe Races and Tribal Canoe Journeys

In many conversations that I had with the Suquamish community members, they talked about the start of Tribal Canoe Journeys. Notably, some community members told me that prior to Tribal Canoe Journeys there was ‘canoe racing’. However, there were some key differences between these canoe races and the Tribal Canoe Journeys, namely the impetus behind each of them. In general, during my conversations with the Suquamish community members they told me that the canoe races were predicated on competition, winning and cash prizes. Thus, the canoe races align with many key tenets of the neoliberal market, which denotes “that human well-being can be best advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade” (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). Conversely, the Tribal Canoe Journeys were described by Bobbie as a “more cultural, spiritual and a healing process” in which the canoe travel from “community to community” (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013). As Bobbie shows, the impetus behind Tribal Canoe Journeys is different to the canoe races.
Indeed, to play sport, or participate in the canoe races involves the submission of oneself to the key tenets of neoliberalism, including, surveillance, exploitation, regimentation, individualism and competition. Through this submission, indigenous peoples also forego their own cultural beliefs and values in favor of the market logic. It is this same neoliberal logic that underpins the policy and practice of SFD. Therefore, if we accept that the use of sport in SFD programs is a-political, neutral and universal; then we also accept (rather than question) that SFD is a proponent of neocolonialism. A proponent that constantly reconstructs historically formed colonial hierarchies. For this reason, the Tribal Canoe Journeys is very important, because it demonstrates a turn away from the neoliberal market logic that majorly underpins SFD policy and practice. This shift away from neoliberal logic is an important step towards indigenous communities right to self-determination and empowerment. Rather than creating a dependency culture, in which the indigenous peoples never rise above the colonial hierarchies of the past.

During our conversation Bobbie spoke about the family element of the Tribal Canoe Journeys, he states:

...we saw the families, the different canoe tribes or the iwis (tribes), and it was just such a feeling of togetherness, and the goal of paddling a canoe set up a whole—...every stroke that you take on this journey is one less stroke somebody else has to take as we all collectively, as families, go towards the goal of arriving at... Suquamish.... (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013)

Newman (2013) cautions against the lure of modern sport’s hyper-competitive and hyper-rationalised neoliberal system, and in this quote it becomes clear that the impetus behind Tribal Canoe Journeys does not revolve around modern conceptions of sport. Instead, the journey is
about the family and togetherness, thus, providing a space for Suquamish identity, culture and beliefs to be privileged.

Additionally, Grace commented on the reasons behind the start of the tribal canoe journeys. Rather than SFD programs that are brought in and placed upon indigenous communities, the Tribal Canoe Journeys are built from the strengths of the indigenous communities culture. During our conversation she stated

...it’s not a program that was officially built specifically to come in and impose...it was really native culturally driven by a few people. And more and more tribal members and community members are participating now, so it’s worthwhile but it’s so beyond worthwhile (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

Grace unpacks the many key points in this statement, first, she explains how, during the genesis of the program it was built from the strengths of the culture. It was not a Western-defined program that was brought in to impart knowledge onto the Suquamish community. She also notes that more and more community members are participating in the Tribal Canoe Journeys, and it could be inferred that the reason behind this success is because the program is culturally driven.

By using the strengths of the culture of the indigenous community in which the SFD programs are based, the Tribal Canoe Journeys opens up a space to move away from approaches that have been based on a deficit model approach to development. In conclusion of this section, we can observe that the Tribal Canoe Journeys is a way to encourage the self-determination of indigenous peoples and the self-determination of indigenous peoples is a key point that some SFD initiatives often miss. Therefore, in the last section of this chapter I will illustrate how the
self-determination of indigenous peoples can be used as a form of decolonizing praxis by extending our learning to encompass some lessons from the Suquamish.

**Self-determination of Indigenous Peoples as Decolonizing Praxis in SFD – Lessons from the Suquamish**

Over the years, development initiatives that have been conducted in indigenous communities have often been positioned from a deficit model approach. Kegler et al. (2003) have described a deficit model approach as a health intervention program that uses a problem (such as Type II diabetes, teen pregnancy, or smoking) based approach. With this kind of approach, little attention is given to building from the inherent strengths and assets of the community. Rather, a strength-based model uses the inherent strengths (or knowledge) of the community, such as culture and relationships, as the basis of the initiative. Aforementioned, the use of canoe culture within the Tribal Canoe Journeys is an important because it is a physical cultural practice that is part of the Salish culture of the Pacific Northwest. Thus, it is a practice that carries the inherent culture of the Salish people and is a source of cultural identity and belonging for many of the participants. Scholars (Maro et al., 2009) have also suggested that there has been a lack of co-creation during the planning, implementation and evaluation of SFD programs in indigenous communities. Given this lack of co-creation, SFD initiatives working in indigenous communities have continued to perpetuate western ideologies. Both the using of a deficit model approach and the lack of co-creation within SFD initiatives have permitted (neo) colonial tactics to persevere within SFD, instead of creating a space for indigenous self-determination. However, as this section will show, there are key lessons that SFD scholars, practitioners and policy makers can learn from the Suquamish and the Tribal Canoe Journeys.
Using Culture as Strength

One of the key themes that arose during my interviews with the Suquamish was the notion of using the strengths of culture as the basis for Tribal Canoe Journeys. For the Suquamish, indigenous peoples whose ancestors were forced to relinquish their culture and identity during the colonial period, the Tribal Canoe Journeys have been a form of cultural revitalization. This cultural revitalization has also enabled the revitalization of Suquamish identity, and Suquamish health and well-being. As Grace noted during our conversation:

The strength, it comes from—it runs both ways. It runs through the person, physical, mental and spiritual strength, and then total understanding of what being in a canoe and on the water means, which is just life changing. And it also runs deep in that tribal members now understand, or certainly understand a little bit on a deeper level, what their ancestors did. What they faced, what strengths they then derived from being in a canoe on the water in all types of water. Stormy weather. I know canoes have been out there in really, really rough water. They’ve been out there on just clear glass, flat water. They’ve used the sails. I mean it just has been a really broad reaching experience for canoe pullers. And subsequently that filters into their families and becomes a further teaching tool for how important and how strong the culture is (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

For the Suquamish, prior to European contact they were a canoe nation, however, this canoe culture was negatively affected during the colonial period. Thus, through paddling in Tribal Canoe Journeys the descendants of the Suquamish are connected to their illustrious ancestors, it is through the current generations that the ancestral Suquamish culture lives to the present day
and can be passed onto future generations. As Grace mentions, the health of the Suquamish person is bound to the health of their culture.

Furthermore, during many other conversations, Suquamish community members talked about how much the Suquamish culture has strengthened since the Tribal Canoe Journeys began in 1989. Grace spoke of the strengthening of Suquamish culture and how Tribal Canoe Journeys have brought back many other aspects of the culture; she contends:

It has and it’s a strengthening of the culture now, with threads of course back to our ancestors. But strengthening the culture now is just as important as it was 300 years ago and what life was like then, 1000 years ago and what was life like then. And this is what it is for us now. So we’re very proud of the fact that our culture Suquamish is making efforts and succeeding at many aspects of understanding what it’s like to be a Suquamish. We’re certainly on the brink of losing everything, all of our cultural identity, but with the canoe journeys it has brought back the awareness and the participation in canoe carving, paddle carving, weaving with cedar and wool, the language is now in our school, and just a little more understanding and respect within the tribe is certainly becoming apparent. So yeah, from the 80s, from the first paddle to Seattle and Bella Bella challenge, the journeys have certainly carved their way into our community and it’s been a very healthy, positive change, yeah, it’s a good direction (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

Grace shows that the Tribal Canoe Journeys provides a space for Suquamish culture to be practiced, and since the Tribal Canoe journeys began it has brought back many other aspects of the culture such as language, cedar weaving, wool weaving, paddle carving, and canoe carving. Once again, the Tribal Canoe Journeys began as part of the centennial celebrations of Washington State and the signing of the Centennial Accord recognizing tribal sovereignty. In
celebration, some Salish tribes organized the Paddle to Seattle to help revive canoe culture that had been lost during colonization. This cultural revitalization is possible because the journey uses culture as a strength rather than prescribing another culture, such as Western culture, as the antidote to the social ills of the Suquamish community.

Healing with Each Generation

A second key theme that arose as part of my interviews with the Suquamish was the concept of healing with each generation. As mentioned earlier, many of the Suquamish tribal members that I talked to spoke of the way that there ancestors had been treated during the colonial period and the long-term effects that those travesties have had upon future generations. However, many of them also told me how there have been healing of those colonial travesties in recent decades, and the Tribal Canoe Journeys has played a key part in this healing. The term healing with each generation was used by many tribal members to denote that with each generation of Suquamish the Suquamish culture strengthens. The Tribal Canoe Journeys have facilitated this process of healing.

Michelle spoke of the strengthening of Suquamish youth identity and culture with each generation:

Michelle: My kids were raised in the canoes, Matahi brought that back and him and Joseph Waterhouse carved that canoe so we were also immersed into that and my kids were born into that. So they have their culture, they live it, they sing it, they pull and now I have grandchildren so my grandchildren are involved in the canoes.

Renee: So you see the youth growing up really strong?
Michelle: Our kids don't have, there are sayings/jokes where you hear people say oh I had to walk 5 miles uphill both ways to school barefoot, times were so hard. And you know they may not have been that hard, but having a culture and keeping our kids around it. It’s a really fine line walking, being who we are and never ever allowing anybody to take that from us again. But we still have to walk in both worlds, and it’s difficult because our kids also have to walk in both worlds (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

Michelle talks about her children and now her grandchildren are growing up immersed in canoe culture and although they have to learn to walk in both worlds, initiatives such as Tribal Canoe Journeys has helped this process.

Pearl also spoke of the strengthening of youth identity and cultural understanding, and found that many community focus groups identified a lack of cultural belonging as the underlying issue that needed to be addressed. She states:

Everyone [Suquamish community member focus group] identified [confidential issue] in the community as a problem, but one of the interesting parts was that not only did they say that there was [confidential issue] but that this [confidential issue] was a symptom of a larger problem, a lack of cultural belonging and that that was the issue that needed to be addressed so once we addressed that issue and we had people feeling like they are involved then we won't have this issue of [confidential issue]. So it was really inspiring to see how thoughtful people were, and these were people from the age of 18 all the way up to in there 60's who all consistently were saying the same thing. So that was when we started developing the curriculum [for the Healing of the canoe project] (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).
Pearl talks about how there is a larger issue that is affecting the Suquamish community members, an issue that many other issues can be traced back to—a lack of cultural belonging. While we might view read this as a functionalist approach, when we take into account the full scope of the passage by putting it in conversation with other statements that have been made we can see that is a functionalism that owes to a lack of cultural belonging. Therefore, if we acknowledge that many SFD programs are positioned from a Western worldview then we could surmise that the “development” these programs are aiming to achieve is not equipped to address a lack of cultural belonging that plagues many indigenous communities. Given this, a key lesson that could be learned is to look at how indigenous worldviews are utilized in the genesis of SFD programs.

**The People are the Spirit of the Canoe, the Canoe is the Spirit of the People**

The last lesson from the Suquamish that I would like to share is the concept of spirituality. I have used the proverb ‘the people are the spirit of the canoe; the canoe is the spirit of the people’ to denote how throughout history the canoe has been the lifeblood of the Suquamish peoples, as well as many other sea-faring Indian nations of the Pacific Northwest. I also use this proverb to encourage the idea of the canoe, not only as a physical construct, but also as a vehicle of culture and a vehicle of spirituality. As I have reiterated numerous times, colonization has held grave ramifications for the Suquamish in terms of culture, identity, beliefs, and spirituality. However, spirituality is an element of culture that is rarely discussed, especially in SFD initiatives. Therefore, in this last lesson from the Suquamish I entertain the notion of spirituality and present it as one of the key elements to understanding the philosophical foundations of a culture; I suggest that we may use these foundations to develop culturally appropriate and thoughtful ways of enabling cultural development that is on the peoples’ own
terms, as well as being careful to avoid the propagation of western culture at the expense of indigenous knowledge and belonging. During a conversation with Michelle she spoke of the importance of spirituality:

It keeps us grounded, you know we have teachings and it makes us almost feel whole and complete and it keeps us grounded emotionally, because our spirit and our mental health needs to strong basically. We have to eat correctly to be happy and to give back to her, the canoe, to take care of her, to guide her. Emotionally we have to be grounded and strong with our emotions and learn how to control them, and spiritually [it] just lifts our spirit for our people. We we're sound and all those four areas it carries us to give back and to give to generations to come, so that they can touch that also (Personal Communication, 06/06/2013).

Michelle describes the importance of spirituality for the Tribal Canoe Journey, which it is the spiritual component of the journey, of paddling, that helps to keep the Suquamish peoples grounded emotionally and their mental health strong. Frank also spoke extensively about the paddling and spirituality:

So my memories were going to Bella Bella [1993] the biggest canoe journey at 14 and knowing that there is such an emphasis on our culture, on our history and on knowing who we are and on spirituality. Its not said often enough that our culture is our spirituality, you know people in American always want us to separate out culture, religion and spirituality, but for us its one in the same well at least for me and the way that I was raised. So, having a strong spirituality a strong culture and a strong connection to the community, these people that are mentors to me while I'm learning about who I am through pulling all day. Our culture, learning who I am what does it mean to be
Suquamish, what does it mean to be a canoe nation, really was empowering and really was a protective factor.... So learning what a protective factor is, and so one day I saw a pamphlet that said a strong Indian identity can protect your family and I was like of course that makes so much sense (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

As Frank contends, the canoe is an important part of Suquamish culture, history, values, identity and beliefs. He states:

It’s not said often enough that our culture is our spirituality, you know people in American always want us to separate out culture, religion and spirituality, but for us its one in the same well at least for me and the way that I was raised (Personal Communication, 06/10/2013).

In this way, Frank makes a key connection, telling us that culture and spirituality go hand and hand. As the title of this section alludes to, ‘The people are the spirit of the canoe; the canoe is the spirit of the people’. Frank also makes connections between the canoe culture of the Suquamish and the strengthening of identity: “a strong Indian identity can protect your family and I was like, of course that makes so much sense.” With a strong Indian (Native American) identity, one can be protected. If we think back to the start of this thesis to the prologue, my elder Matahi states:

When the storm comes the canoe are ready that’s the same with the youth. If you can prepare them for life, their cultural roots deep in the ground, deep in the Earth and relate it to the ocean and their music and their legends, they can face the world. They don't need to drink, they don't need to drug up. My elders sent me here to find part of the solution for the young generations who are alcoholics, drug addicts, who are unemployed, who are homeless. We believe part of the Māori answer lies with the Indigenous people of this
land. If we reconnect and share our problems we'll find a common solution. This is part of it (Suquamish Canoe, 1988).

Thus, as both Frank and Matahi state, by strengthening the identity of the people by focusing upon the strengths of their culture, they can face the world. Through strengthening cultural belonging and empowerment, future generations may be prepared to face the storms of life and be better empowered to exercise their right to self-determination.

**Conclusion**

Throughout this master’s thesis I have aimed to present a (albeit humble attempt) case for adopting a decolonizing *praxis* when planning, implementing and evaluating SFD programs in indigenous communities. Through the explication of the Tribal Canoe Journeys, it has been my intention to present a case that explores how the ramifications of a colonial history have had negative effects on the Suquamish, and how, if we are not careful, SFD initiatives may (often unintentionally) perpetuate colonialism through practices. Practices that ignore, or perhaps even actively damage, the values and identities of the marginalized or indigenous communities they purport to help. That is to say, if they fail to adopt a decolonizing *praxis* when working with SFD initiatives in indigenous communities, they risk extending the grave harm that a history of colonialism has already wreaked upon indigenous populations.

I must make clear that this document should not be read as a “how to” guide for working with indigenous communities, but rather as a critical commentary on SFD in indigenous communities. I have hoped to achieve this by situating the case study of the Suquamish and their experiences with the Tribal Canoe Journeys of the Pacific Northwest of North America within the broader context of SFD. To date, there have other SFD programs that have been conducted.
within the Suquamish community, notably youth baseball initiatives. However, these initiatives are specifically targeted at youth, and use a Western sport to create a healthier Suquamish population (Suquamish Baseball, 2013). Where the Tribal Canoe Journeys differ is from its genesis, which is majorly driven by Suquamish values, beliefs and worldview. The Tribal Canoe Journeys utilizes a traditional physical cultural practice to encourage health and wellbeing amongst the Suquamish (and other Salish Tribes). Specifically, the Tribal Canoe Journeys is unique because it uses Salish canoe culture, and facilitates the strengthening of cultural and identity and belonging amongst the Suquamish. It was this lack of cultural belonging that was identified by the Suquamish community as being the overarching reason why there were issues of alcoholism and drug abuse within the community.

Although I have pointed to how I (as an indigenous Māori person of New Zealand) could relate to the Suquamish and their histories of colonization, the aim of this thesis is not to reduce our very separate experiences to ‘one homogenous indigenous experience’. In fact, I have aimed to do quite the opposite. Instead of looking at generic approaches to SFD that can be implemented into indigenous communities, I hope that I have made clear that, to date, this kind of approach has had limited success. One key reason for this limited success may be located in the diversity of indigenous peoples. The diversity of indigenous peoples is vast, and differences can occur not only between indigenous “groupings” of peoples, such as the many Native American Nations of the Pacific Northwest, but can also differ between members of the same Tribe and even between Tribal families. For this reason, it is important to adopt a de-colonizing approach to SFD in order to empower indigenous peoples to take up their right to self-determination and to use the inherent strengths and knowledge within their community as the basis for any development program.
Implications

**Tribal Canoe Journeys is not “sport”**. Throughout this thesis I have endeavored to critique the Western SFD policy and practice. Through the exploration of the Suquamish community members experience with the Tribal Canoe Journeys, I hope that I have made it clear that Tribal Canoe Journeys is different to modern forms of Western sport. Indeed, in the second section of this chapter I highlighted the very different epistemological foundations upon which Tribal Canoe Journeys is framed, in relation to the canoe races and other western sports such as basketball, football and hockey. Therein, lies a key point. That although the Tribal Canoe Journeys is a large organized event, its success in the revitalization of Suquamish (as part of the wider Salish cultural revitalization) may be due to the fact that Tribal Canoe Journeys is not a sport. Rather, the Tribal Canoe Journeys carries its own values, cultural beliefs, and cultural identity. Values and beliefs that have been described by Suquamish community members as: spirituality, togetherness, and family. These types of values differ greatly from modern western sport, which is often underpinned by neoliberal logic. Therefore, a key implication of this research project and underlying reason why Tribal Canoe Journeys has had major success is because it is not a “sport.”

**Tribal Canoe Journeys is not “development”**. The second implication refers to the concept of “development” and precisely what development is. As I have alluded to throughout this thesis, the notion that marginalized, indigenous and/or disadvantaged communities are in need of “development” is often driven by a narrow ethnocentric view of development that has been devised in the West. Given this, I ask the reader to consider the following questions, when thinking about SFD policy and practice: who defines development? Who decides who needs to
be developed? Who decides how development (SFD) initiatives are planned, implemented and evaluated? What are the underlying epistemologies that guide this development?

More often than not, it is the Western based SFD policy maker/practitioner that decides the answers to these questions. Instead of entering into a collaborative process with the indigenous/marginalized community that acknowledges the inherent knowledge that the community holds. This is part of the reason why to date, SFD programs have had limited success in indigenous communities. However, I propose that the Tribal Canoe Journey is an excellent example of an initiative that is successful within an indigenous community. One of the reasons why the Tribal Canoe Journey has been so successful is because it is not development (well at least not development by Western standards). Instead Tribal Canoe Journeys is an initiative that is community-driven, devised within the traditional Salish canoe culture and seeks to empower the Suquamish by establishing their right to self-determination, rather than developing them into neoliberal citizens.

**Pedagogic space for the re-centering of indigenous knowledge in SFD.** The last implication that I would like to highlight is the potential that this type of research has as a pedagogical tool for SFD policy makers and practitioners. For those considering the development of SFD programs within indigenous communities, after reading this thesis I hope would reconsider their practice. For a group of people that have been negatively influenced by a colonial history, the neocolonial nature of current SFD programs is disturbing. Thus, a key implication that could be taken away from this thesis is the need for the re-centering of indigenous knowledge in SFD. Although this study is unique and the “results” cannot be generalized, I would think that that is the key point for anyone working with indigenous
communities. The notion that no, two indigenous communities are the same. Instead of generalizing results and practices we need to look at how the strengths of an indigenous community can be fostered.

**Trans-indigenous Conversation as a Decolonizing Praxis.** An additional implication that was a strength of this research project was the trans-indigenous conversational nature of the project. As I presented in the methods section of this thesis, this research project was undertaken as a collaborative project the Suquamish community and I (an indigenous Māori woman). Indeed, this project has been positioned as an investigation of the Tribal Canoe Journeys from a Suquamish perspective as an exemplary form of decolonizing praxis for SFD in indigenous communities. However, simultaneously throughout this research project I have endeavored to enter into a trans-indigenous conversation, which could be viewed as a form of decolonizing praxis. Decolonizing in the way that it is a trans-indigenous conversation in which both, the Suquamish and I can share and learn from each other. In particular during the collaborative storytelling sessions, and throughout my stay with the Suquamish we shared many stories about our respective cultures and specifically our canoe cultures. In this way, this project was an extension of my previous experiences and work with my elder Matahi on the decolonizing potential of waka ama in New Zealand. Therefore, I do not surmise this is a new conversation as a new conversation but rather if we return to ‘Chapter One: Suquamish Canoe’, then this project can also be viewed as a revival of a conversation that started in 1988 between my elder Matahi Whakataka-Brightwell and the Suquamish community. In acknowledging this, the trans-indigenous conversational nature of this project is a form of decolonizing praxis within itself and
encourages self-determination of indigenous peoples worldwide through the sharing of knowledge.

Limitations of this Research Project

Some researchers may read many limitations within this research project including: the time frame, my personal biases, and the number of people that I had conversations with. Although I acknowledge these limitations, I would encourage the reader to look at this research project as a conversation that captures one passage of time and is part of an ongoing trans-indigenous conversation. Nevertheless, I will address these limitations. Firstly, in terms of time frame, this research project was undertaken as a yearlong project from start to finish. This meant that the depth of the project has been limited due to the time frame that was given. Also, the actual collection of empirical material was only conducted over a weeklong period. During many conversations that I had with the Suquamish Tribal members, it became clear that even if this study were conducted over a number of years, it would probably not be long enough. Thus, the aim of this project would be to present the findings to the Suquamish Tribe, so that they may use them to further their own self-determination. Upon considering my role in this project has been as a conversant, admirer and friend of the Suquamish and as an important part of the decolonizing process, this document will be gifted back to the Suquamish community, and any future articles (if any) will be written in conjunction with the Suquamish Tribal members, who will have authorship.

An additional limitation could be viewed in the restricted number of Suquamish Tribal members that I spoke with during my weeklong stay at the Port Madison Reserve. Once again if we acknowledge that the project is part of an ongoing trans-indigenous conversation between the
Suquamish and I, then this limitation becomes less important. However, for the boundaries of this document, it could be viewed as a limitation.

Another limitation of the research was the fact that the researcher was not able to attend the event before writing this document, as the Tribal Canoe Journey for 2013 is scheduled for August, which is well after this document will be completed for the purposes of the degree program. Obviously the scope of this project, given the timeframe and budget, is small; therefore further research into SFD in a variety of indigenous contexts is needed in order to garner more insight.

The final limitation that I will address is my personal bias to this project, which is built on my previous research on *waka ama* culture in New Zealand and my identity as an indigenous *Māori* woman. However, I follow the work of Smith (1999) and Marsden (1992) by imploring that to me there is no such thing as objectivity. Simply put, there is no “objective act” in research; rather everything is subjective and political by its very nature. When a researcher selects a research question or topic, whether it is to find the oxidative capacity of muscles and mitochondria or to look, as I have endeavored, at the need to adopt a decolonizing *praxis* when conducting SFD in indigenous communities, the research process is subjective. It is subjective because it research is *always* informed by the research context and the researchers personal biases. In order to clarify this point I point to the words of Marsden as he states,

The route to *Māoritanga* [*Māori culture*] through abstract interpretation is a dead end. The way can only lie through a passionate, subjective approach. That is more likely to lead to a goal…. Abstract rational thought and empirical methods cannot grasp the concrete act of existing, which is fragmentary, paradoxical and incomplete. The only way lies through a passionate subjective approach…(cited in Raeburn & Rootman, p. 113).
Marsden denotes that Māori culture (which could easily be substituted for Suquamish culture) cannot be grasped through abstract interpretation, but rather should be experienced. Specifically, in this research project I have entertained my subjective reality as an indigenous Māori woman who has ventured to be a participant in the Suquamish canoe culture. However, rather than claiming that my research is objective, I openly state that it is subjective and inherently biased. Although, some may perceive this as a limitation, I believe that it is a strength of the project and by outwardly stating this I am conducting a form of decolonization, because I am privileging indigenous ways of knowing over a Western worldview, which has historically been equated with the Enlightenment, positivism and hence objectivity.

In conclusion of this section and to reiterate, although I have addressed some key limitations for the boundaries of this thesis, I do not see this thesis as an endpoint. Rather, as I mentioned in the implications section, I see this thesis as a part of the revival of a trans-indigenous conversation that began in 1988 and is part of an ongoing dialogue. Therefore, I view this thesis as a snapshot of one passage of time, as part of an ongoing trans-indigenous conversation.
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APPROVED CONSENT FORM

CONSENT FORM

FSU Behavioral Consent Form
This study will explore the use of a Native American worldview in sport-for-development programs in Native American communities, with particular emphasis on the way in which a Native American worldview can be used to enhance the impact sport-for-development programs have on Native American communities.

This study is being conducted by Renee Wikaire under the supervision of Dr. Joshua Newman. Renee is a Graduate Fellow and Dr. Joshua Newman is an Associate Professor in the Sport Management Department at Florida State University.

Background information
The purpose of this study is to explore the use of Native American worldview in sport-for-development programs, and offer commentary on how the successful implementation of these programs can enhance the health of Native American communities.

Procedures
If you agree to be in this study we would ask you to participate in a 30 minute – 2 hour one-on-one or group-based interview. Each interview will be recorded and transcribed but no identifiable information will be collected. Pseudonyms will be used.

Risks and benefits of being in this study
The study has minimal risks. But at any time you may terminate your participation in this study. The benefits to participation are not direct, but discussing your involvement in and development of, sport-for-development programs in Native American communities will benefit the Native American communities in general.

Compensation
You will not receive any payment for your participation in this study.

Confidentiality
The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only FSU researchers will have access to the records. The principal investigator and his graduate research assistants will be the only individuals who will have access to the recordings and transcriptions. The recordings will be stored in a locked file cabinet for one year and then destroyed. The transcriptions will be stored on a password-protected computer for one year and then erased.
Voluntary Nature of the Study
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University or the community. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions
The researcher primarily responsible for conducting this study is Renee Wikaire. You may ask any questions you have now. However, if you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact Renee Wikaire at *****@my.fsu.edu or ***-***-*** or Dr. Joshua Newman at *****@fsu.edu or ***-***-****.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the FSU IRB at 2010 Levy Street, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2742, or 850-644-8633, or by email at humansubjects@magnet.fsu.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent
I have read the above information. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have had those questions answered to my satisfaction. I consent to participate in the study.

________________ _________________
Signature Date

________________ _________________
Signature of Investigator Date
Office of the Vice President for Research  
Human Subjects Committee  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742  
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 04/15/2013

To: Renee Wikaire <*****@my.fsu.edu>

Address: **************

Dept.: SPORT MANAGEMENT

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research  
Exploring a Native American Worldview in community sports programs

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 04/14/2014 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.
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CHIEF SEATTLE’S SPEECH

"Yonder sky that has wept tears of compassion on our fathers for centuries untold, and which, to us, looks eternal, may change. Today it is fair; tomorrow it may be overcast with clouds. My words are like stars that never set. What Seattle says, the great chief, Washington, can rely upon, with as much certainty as our paleface brothers can rely upon the return of the seasons.

"the son of the white chief says his father sends us greetings of friendship and good will. This is kind, for we know he has little need of our friendship in return, because his people are many. They are like the grass that covers the vast prairies, while my people are few, and resemble the scattering trees of a storm-swept plain.

"The great, and I presume also good, white chief sends us word that he wants to buy our lands but is willing to allow us to reserve enough to live on comfortably. This indeed appears generous, for the red man no longer has rights that he need respect, and the offer may be wise, also, for we are no longer in need of a great country.

"There was a time when our people covered the whole land, as the waves of a wind-ruffled sea cover its shell-paved floor. But that time has long since passed away with the greatness of tribes now almost forgotten. I will not mourn over our untimely decay, nor reproach my paleface brothers for hastening it, for we, too, may have been somewhat to blame.
"When our young men grow angry at some real or imaginary wrong, and disfigure their faces with black paint, their hearts also are disfigured and turn black, and then their cruelty is relentless and knows no bounds, and our old men are not able to restrain them.

"But let us hope that hostilities between the red man and his paleface brothers may never return. We would have everything to lose and nothing to gain.

"True it is, that revenge, with our young braves, is considered gain, even at the cost of their own lives. But old men who stay at home in times of war, and old women, who have sons to lose, know better.

"Our great father Washington, for I presume he is now our father as well as yours, since George has moved his boundaries to the north; our great and good father, I say, sends us word by his son, who, no doubt, is a great chief among his people, that if we do as he desires, he will protect us. His brave armies will be to us a bristling wall of strength, and his great ships of war will fill our harbors so that our ancient enemies far to the northward, the Simsiams and Hydas, will no longer frighten our women and old men. Then he will be our father and we will be his children.

"But can this ever be? Your god loves your people and hates mine; he folds his strong arms lovingly around the white man and leads him as a father leads his infant son, but he has forsaken his red children; he makes your people wax strong every day, and soon they will fill the land; while my people are ebbing away like a fast-receding tide, that will never flow again. The white man's god cannot love his red children or he would protect them. They seem to be orphans and
can look nowhere for help. How then can we become brothers? How can your father become our father and bring us prosperity and awaken in us dreams of returning greatness?

"Your god seems to us to be partial. He came to the white man. We never saw him; never even heard his voice; he gave the white man laws but he had no word for his red children whose teeming millions filled this vast continent as the stars fill the firmament. No, we are two distinct races and must ever remain so. There is little in common between us. The ashes of our ancestors are sacred and their final resting place is hallowed ground, while you wander away from the tombs of your fathers seemingly without regret.

"Your religion was written on tables of stone by the iron finger of an angry god, lest you might forget it, the red man could never remember nor comprehend it.

"Our religion is the traditions of our ancestors, the dream of our old men, given them by the great spirit, and the visions of our sachems, and is written in the hearts of our people.

"Your dead cease to love you and the homes of their nativity as soon as they pass the portals of the tomb. They wander far off beyond the stars, are soon forgotten, and never return. Our dead never forget the beautiful world that gave them being. They still love its winding rivers, its great mountains and its sequestered vales, and they ever yearn in tenderest affection over the lonely hearted living and often return to visit and comfort them.

"day and night cannot dwell together. The red man has ever fled the approach of the white man,
as the changing mists on the mountainside flee before the blazing morning sun.

"However, your proposition seems a just one, and I think my folks will accept it and will retire to the reservation you offer them, and we will dwell apart and in peace, for the words of the great white chief seem to be the voice of nature speaking to my people out of the thick darkness that is fast gathering around them like a dense fog floating inward from a midnight sea.

"It matters but little where we pass the remainder of our days. They are not many.

"The Indian’s night promises to be dark. No bright star hovers about the horizon. Sad-voiced winds moan in the distance. Some grim nemesis of our race is on the red man's trail, and wherever he goes he will still hear the sure approaching footsteps of the fell destroyer and prepare to meet his doom, as does the wounded doe that hears the approaching footsteps of the hunter. A few more moons, a few more winters, and not one of all the mighty hosts that once filled this broad land or that now roam in fragmentary bands through these vast solitudes will remain to weep over the tombs of a people once as powerful and as hopeful as your own.

"But why should be repine? Why should i murmur at the fate of my people? Tribes are made up of individuals and are no better than they. Men come and go like the waves of the sea. A tear, a Tamanawus, a dirge, and they are gone from our longing eyes forever. Even the white man, whose god walked and talked with him, as friend to friend, is not exempt from the common destiny. We may be brothers after all. We shall see.
"We will ponder your proposition, and when we have decided we will tell you. But should we accept it, I here and now make this the first condition: that we will not be denied the privilege, without molestation, of visiting at will the graves of our ancestors and friends. Every part of this country is sacred to my people. Every hillside, every valley, every plain and grove has been hallowed by some fond memory or some sad experience of my tribe,

"Even the rocks that seem to lie dumb as they swelter in the sun along the silent seashore in solemn grandeur thrill with memories of past events connected with the fate of my people, and the very dust under your feet responds more lovingly to our footsteps than to yours, because it is the ashes of our ancestors, and our bare feet are conscious of the sympathetic touch, for the soil is rich with the life of our kindred.

"The sable braves, and fond mothers, and glad-hearted maidens, and the little children who lived and rejoiced here, and whose very names are now forgotten, still love these solitudes, and their deep fastness at eventide grow shadowy with the presence of dusky spirits. And when the last red man shall have perished from the earth and his memory among white men shall have become a myth, these shores shall swarm with the invisible dead of my tribe, and when your children's children shall think themselves alone in the field, the store, the shop, upon the highway or in the silence of the woods, they will not be alone. In all the earth there is no place dedicated to solitude. At night, when the streets of your cities and villages shall be silent, and you think them deserted, they will throng with the returning hosts that once filled and still love this beautiful land. The white man will never be alone. Let him be just and deal kindly with my people, for the dead are not altogether powerless."
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