# How Canadian Public Schools Undermine Indigenous Humanity: Educational Administration and Ongoing Colonialism

A Thesis Submitted to

the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of Master of Education

in the Department of Educational Foundations

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon

By

Chelsea Davis

©Copyright Chelsea Davis, June 2020. All rights reserved.

# PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis/dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis/dissertation in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis/dissertation work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis/dissertation or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis/dissertation.

# DISCLAIMER

Reference in this thesis to any specific commercial products, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the University of Saskatchewan. The views and opinions of the author expressed herein do not state or reflect those of the University of Saskatchewan, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes. Requests for permission to copy or to make other uses of materials in this thesis/dissertation in whole or part should be addressed to:

Department of Educational Foundations
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan
27 Campus Drive
Saskatoon, SK S7N 0X1
Canada

OR

Dean College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
University of Saskatchewan
116 Thorvaldson Building, 110 Science Place
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5C9
Canada

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is a non-empirical, anticolonial, historical, and political analysis of policy and public education in Canada. I examine the socio-cultural and ideological foundations of Western education and the ongoing colonialism within the public education system in Canada. Central to my theoretical framework is understanding how the white settler state is created and maintained in Canada. My focus on white settler colonialism is important as it will highlight how the whiteness of public schools and their administration maintains erasure and genocide through policy. After decades of blaming and fixating on the Indigenous youth viewed as incapable of succeeding in the Canadian public education system, it is time to shift the gaze back to the system itself. What is this system that claims to support the integration of Indigenous youth into its masses while simultaneously further oppressing them via discipline and surveillance efforts? In order to understand the problem of the Canadian public school system undermining Indigenous humanity, we need to understand the system itself and how, and by whom, it is maintained. How does this system remain intact? We have been working towards the inclusion of Indigenous youth into the public education system for decades with little to no improvement. What keeps this system of harm alive? How does it reproduce itself? In order to understand the problem of Indigenous youth being failed by the public education system in Canada, a critical history of the policies and ideologies that inform education, specifically public education, is needed.

As a white settler and educator working within the system I am critiquing, I hope to highlight the challenges in supporting Indigenous peoples' sovereignty. This thesis is part of my own journey in understanding the forces that shape us and the systems we simultaneously uphold and are troubled by.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the unwavering guidance, commitment, wisdom, resources, and support I received from my thesis advisor, Dr. Verna St. Denis. I cannot adequately put into words how deeply thankful I am for Verna's wisdom, encouragement, and the amount of time and guidance she so selflessly gave to me throughout the researching and writing of my thesis. I would also like to thank my thesis committee, Dr. Sheelah McLean and Dr. Carmen Gillies for the thoughtful, diligent, and meaningful feedback and recommendations they provided me throughout this process. I would like to acknowledge the support I have received from the Department of Educational Foundations, whose faculty has supported, transformed, and encouraged me every step of my graduate school journey.

I would like to thank my family, my mother (LeeAnn) and my father (Warren), for their constant support and encouragement. I am especially thankful for my sister (Brittany, DVM), my dearest friend, my constant inspiration, and my greatest supporter.

A special thank you to the Indigenous youth I worked with during my time co-facilitating the Spirit of Youth student group at Centennial Collegiate. Without you, this journey would have never begun.

This thesis is dedicated to the Indigenous youth I have had the honour of learning with, past and present. Thank you for being my best and most important teachers and for inspiring and encouraging me to go to graduate school. This work is in solidarity with you.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**PERMISSION TO USE** .......................................................i
**ABSTRACT**.......................................................ii
**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**.......................................................iii
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**.......................................................iv
**INTRODUCTION**.......................................................1
    Public Education is Ongoing Colonialism.......................................................1
    Methodology: Critical Anticolonial Theory.......................................................4
    Theoretical Framework.......................................................6
    Social Location.......................................................16
    Rationale.......................................................19
    Organization of the Thesis.......................................................22
**CHAPTER ONE:** .......................................................29
    Introduction…....................................................29
    The History of Indigenous Education in Canada’s Integration Policy Period…….........29
    The 1972 Indian Control of Indian Education Policy.......................................................38
    What is Control?.......................................................44
    The Future of Indigenous Education.......................................................49
**CHAPTER TWO:** .......................................................52
    Introduction…....................................................52
    Educational Administration: Defenders of the Status Quo.......................................................53
    Administrators and the Implications of Discipline Practices.......................................................55
    The Whiteness of Educational Administration.......................................................59
    Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, and Liberalism…....................................................61
    Social Justice Administration: Inadequacies and Limitations.......................................................65
    Educational Administration Training and Preparation Programs.......................................................66
    Institutions, Civilization, and the State.......................................................71
    The Scientific Management Model.......................................................81
    Societal Anxiety About Cultural Heterogeneity and the Need for Conformity................83
**CHAPTER THREE:** .......................................................85
    Introduction…....................................................85
    Institutional Obsession with Discipline, Punishment, and Surveillance............................85
    Modern Discipline and Punishment in Canadian Public Schools.......................................................91
    Poverty and Class.......................................................98
    Inclusion as Symbolic Colonialism.......................................................100
**CONCLUSION**.......................................................103
    Antiracism: Challenging Racialization and Mitigating Violence.......................................................103
    The Importance of Antiracist Education for Administrators: Goals and Barriers...........104
    Uncomfortable Stories.......................................................107
**REFERENCES**.......................................................109

# INTRODUCTION

## Public Education is Ongoing Colonialism

Public education in Canada is a sprawling system that does more harm to Indigenous[1] youth than provides education (Battiste, 2000; Dhillon, 2017; Gebhard, 2017). Public education in Canada can be defined as provincially-controlled, publicly-supported education that includes separate schools. Few educational systems have “a history as destructive to human potential as Canada’s with its obsession with [ongoing colonialism]” (Battiste, 2013, p. 180). The Canadian education system has, and continues to, undermine the humanity of Indigenous students through a system built on “false colonial and racist assumptions that target them as inferior” (Battiste, 2013, p. 180). Education is a colonial project, an extension of ongoing colonialism in Canada, that continues to be shaped by the legacy of imperialism (Calderon, 2014). As defined by Ashcroft et al. (2000), colonialism is “the consequence of imperialism in which foreign settlements are implanted on distant territories” (p. 47). Smith (1999), a renowned Māori scholar, educator, and researcher, describes imperialism as the practice, theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory, imposing its culture, values, and beliefs on them through a system of hegemony. Colonialism has therefore been represented as “a virtuous and necessary civilizing task involving education and paternalistic nature” (Ashcroft et al., 2000, p. 47). Colonialism is one manifestation of imperialism (Smith, 1999). Smith (1999) explains that imperialist expansion was facilitated by colonialism through “ensuring that there was European control, which necessarily meant securing and subjugating the indigenous populations” (p. 21). While imperialism “usually implies the conquering of foreign land to exploit natural and human resources, colonialism also includes the settlement of the territory with populations from the ‘mother’ country” (Baker, 2006, p. 29) In this thesis, I will argue public education in Canada, as well as the Western policy and research influencing and guiding public education, is a form of reinvented and ongoing colonialism. Canadian colonialism is not just a legacy, but an “ongoing ideology and practice that is critical to defining the sense of both nation and self” (Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 35). I will also argue that colonialism continues to block efforts towards fulfilling the promise of Indigenous education by legislating mandatory attendance for Indigenous youth within the Western system. There are multiple, intersecting reasons for the continued harm perpetuated by the Canadian public education system but, for the purposes of this thesis, I will be narrowing in on one of the many pieces of the larger puzzle. My main question explores how the public school system in Canada violates and refuses to educate Indigenous youth, while it purports to be educating, and why the Western Canadian education system, given its origins and political commitments, will never, unless dramatically transformed, serve or benefit Indigenous youth.

---

[1] For the purpose of my thesis, the term *Indigenous* is “meant to encompass people categorized as non-status, status, Inuit, Métis, and First Nations” (Gebhard, 2017, p. 3). I recognize that “one term cannot encapsulate the diversity found within Indigenous cultures and languages” (Gebhard, 2017, p. 3). When I quote or paraphrase authors, “I shall employ the author’s terminology in order to respect the right of people to name themselves” (Gebhard, 2017, p. 3). I will also employ the terminology used in original policy documents that I cite throughout my thesis.

Colonial schools’ hidden curriculum maintains a “steady assault on the essence of Indigenous social systems” (Bear, 2001, p. 22). The hidden curriculum is the “elements of socialization that take place in a school but are not part of the formal curricular content” (Margolis et al., 2001, p. 6). These elements of socialization include “the norms, values, and belief systems embedded in the curriculum, the school, and classroom life, imparted to students through daily routines, curricular content, and social relationships" (Margolis et al., 2001, p. 6). Not recognizing, teaching about, or working to expose the processes and continued implications of ongoing colonialism ensures it will survive (Bear, 2001). There will "never be true self-determination for Native people until education itself is liberated" (Bear, 2001, p. 27).

This thesis examines the socio-cultural and ideological foundations of Western education and the ongoing colonialism within the public education system in Canada. I argue that the Western education system in Canada continues to expect failure from Indigenous youth; the system sets youth up for failure and then executes it. As McDermott (1997) explains, "school failure *is* an achievement of a kind" (p. 111). Everyone that participates in the system is involved in the production of school failure, as "school failure takes work on the parts of everyone in the system" and school failure "makes sense to most participants at most levels of the system" (McDermott, 1997, p. 111). School failure is, in various ways, adaptive (McDermott, 1997). School failure is adaptive in that it continues to alter its execution of the production of school failure to define those who are successful by emphasizing those who are not. Because school failure "is an institutionalized event means that it will be staged, and then noticed, documented, and worried about, without regard for the more obvious intentions, desires, [and] actions of any participants" (McDermott, 1997, p. 130). Even "well-meaning teachers are invested in discourses that foreclose Aboriginal students' chances of success before they even arrive at school" (Gebhard, 2018a, p. 2). Those who are successful in school "make possible—and are made possible by—those who fail" (McDermott, 1997, p. 129). As St. Denis (2002), a Cree and Métis professor, educator and antiracist scholar, explains, minimal "attention is paid to [Indigenous] people's interpretations of what they regard as the causes of failure for their children" (p. 58), like the hostility of white teachers, unfair disciplinary practices, biased curriculum, and the impacts of poverty. Central to understanding the current issues in Indigenous education is understanding why and how our system continues to require Indigenous youth to fail.

As a white settler and educator working within the system I am critiquing, I hope to highlight the challenges in supporting Indigenous peoples' sovereignty. I must be wary of the conceptual theories I use in my work and research and consider why I am using them; I must position myself in relation to every topic I study, research, and write about (M. Valle-Castro, personal communication, March 2, 2018). It is my responsibility to listen, learn, and pay attention to what Indigenous people are saying and help to educate and challenge my fellow white settlers about these issues.

## Methodology: Critical Anticolonial Theory

This thesis is a non-empirical, anticolonial, historical, and political analysis of policy and public education in Canada. When I began my research for this thesis, I identified key texts that guided the direction of my examination. The first book I read on my thesis journey was Dhillon's (2017) *Prairie Rising*. Dhillon's prairie ethnography was one of the first pieces of research I had read that echoed the specific circumstances I was witnessing while working in an alternative education program in Saskatoon. From there, I began to explore other key texts such as Callahan's (1962) *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*, Foucault's (1995) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, and Graham and Slee's (2008) *An Illusory Interiority: Interrogating the Discourse/s of Inclusion*. These four readings exposed me to many of the early themes and questions that informed and guided the direction and resulting research for this thesis. These texts also inspired the selection of my main methodology: critical anticolonial theory.

Methodology is “a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed” (Calderon, 2014, p. 83). Therefore, my research cannot be separated from my white settler identity and my settler relationship to the Indigenous land I occupy in relation to Indigenous peoples. As Calderon (2014), a professor whose research focuses on Indigenous education, Chicana(o)/indigenous student success, and anticolonial critical race theories, explains, anticolonial methodology is an interdisciplinary framework used to examine the ways “multiple colonialisms (post, settler, internal, etc.) operate insidiously in educational contexts across the globe” (p. 82). While many forms of colonialism may interact, my thesis will focus on settler colonialism as it is the dominant form of colonialism within Canada and remains largely unchallenged (Calderon, 2014). Anticolonial theory is an engagement with settler colonialism and does not claim that colonialism is in the past (Spoonley, 1995). As Smith (1998) explains:

> Naming the world as ‘post-colonial’ is, from indigenous perspectives, to name colonization as a ‘finished business.’ According to many indigenous perspectives the term post-colonial can only mean one thing; the colonizers have left. There is rather compelling evidence that this has not in fact occurred. (p. 14)

Anticolonial theory should not claim that colonialism has ended but instead be used to critique and challenge ongoing colonialism (Spoonley, 1995). For my thesis, anticolonial theory is used “to signal a project by those who want to critique and replace the institutions and practices of colonialism” (Spoonley, 1995, p. 49). Therefore, anticolonialism should not be confused “with claiming the act of colonizing is no longer practiced, that somehow the ‘white’ world now understands this phenomenon and is able to desist from it" (Mahuika, 2008, p. 10). Critical anticolonial theory embodies the resistance to both old and ongoing forms of colonization (Mahuika, 2008). As a white settler, the goal of my work is not to decolonize but instead to encourage my readers, and myself, "to question common settler colonial tropes that erase the complexity of [Indigeneity]" (Daza & Tuck, 2014, p. 310).

## Theoretical Framework

Connected to my methodology is my theoretical framework, which I will outline in the following section of my thesis. Central to my theoretical framework is understanding how the white settler state is created and maintained in Canada. The political identity of Canadians is bound with stories, systems, and institutions built on stolen land (Lowman & Barker, 2015). Therefore, settler colonialism is separate from other forms of colonialism because it generates an entire group of people, a settler society (Lowman & Barker, 2015). White settler colonialism "is characterised by specific ways of thinking about heritage, belonging, race and difference, and power" (Lowman & Barker, 2015, p 25). Settler colonialism is simultaneously a process-based identity and the process itself; the identity shapes the process (Lowman & Barker, 2015). One of the main goals of settler colonialism is to transcend colonialism, which occurs when settler society is normalized and unquestioned and the histories of the settler society become whitewashed (Lowman & Barker, 2015). This whitewashing emphasizes "practices of benevolent or philanthropic colonialism involving peacemaking, treaties, and the giving of 'gifts'" (Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 26), gifts like institutionalized public education. This whitewashing is a myth that seeks to disguise the "Settler colonial trajectory and remains bent on appropriating, assimilating, or disappearing any aspects of Indigenous identity that threaten our claims to the land” (Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 47).

The white settler state mirrors government structures and policy in every institution, particularly within the institution of public education. As McLean (2013), a white settler, antiracist educator, scholar, and Idle No More organizer, explains, “the ongoing erasure of Indigenous Peoples and histories from the land justifies the white-settler state; this erasure is extended into public school systems" (p. 335). An effect of this mirroring is the hierarchy of whiteness of the administration, teachers, and curriculum within the public education system. Another effect of this whiteness is the push out of Indigenous students. It is important to clarify that I am not looking into the politics between Indigenous peoples, but instead am highlighting how Indigenous people are racialized as different by the white settler state and its institutions. Racialization can be understood as “the production of racial groups based on the ideological belief that they share innate or essential ‘traits’ because of skin color or ethnicity” (McLean, 2007, p. 11). The history of white settler colonialism and its racializing processes have created harmful impacts on Indigenous peoples (Larocque, 1991).

My focus on white settler colonialism is important as it will highlight how the whiteness of public schools and their administration maintains erasure and genocide through policy. In a colonial context, “white settler identity is co-constructed with Indigeneity” (McLean et al., 2017, p. 4). White settler identity is produced through state policies and practices that elevate white-settler status while “Indigenous Peoples are co-constructed as inferior and marked for genocide” (McLean, 2013, p. 358). White settlers view their state rights as deserved because of their own “intrinsic goodness, rather than colonial practices of domination” (McLean et al., 2017, p. 4).

Indigenous peoples have been primarily represented as primitive, savage, and wild, often considered a part of the wilderness (McLean et al., 2017). Savagery is co-constructed by and through whiteness and white supremacy because “Canadian nationhood is founded on the removal of Indigenous Peoples from their lands, as white-settlers are produced as the true subjects of the nation" (McLean, 2013, p. 358). While whiteness “is a constructed and fluid identity location, it remains a powerful method through which to categorize, distinguish and ‘other’, and to legitimize inequalities” (Raby, 2004, p. 368).

The process of marking Indigenous people as dispensable is “extended into our public schools systems, where classrooms and curricula perpetuate acts of genocide through the erasure of Indigenous histories and territories” (McLean, 2013, p. 361). I will argue that administrators are one of the main instruments for upholding the colonial structures of whiteness in schools. They play an essential role in reproducing discipline and punishment and in upholding the civilized versus savage binary. The school policies created by the white settler state, and upheld by white administrators, teachers, and curriculum, require the genocide of Indigenous people, as school policies and everyday practices work to reproduce the state and normalize white settler colonialism (McLean, 2016). In order to understand what has happened with Indigenous education, how it has been undermined and co-opted by the Canadian government, the oppressive policies limiting, controlling, and oppressing Indigenous education need to be understood.

Educational policies “have been a central mechanism through which Aboriginal peoples have been produced as devoid of the values and qualities of the nation” (Gebhard, 2018a, p. 3). This becomes very evident when examining the three major, genocidal educational policy initiatives in Canada regarding Indigenous education: residential schools, integration, and multiculturalism, which will be discussed in the first chapter of this thesis. The birth of Canada “was induced by the suffering of [Indigenous] people as a whole, a suffering shared by each of the peoples [I]ndigenous to that portion of North America” (Starblanket, 2018, p. 22), Turtle Island, which is now commonly referred to as Canada. In every occurrence, this suffering was a result of genocidal actions taken by the Canadian settler state against Indigenous people (Starblanket, 2018). The primary perpetrator of genocide is the state and it is important to understand the critical role that state policy plays in the goal of genocide (Starblanket, 2018). As Starblanket (2018), a Cree scholar and the Dean of Academics at the Native Education College, explains, Canadian “law and policy have been expressly geared toward bringing about the complete disappearance of Indigenous Nations” (p. 90). These policy-driven actions continue today, though an altered and modernized form (Starblanket, 2018). Therefore, it is important to briefly explain educational policy to better articulate the detrimental impacts it has had on Indigenous people and education in Canada.

Educational policy is complex in nature and is often inadequately and simply defined. It requires a broad understanding of interrelated processes to understand how policy is conceptualized (Bell & Stevenson, 2006). As Bell & Stevenson (2006), educational and leadership policy scholars, explain, policy is about power, the “power to determine what gets done, or not done” (p.23), which is an intensely political issue. Those who develop policy will “interpret its content differently, and those receiving policy will do similarly” (Bell & Stevenson, 2006, p. 23). Policy does not move in a linear process from one step to the next, but instead includes “differences in emphasis, differences in interpretation and differences in attitudes” (Bell

& Stevenson, 2006, p. 23) to particular policies. Policy is both a product and a process (Bell & Stevenson, 2006). Educational policy provides a lens through which to view the world and “a moral compass that shapes actions and responses to the environment” (Bell & Stevenson, 2006, p. 23). Values are constantly shaped, formed, and re-formed in and by educational policy and the significance of the state and power relations in educational policy development cannot be overstated (Bell & Stevenson, 2006).

Raptis & Bowker (2010), who examine histories and policies of Indigenous education, explain the politics of policy development as “a complex and integrative process involving social, political, and economic forces outside of schools” (p. 18). Government policy decisions “often reflect the competition between organized groups that seek to protect or promote the interests of their members” (Raptis & Bowker, 2010, p. 18). Because “some groups enjoy greater access to resources than others, some demands tend to receive a more sympathetic hearing from the government than others” (Raptis & Bowker, 2010, p. 18). Through the politics of policy development, the depoliticizing of educational studies and policy occurs.

The persistent concepts in policy processes have been found to be “power, authority, and value allocation” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999, p. 403). Policy can be seen as a “source of influence that could be used to shape the political process of which policy studies/analyses are deemed to be part” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999, p. 404). Policy reflects the historically developed relationship between the state and the citizen and citizens’ ability to influence education policy is restricted due to “their limited access to resources, their exclusion (being a voiceless group), the dominant discursive practices that set the policy agenda, or other possibilities” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999, p. 408). This highlights how policy politics are formed and guided by unequal power relations. Educational policy is often a symbolic performance as it frequently fails to provide any tangible solutions or changes (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999).

Ball (1995), a sociologist and educational policy scholar, criticizes post-secondary teacher education programs specifically for removing theory work from teacher education classes to instead focus on skills, competencies, and “on the job training” (p. 266). Educational policy in particular is a field that has been criticized “for its inclination toward merely descriptive concepts, an atheoretical tradition” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999, p. 402). Ball argues for the need to “re-envision educational studies through a critical reflexivity against management effectiveness theories” (p. 262). To do this, Ball proposes a “post-structural, post-epistemological” (p. 265) alternative, which he describes as an argument against the absence of theory. The absence of theory “leaves the researcher prey to unexamined, unreflexive preconceptions and dangerously naïve ontological and epistemological” (Ball, 1995, p. 265) empirical reasoning and knowledge. Theory could be used as the means to “save educational [policy] from itself” (Ball, 1995, p. 266). This is because theory, according to Ball (1995), is a vehicle for thinking otherwise. Theory offers a way to challenge dominant narratives in education. It was not until I was in the classroom teaching that I realized the disservice this lack of theory was to me as an educator and to the youth I work with. This was a motivating factor for me to enter graduate school to further explore my own philosophy of education, something only touched upon in my undergraduate studies. I needed the tools of theory to fully understand what I was seeing and experiencing while working within the public school system.

Policy contributes to socializing Canadians into benevolence. In the case of Indigenous people, each policy seeks to promote perceived benevolence while continuing forced colonization. Canada has been "characterized in national mythology as a nation innocent of racism" (Dua et al., 2005, p. 1). Canada is often internationally "constructed as a 'peacekeeping nation' that is outside larger imperialist agendas" (Dua et al., 2005, p. 1). This construction seeks to erase Canada's history of colonization (Dua et al., 2005). The "invisibility of the continuing colonization of indigenous peoples throughout North American and their struggles to reclaim their nationhood within settler societies is striking" (Dua et al., 2005, p. 3). Education in Canada is meant to be a positive field of work, where past atrocities are left unexamined and current oppression is denied, avoided, and ignored. This denial and avoidance is part of the erasure and genocide that socializes Canadians into benevolence. The refusal to confront and examine ongoing colonialism is part of the mechanism that keeps the settler state intact. The "construction of Canada as a national space, with an attendant national identity, has been tied to a transnational discourse of whiteness" where the "potency of whiteness is evident in settler society" (Dua et al., 2005, p. 3). While "colonialism is presently not considered a crime in international law, international law does declare the 'doctrine of discovery' and conquest and dehumanizing descriptors such as *civilized* and *uncivilized* criteria as invalid to justify the taking of other Peoples and Nations lands and territories" (Starblanket, 2018, p. 160). The "colonizer's system inherently results in genocidal outcomes" (Starblanket, 2018, p. 172) and the maintenance of a colonial system is indicative of genocidal intent.

Therefore, I will be using the term *genocide* instead of *assimilation* throughout this thesis paper as "the Canadian settler state and the society it represents seek to conceal the reality of genocide against the Indigenous Peoples of Turtle Island" (Starblanket, 2018, pp. 28-29). Assimilation was not the only goal of the Canadian government. In fact, there has never been a chance to assimilate as there was a move away from assimilation, a dissatisfaction with the goal of assimilation, that stemmed from white Canadian society's inability "to accept Indians even at the bottom rung of the dominant socioeconomic order, much less as equal human beings" (Barman, 1986, pp. 119-120). The government wanted Indigenous people to accept their oppression, not to actually compete with white people. As Barman (1986), a professor and scholar who studies the relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers, explains, assimilation "was never given a fair chance to succeed" (p. 126). The Department of Indian Affairs' goal was "to fit the Indian for civilized life in his own environment" rather than to "transform an Indian into a white man" (Barman, 1986, p. 110). In fact, in 1897 Frank Oliver, Minister of Interior from 1905-1911, stated that it was a "very undesirable use of public money" to educate "these Indians to compete with our own people" (Barman, 1986, p. 120). The 1910 federal reversal of the policy of assimilation, once advocated by the Department of Indian Affairs during the late nineteenth century, removed the option for Indigenous people to enter greater society (Barman, 1986). Although the concept of assimilation remains popular, the term genocide may be more accurate.

The definition and concept of genocide remains deeply controversial (Starblanket, 2018). As Starblanket (2018) explains, in international law, genocide is defined as:

> [A]ny of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such: a) Killing members of the group; b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; c) Deliberately

> inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; d) Imposing measures intended to prevent birth within the group; e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. (p. 207)

It is genocide "when *any* of the enumerated acts is committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a protected group" (Starblanket, 2018, p. 207).

For the purposes of this thesis, I am concerned with "the negation of genocide: that is, how groups intending to destroy other groups seek to mobilize their destructive powers [and how they] face obstacles and resistances" (Woolford, 2015, p. 8). A "nuanced understanding of the term 'genocide' can offer a lens through which settler colonial impositions on Indigenous societies can be held to account" (Woolford, 2015, p. 9). I will not use the term *cultural genocide* as this can be put in contrast with *actual* genocide, which might inform my readers that it is a lesser form of genocide (Woolford, 2015). It is important to "highlight the distinctiveness of forced assimilation as a destruction project" (Woolford, 2015, p. 10). Genocide can be defined as "the attempted destruction of groups rather than simply a form of mass death" (Woolford, 2015, p. 10). Raphël Lemkin, "known as the 'father' of the Genocide Convention", coined the term *genocide* by "combining the Greek words *genos* (race, tribe) and the Latin *cide* (killing)" (Starblanket, 2018, p. 40). In his definition, Lemkin "emphasized the collective aspect of the crime", he highlighted that "genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group"(Starblanket, 2018, p. 40). Therefore, genocide can be understood as a crime against nations.

Genocide must be comprehended not as a series of traits or characteristics but "as a dynamic process that ebbs, flows, and intensifies at specific historical moments and in specific places" (Woolford, 2015, p. 11). It is "comprised of the activities of multiple actors, who form networks of destructive forces that threaten the life of a group or the lives of multiple groups" (Woolford, 2015, p. 11). A complex understanding of "patterns of destruction wrought by settler colonialism offers a more promising path for redressing genocidal Indigenous-settler relations in a decolonizing manner, since we must understand the complexity of these patterns before we can transform them" (Woolford, 2015, p. 12).

It is critical to understand that Canadian "benevolence was not the primary motivation behind assimilative schooling, for discourses of benevolence were underwritten by a settler colonial desire for land, resources, and national consolidation" (Woolford, 2015, p. 3). The claims of benevolence made by the Canadian government and white settlers function to justify their interventions in Indigenous lives (Woolford, 2015). It is from this that "a conceptualization of the Indian as a problem was formulated and policy interventions implemented by state institutions were derived" (Woolford, 2015, p. 4). It is clear that "there is no sugar coating genocide" (Starblanket, 2018, p. 270) As Starblanket (2018) explains, "the language employed by the colonial oppressor tends to minimize the atrocity of the past and present" (p. 270) and the reality is that genocide destroys Indigenous Peoples and Nations. It is critical to acknowledge that genocide is a human issue, it is not an academic discussion, it is not the past, "it is happening right now across Great Turtle Island" (Starblanket, 2018, p. 283). This analysis is an important intervention against the litany of statistics that are often repeated in the news regarding

Indigenous people, which often frame them as the problem rather than as the victims of ongoing attempted colonialism and erasure.

## Social Location

I am a white-identified, settler, cis-gendered, straight female. I grew up and live in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Treaty 6 territory and the homeland of the Métis nation. As discussed by Lowman and Barker (2015), my identity as a Settler "is situated", meaning that my Settler identity is "based on location-specific relationships to the [land I] occupy in relation to Indigenous peoples" (p. 15). This identity is deeply connected to the colonial education system, as "settler identity is rooted in the processes and practices of settler colonialism" (Lowman & Barker, 2015, pg. 15). Therefore, my commitment and responsibility is to be deeply critical and aware of my own privilege, dedicate myself to unlearning and unknowing, recognizing and understanding my complex role as a colonizer-perpetrator and colonizer-ally, and work in solidarity with Indigenous peoples (Hunt & Holmes, 2015, p. 166).

Growing up, I attended and was socialized by Saskatoon's public education system, in which I now work. I am currently a high school teacher in the public education system and have continued to benefit greatly from my privilege within this colonial educational system, both as a student and, now, as a teacher. I graduated in 2015 from the University of Saskatchewan's B.Ed. program, where I convocated as a new, eager, yet inexperienced, teacher. As Schick (2000), a critical anti-oppressive scholar and educator, explains, "never once did I question whether my racialized identity, my whiteness, was a factor in my applying to become a teacher" (p. 303). I did not fully and readily unpack "fantasies of righteousness and goodness" or my "dream that [my] love would save children" (Schick, 2000, p. 303) in my care. I did not understand how I, as a white teacher, “participated in the construction and continuation of imperialism” (Schick, 2000, p. 308). During the early years of my secondary teaching career, I had prided myself on my commitment to antiracist/anti-oppressive education. I felt as though I was a leader in the field within my school and believed that I had a great foundation and knowledge base for the work I was doing. I often felt an immense push back from my colleagues and administrators on the work I was trying to engage us all in. It became difficult, and often personally painful, to interact with my co-workers as I always felt like we were getting nowhere as a staff, school, and division. I watched my mostly Indigenous students experiencing daily oppression and systemic racism within the school system. While I had entered the system ready and excited to teach for social justice, ready to change and fight the system from within it, it quickly became clear to me that something darker and more insidious was at play within public education. I cared deeply about the Indigenous students I worked with and wanted them to succeed but was witnessing the immense barriers that disallow Indigenous youth to be truly successful within the colonial public education system. At the time I could not name what I was witnessing, as I did not fully understand it. This is when, and why, I made the decision to come back to the University of Saskatchewan and pursue my Master’s degree in the Department of Educational Foundations.

My first students helped to teach me very quickly into my career that I was missing an important piece of the puzzle that could help put this work into perspective and teach me what I was neglecting. I began this thesis journey because I was so frustrated with the system and its administrators, in particular. I knew I needed to better understand how and why the public education system works the way it does. As a teacher, I worked in the practical realm, usually only considering what might work given the specific situation I was in, and not considering a larger body of literature and research that should inform and guide this work. Telling a story about racism does not necessarily begin to challenge racism, which is why we need theory and research to support these stories (C. Gillies, personal communication, June 22, 2017). I began this journey wanting to discuss the glaring lack of antiracism within school administration but realized that what I needed to know more about was what Indigenous people were, and have been, saying they want from education and learn more about the origins of the public education system in which I have been immersed my entire life. This thesis is part of my effort to better understand the different levels of the system that contribute to the massive and harmful institution of public education.

I recognize that my privileged ideal of post-secondary education has largely been taught to me though the colonial education system I grew up in. I grew up experiencing success in a very colonial education system, and therefore, was unable to see or recognize other ways of being successful or defining success. I was educated and shaped by the policies of the institution I am critiquing in this thesis. This thesis is part of my own journey in understanding the forces that shape us and the systems we simultaneously uphold and are troubled by. As Gramsci explains, knowing ourselves "as a product of the historical process to date, which has deposited in [us] an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory" (as cited in Said, 1978, p. 33) makes it imperative that I attempt to compile this inventory for myself and seek to understand the history of the institution of public education in order to better explain how it has shaped us all.

It is deeply important that I understand these concepts in relation to the research and work I engage in for my thesis. I am conducting this research in critique of a system from which I will continue to benefit. This positionality is complex and requires constant re-location and (un)learning of my own socialized and racialized white, settler identity. Though my thesis was pursued in solidarity with Indigenous' calls for Indigenous control of Indigenous education, it is crucial that I not claim to be finding or creating solutions for Indigenous people. I must not allow this work to contribute to the problematic narrative that claims Indigenous people are the problem, nor can I contribute to a damaging white saviour narrative. I must resist priding this work on "exceptionalism—a standing temptation for antiracist whites" (Thompson, 2008, p. 329). Exceptionalism refers to white people who "position themselves as exceptions to whiteness" (Thompson, 2008, p. 329) and therefore feel that they are able to comment freely on matters of race and racism. As Freire (2005) explains, I must do this work "*with*, not *for*, the oppressed (whether individuals or peoples) in the incessant struggle to regain their humanity" (p. 48). I cannot write about or for Indigenous people but instead, must critique the colonial, white settler institution of education from which I benefit.

## Rationale

My interest in my topic of study began during my time working in a behavioral support program for youth with justice system involvement. Justice system involvement in this context can be defined as youth who have recent charges, are on probation, have community supervision, or are serving a sentence in open custody. This program was intended to serve as a transitional, short term school placement for youth who were being removed from their current school placement for a variety of reasons determined by school administrators. The program was staffed by the public school system and funded by the Ministry of Corrections and Policing. When I began my time as the teacher of this program, I believed it was valiant to fight the system from within and I was passionate about working with the youth in this program to support them in what I believed was their goal of returning to a traditional school in the city. However, I quickly realized that this program did not function as a supportive, transitional option for youth who needed extra support to utilize but instead as an extension of the demonizing, criminalizing, white supremacist system in which these youth were already being oppressed.

Administrators who no longer wanted to interact with youth that they viewed as problematic and criminal were free to refer youth to the program in which I worked in order to appear as if they were doing their due diligence in finding a supportive placement for the youth, while quietly fast tracking the drop-out and incarceration rates of these same youth. It is not a coincidence that the overwhelming majority of the youth that were referred to the program were Indigenous; those who were not were students of colour. The overrepresentation of Indigenous youth in this program is tied to Indigenous youth in schools being viewed as uneducable and to the drastic overrepresentation of Indigenous youth in custody in Saskatchewan. Currently, 98% of the female youth and 92% of the male youth in custody in Saskatchewan are Indigenous (Statistics Canada, 2018). The direct relationship between youth referrals to the program I was working in and the reincarceration rates of these same youth was glaring.

The alarming circumstances and situations that I repeatedly witnessed during my experience teaching in this program led me to search for and explore literature and research that had been previously conducted about these issues. Dhillon's (2017), a first generation anticolonial scholar and organizer, *Prairie Rising* was one of the first works I read that echoed the Saskatchewan-specific circumstances I was witnessing on a daily basis in the program I worked. Through reading Dhillon's research, the intrinsic and mutually complicit connection between the education and justice system in this province became clearer to me. As Dhillon

(2017) states, this connection is an example of the “reconstructed colonial statecraft that seeks to target Indigenous youth for the end goal of reproducing and maintaining the settler colonial state project and the multitude of social and political practices that weave it together” (p. xi).

As I continued to read and research, it became increasingly apparent to me that, despite reformation attempts and claimed reconciliation efforts by the Canadian public education system, this colonial, Western system of education will continue to fail youth, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, regardless of any tinkering or inclusion efforts made by those working within the system. The problem is not a broken education system that needs repairing, but rather a system that was built to uphold and perpetuate the oppression and demonization of marginalized communities, especially Indigenous youth. As Graham & Slee (2008) explain, “cosmetic adjustments to traditional schooling simply work to (re)secure an invisible centre from which constructions of Otherness and the designation of marginal positions becomes possible” (p. 278).

Through the readings I engaged in at the beginning of my thesis journey, it also became clear to me that educational leadership and administration programs held much of the responsibility in the upholding of this oppressive system. These programs train “hired technicians of the status quo who generally believe in, benefit from, and often coerce teacher[s] and students into supporting unjust state and corporate agendas” (McMahon, 2007, p. 685). These leadership programs often fail to “question the morality of the organizational goals of education and the means by which they are achieved” (McMahon, p. 685). This led me to consider the reasons why our public education system continues to fail Indigenous youth, while simultaneously blaming them for their inability to find success within the system. It also prompted me to consider what Indigenous scholars and researchers were calling for: Indigenous control of Indigenous education. What barriers would we need to overcome in our current provincial public education systems to make this a reality?

After decades of blaming and fixating on Indigenous youth—who are viewed systemically as incapable of succeeding in the Canadian public education system—it is time to shift the gaze back to the system itself (Battiste, 2013; Schick & St. Denis, 2005). What is the history of this system that claims to support the integration of Indigenous youth into its masses while simultaneously further oppressing them via discipline and surveillance efforts? In order to understand the problem of the Canadian public school system undermining Indigenous humanity, we need to understand the system and how, and by whom, it is maintained. This thesis therefore provides a critical history of the policies and ideologies that inform education, specifically public education.

## Organization of the Thesis

The first chapter of my thesis will begin by discussing the history of Indigenous education within the Canadian government's integration policy period, beginning after the second world war, which will include a discussion of the policy and politics of integrated schooling and the ongoing eviction of Indigenous students from the public education system. This chapter will examine how these oppressive policies came to be, the intention behind the policies, how these policies were created to continue thinly disguised genocidal efforts, and how the Canadian government implemented these policies. The examination of these policies will include a discussion about the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons (1947) document, The Hawthorne Report (1967), and the White Paper (1969). I will explore the Canadian government's intentions in enacting these genocidal policies that highlight the past and ongoing colonialism within the public education system. Next, I will examine Indigenous' critiques of the Canadian government's many assimilative policies that led to the creation of the 1972 Indian Control of Indian Education (ICIE) policy. I will discuss Indigenous policy makers' intentions, through reflections those involved in the process have since made, behind the creation of the ICIE policy and highlight how Indigenous people have never been passive recipients of the Canadian government's genocidal policies (Dhillion, 2017). I will examine the ICIE policy's clearly stated intent and philosophy regarding First Nations' education, discuss the reflection on the policy by its creators over three decades after its publication, and explore how the ICIE policy was undermined by ongoing colonialism. Ongoing colonialism efforts are consistently attempting to undermine the education Indigenous people are actualizing. I will also discuss what Indigenous people continue to assert regarding Indigenous education, despite the ongoing colonialism of the Canadian public education system. The first chapter of my thesis will highlight the viable, decolonial educational alternative that exists in Canada and has been articulated time and time again by Indigenous people. The following quote from an Indigenous research participant in St. Denis' (2010) *A study of Aboriginal teachers' professional knowledge and experience in Canadian schools* is a glaring example of this articulation:

> One of the Aboriginal teachers said: You would think that non-Aboriginal teachers could have said sooner, "This is the wrong way," "can we do this any other way?" Change could have happened a long time ago. This research project is something that I'm really quite excited about. I would like to see the change happening while I'm still here. (p. 23).

This quote demonstrates the need for change, for imagining a new form of education that honors Indigenous calls for quality education for their children. Why, in over 150 years of public education in Canada, has there been so little change? Indigenous people in Canada have consistently and clearly communicated their right to education so why can't we, or why aren't we, listening?

The second chapter of my thesis will focus on the history of public education in Canada in an effort to further understand the politics and social history of why our Western, colonial education practices continue to attempt to integrate and fail Indigenous youth. I will closely examine who the public education system in Canada was created by and for, and its purposeful, ongoing legacy of attempted genocide. This chapter will also focus on educational administration and their graduate preparation programs as the gatekeepers and champions of white settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy within the public education system in Canada. I will claim that educational administrators in public schools are largely socialized to maintain the status quo. I will also claim that white administrators in particular are the main instrument for upholding colonial state structures of whiteness in schools, as well as playing an essential role in reproducing discipline and punishment.

Other than tokenistic attempts at educational reform, I will argue that educational administrators participate in the system as barriers to change and are the champions of colonialism within the public school system. I will examine how it is nearly impossible to implement any radical change or reform in the Canadian public education system when those in charge of the system are trained, hired, and expected to uphold the status quo. It will become clear that even though administrators and their schools might look like they promote "democracy, creativity, and diversity", they actually "operate under conditions that embody a competing set of values, like obedience, compliance, routine, conformity and homogeneity"

(James, 2010, p. 160). In Canada, authority relations in the institution of public education “are mediated, to a large extent, by race” (Solomon & Palmer, 2006, p. 193). Therefore, it is important for me to discuss discipline practices of administrators and how the permanent exclusion of students can be seen as a “critical incident” (Carlile, 2011, p. 1) through which to investigate the effects of institutional racism. The “institutional aspects of racism that influence educational leadership broadly and the ways principals engage in student discipline practices” (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 522) are often unquestioned.

Important to this examination will be a discussion about how whiteness functions in educational administration. Scholars generally agree that White principals do not have a thorough or adequate understanding of racism in its many expressions and do not understand how they are perpetuating racism in their schools (DeMatthews et al., 2017). I will highlight that seeing and understanding Whiteness ideology needs to be a starting point for educational administrators to begin dismantling whiteness within their school communities (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). McMahon (2007), an educator and educational leadership scholar, argues that the creation of our public education system that “codifies the superiority of the white race over others” was in no way accidental (p. 687). Because white educators and administrators benefit from “and are implicated in inequitable institutions, the onus is on all whites to work to dismantle them” (McMahon, 2007, p. 687).

However, although administrators need to be held accountable for their own roles in “maintaining inequitable hierarchies, school districts, faculties of graduate studies and administrator preparation programs providers are ultimately responsible" (McMahon, 2007, p. 693-694). There are "grave concerns" about "leadership preparation programs' lack of relevance in preparing school leaders to address the crisis conditions facing many children and schools" (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 201) in Canada. Therefore, I will highlight the inadequacies and problems with educational administration training and graduate programs, as well as concerns about educational administration graduate school faculty who are "also entrenched in the structures which work to preserve their power and privilege" (McMahon, 2007, p. 690).

Through exploring the socio-political foundations of the public education system, it will be made clear that from the onset of the creation of this system, Indigenous people were set up as the ultimate *Other*. As McLean (2007) explains, the objectification and dehumanization of Indigenous people works to "differentiate them from white society and our norms" (p. 71). McLean (2007) further explains that "these constructions create rhetoric which seem to explain why '*they* can not make it, 'why *they* do not deserve it', and generally puts the onus back on the group being oppressed to transform" (p. 71). This *Othering* of Indigenous people ignores the reality of the historical oppressions that I will examine in this chapter of my thesis. I will explore the origins of the narrative of Canadian civilized society and examine how civilization and education "are irreconcilable with mutual relationships and self-purpose; [how] they are antithetical to knowledge and life" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 117). This exploration will also highlight how the philosophies and worldviews that guided the creation of the Canadian public education system were created in opposition to Indigenous philosophies and worldview.

Through an exploration of Western institutions, and their violent practices, this chapter will help to highlight that civilization and education are “about securing the status quo of inequality, immobility, consumption, and ignorance; they are both driven by an impetus for colonization of the mind and space of personal desires, aspirations, imagination and will” and “the methods and contents of education inform the larger narrative of civilization” (AbdelRahin, 2013, pp. 3-4). As Battiste (1998) , a Mi’kmaq scholar, professor, and educator, has argued, public schooling is steeped in racist strategies that seek to “maintain colonial power over Indigenous people” (p. 21). I will also discuss the importance of framing “any attempt to explain the successful imposition…of public education” on Canadian society through a “larger inquiry into the hegemony of democratic capitalism in North America” (Katz, 1976, p. 401). This will include a discussion about how the public education system gained popular status and the policies that drove the establishment of institutions like it. The policies “that created institutions [like the Canadian public education system] arose in response to shifting social conditions: most directly from pressure felt within cities and regions experiencing a shift to a capitalist mode of production” (Katz, 1976, p. 391).

The third chapter of my thesis will focus on the disciplinary and surveillance practices revered by the early school promoters in Canada. Through this exploration, it will become clear that one of the main goals of these disciplinary practices in the public school system was, and remains, to civilize what and whom is viewed as *savage*. As discussed in the second chapter of this paper, the origin of the public school system was predicated on anxiety about cultural heterogeneity and an obsession with improving the “susceptible and weak” (Prentice, 2004, p. 170) nature of human beings. Therefore, civilization and industry through discipline were to replace what the school promoters described as “the engulfing wildness” (Prentice, 2004, p. 175) of early Canadian society. The public education system that has, and continues to, value civilized pupils, docility, discipline, and punishment is in direct opposition to the humanity of Indigenous peoples. As Battiste (1998) has discussed, education “has not been benign or beneficial for” (p. 19) Indigenous peoples in the public education system. Within this system, Indigenous worldviews and the people who hold them continue to be attacked (Battiste, 1998). From the onset of the creation of the public school system in Canada, school promoters condemned those they viewed as *savage*, often using what the settlers viewed as Indigenous peoples’ uncivilized nature as the antithesis of successful, contributing citizens. Through this chapter’s exploration of the history and foundational philosophies of public school in Canada, I will make the claim that from the onset of creation of the institution of schools, Indigenous peoples were positioned as the undisciplined, uncivilized *Other* and therefore, “any contemporary focus on educational initiatives/social intervention must be understood as an institutional instrument in domination” (Dhillon, 2017, p. 92).

# CHAPTER ONE

# THE HISTORY AND FUTURE OF INDIGENOUS EDUCATION

## Introduction

The first chapter of my thesis will explore the history of Indigenous education within the Canadian government's integration policy period, beginning after the second world war. This chapter will examine how these oppressive research policies came to be, the intention behind the policies, how these policies were created to continue thinly disguised genocidal efforts, and how the Canadian government implemented these policies. I will also discuss what Indigenous people continue to assert regarding Indigenous education, despite the ongoing colonialism of the Canadian public education system. The first chapter of my thesis will highlight the viable, decolonial educational alternative that exists in Canada and has been articulated consistently and clearly time and time again by Indigenous people.

It is important to state that I have chosen specific policies to highlight how Indigenous people are racialized as different through the co-production of whiteness versus savagery. I am not examining the politics between Indigenous groups and I acknowledge that the policies I have chosen to examine do not affect or target all Indigenous people in the same way. Though the policies discussed in this chapter affect different Indigenous groups in uniquely insidious ways, I highlight that the Canadian public school system and its guiding policies do not differentiate between Indigenous groups, but instead work to homogenize them therefore contributing to a erasing discourse of pan-Indigeneity. These white settler definitions of Indigeneity function to further erasure of Indigenous people.

## The History of Indigenous Education in Canada's Integration Policy Period

It is critical to state very clearly that “Indigenous peoples have always valued education” (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 14). Long before Europeans arrived in North America, Indigenous peoples had their own form of education, this education involved the community as the classroom, the members as the teachers, and “each adult was responsible to ensure that each child learned how to live a good life” (Kirkness, 1999, p. 15). Jeanette Armstrong, educator, protector, and professor, raised in the Okanagan Reserve in British Columbia, describes the traditional Indigenous peoples’ “views of education as a natural process occurring during everyday activities…ensuring cultural community and survival of the mental, spiritual, emotional and physical well-being of the cultural unit and of its environment” (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 7). Indigenous pedagogy is often referred to as holistic learning and teaching and is the education that existed on this land prior to contact, which colonialism efforts have historically tried to destroy (Anuik & Gillies, 2012; Battiste, 2013; Bentham et al., 2019). Indigenous people have always advocated for “learning that affirms their own methods of knowing, cultural traditions, and values (Canadian Council on Learning, 2007, p. 2). However, as Bentham et al. (2019) explain, “educational spaces founded within neo-colonial structures have been sites of ongoing violence against Indigenous epistemologies, peoples, and lands” (p. 23).

The broad context of colonial encounters in Western education includes three “identifiable colonial periods of Canada and the history of Native Education” (Bear, 2001, p. 11), which are the classical period of colonialism, internal colonialism, and the Postwar period of colonialism. The classical period of colonialism involved the incorporation of Indigenous nations “within the national border of British North America” (Bear, 2001, p. 11). The second period of colonialism can be referred to as internal colonialism, when First Nations were “rapidly outnumbered, disposed and displaced by British settlers” and, “even though imperial authorities in England made it illegal” (Bear, 2001, pp. 10-11) the Royal Proclamation of 1763 made it possible for settlers to take Indigenous lands without the consent of Indigenous nations. During the period of internal colonialism, educational goals were characterised by efforts to assimilate Indigenous peoples, based on the “racist belief in social evolutionism, which held that Aboriginal people could eventually be educated out of their ‘savage’ and ‘wandering’ ways to become like Europeans” (Bear, 2001, p. 12). Central to this historical time was the “genocidal strategy of removing Indigenous children from their families and communities and training them in residential or industrial schools” (Bear, 2001, p. 12). The “infamous objective of the Residential school system, as stated by an unknown government official, was to kill the Indian in the child” (Gebhard, 2013, p. 2).

Residential schools were total institutions, a term coined by Erving Goffman, which is a ‘social hybrid, part residential community, part formal organization…. In our society, they are the forcing houses for changing persons; each is a natural experiment of what can be done to the self” (Starblanket, 2018, p. 99). Residential schools “as total institution[s] implemented the techniques of destruction” (Starblanket, 2018, p. 100). The highest recorded number of residential schools in Canada was 80 in 1933 (Kirkness, 1999). While Canadians see ourselves as world leaders in social welfare, health care, and economic development, the effects of the “state-sponsored attack on [I]ndigenous communities that" began during this time “haunt us as a nation still” (Daschuk, 2013, p. 186). Our “colonial society…has allowed the State of Canada to continue to forcibly remove Indigenous Peoples’ children under a genocidal, dominating and dehumanizing discourse” (Starblanket, 2018, p. 273). For example, heavily raced child-saving discourses express the belief that Indigenous parents are the loci of child neglect, thereby justifying state intervention, removal, and stewardship of Indigenous youth. The majority of "people in this oppressor colonial society do not understand or seem to care about the extent to which forcible transferring of Indigenous children [has and continues to affect] the ability of the Original Nations of Great Turtle Island to survive with their distinct national identities intact into the future" (Starblanket, 2018, p 273).

Integration can be defined simply as "the process of having [Indigenous] children attend public schools" (Kirkness, 1999, p. 16). The Department of Indian Affairs began to favour integrated schooling as early as 1944 as a way of reducing the cost of providing schooling for Indigenous children, a key aim of the integration movement (Raptis & Bowker, 2010). The Canadian government went about achieving these aims by creating the Special Joint Committee, which was the official first step in the policy shift from segregation to integration and was legalized in 1951 by revisions to the Indian Act, which enabled "the Minister of Indian Affairs to enter into agreements with provincial governments, territorial councils, school boards or religious or charitable organizations for the schooling of Aboriginal children living on reserves" (Raptis & Bowker, 2010, p. 4). The rationale behind this shift to integration "was twofold: policymakers' longstanding goal" (Raptis & Bowker, 2010, p. 5) of colonizing Indigenous peoples and financial considerations. In fact, the government's policy shift to integration did not address the recommendations presented to the Special Joint Committee (SJC) and was "shaped more by the recommendations of the government's bureaucrats and consultants than by the voices of" (Raptis & Bowker, 2010, pp. 17-19) Indigenous peoples who presented to the SJC. This is hardly surprising given that, as Raptis and Bower (2010) explain:

> [U]nder the Indian Act, Native people living on reserves were placed under the almost total control of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs whose god-like powers would be

> exercised by federal bureaucrats in Ottawa and by officials in the field [Indian agents]. (p. 19)

This made it “impossible for Indians living on reserves to assume responsibility and control over their social and economic development” (Raptis & Bowker, 2010, p. 19). As Bell and Stevenson (2006) argue, the significance of the state and power relations in educational policy development cannot be overstated. Therefore, it can be argued that the SJC served only to “help the government maintain the illusion of a democratic state that appeared—at least superficially—attuned to its citizens’ demands” (Raptis & Bowker, 2010, p. 19). In other words, the SJC was an effective and inexpensive way for the state to begin to shift its methods of colonization, from segregation to integration, while appearing to consider the needs and voices of Indigenous people.

The revised Indian Act in 1951 “authorized the federal government to begin striking tuition agreements with local and provincial education authorities for the integration of Native students into public schools” (Bear, 2001, p. 13). By 1959, “35% of school-age Native children had been integrated into public schools and by 1969 the number had jumped to 61% with little to no consultation with Indigenous parents, First Nations Bands, or Indigenous organizations” (Bear, 2001, p. 14). Integration was founded on the philosophy of ongoing colonialism, which presumed that Indigenous people needed and wanted assimilation (Bear, 2001). The integration of Indigenous children and youth into provincial schools became romanticized by progressive white Canadians in the 1960s, further cloaking the “colonial and racist motives of the Canadian state” (Bear, 2001, p. 14). Therefore, while Canadian public schools made “great fanfare of welcoming Native children and posing as benevolent, they actively pursue a hidden agenda…of obliterating Native nations” (Bear, 2001, p. 21). Integration as an educational policy therefore becomes little more than a “symbolic performance” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999, p. 414) on the part of the Canadian government. The government even forced Canadian citizenship on First Nations people in the 1960s, despite many objections from Indigenous communities (Bear, 2001). In the first decade of integration, most Indigenous children dropped out of school before graduation (Bear, 2001, p. 15). These dropout rates highlight that the successful inclusion of Indigenous youth was not the true goal of the Canadian state who ignored the voices of the Indigenous people it claimed to be progressively integrating.

The third period of colonialism, the Postwar Period, 1940s to 1970s, is often seen as a time of great “strides in Native education since many innovations were made” (Bear, 2001, p. 13). However, this period was defined by a new policy of integration, which “arose out of the findings of a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons in 1946-1948” (Bear, 2001, p. 13). The policy of integration is an example of what Raptis and Bowker (2010) discuss about government policy decisions reflecting “the competition between organized groups that seek to protect or promote the interests of their members” (p. 18). In this case it was the Canadian government protecting the colonial interests of the settler population, thinly disguised by a narrative of progressive educational policy. Located within the report from the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons (1947) is the “Plan for Liquidating Canada’s Indian Problem within 25 years” (p. 310). The stated objective of this plan was “to abolish, gradually but rapidly the separate political and social status of the Indians (and Eskimos); to enfranchise them and merge them into the rest of the population on equal footing” (Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, 1947, p. 310). This is a clear example of how policy that fails to consult Indigenous nations, provides no solutions, makes no concrete changes, and becomes little more than a symbolic performance (Berkhout &

Wielemans, 1999). The report outlined a critical part of the government's plan, which was to "change the present Indian educational system by abolishing separate Indian schools and placing Indian children in the regular provincial schools, subject to all provincial school regulations" (Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, 1947, p. 311). This committee concluded that residential schools should be closed, not because of the horrific conditions but because "they failed to assimilate Native children" (Bear, 2001, p. 13), leaving the solution of integration into a system that continued the work that residential schools began, but this time under the guise of progressiveness and inclusion.

In 1967, Dr. Harry Hawthorne, a University of British Columbia professor, released a two-volume study on Contemporary Indians. The Hawthorne Report "represented one text among a growing body of research interested in addressing the high educational failure of Indian and Aboriginal students" (St. Denis, 2002, p. 37). In 1972, The Winnipeg Free Press printed a number of Hawthorne's findings in an article called "Indian School Problem Studied" (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 12). The article asked: "What makes Indian and Métis children abandon one of the world's best education systems?" (Kirkness & Selkirk Hawthorn, 1992, p. 13). This is the wrong question; we "claim to offer good education to many minority people who seem to reject it" (McDermott, 1997, p. 129), which minimizes the reality of the impacts of the public education system on Indigenous peoples. A more productive question might include: how and why do we in Canada continue to construct minority groups, particularly Indigenous people, as visible failures in the public education system (McDermott, 1997)? For example, Dr. Hawthorne made many recommendations "for change that target[ed] the psychology of Indian people" (St. Denis, 2002, p. 59), rather than targeting the system that was creating the conditions that disallowed Indigenous people to experience success in public education.

The Hawthorne Report "concluded that the dropout rate of 97% was attributable to the cultural differences of Native People and was considered scientifically proven" (Bear, 2001, p. 15) by government hired scientists. The report also pointed to "the socialization practices and the attitudes of Indian students and their parents" (St. Denis, 2002, p. 48) as the primary source of problems that result in academic failure. The failure of Indigenous students in school was explained by and "attributed to the psychological and cultural difference of Indian people" (St. Denis, 2002, p. 51). The report stated that "schools have been unable to resocialize such groups of [Indigenous] children" to meet the "needs and standards of the majority" (Hawthorne, 1967, p. 106). The Hawthorne Report emboldened and validated the government to continue its integration project with renewed enthusiasm (Bear, 2001). The report even stated that "integrated education appears the most feasible of educational alternatives for Indian students" (Hawthorne, 1967, p. 106).

Two years after the publication of the Hawthorne Report, a new policy development called the White paper (1969) that "recommended drastic changes in how the federal government should relate to Aboriginal people" (St. Denis, 2002, p. 88), became a turning point as it "fully highlighted the genocidal intentions of the government's integration policies" (Bear, 2001, p. 15). The White Paper (1969) was created by the federal government under prime minister Pierre Trudeau and minister of Indian Affairs, Jean Chrétien. It highlighted that the government cared more about the rising costs associated with administering Canada's treaty responsibilities to Indigenous people than it did about Indigenous humanity. In his book The Unjust Society: The Tragedy of Canada's Indians, Harold Cardinal (1969) protests the Canadian government's proposed White Paper (1969), calling it a "thinly disguised programme of extermination through assimilation" (p. 1). Understanding the government's true intent behind the White Paper helps to explain how integration has resulted in only a physical presence of Indigenous youth in public schools, due to its function as a “program of [colonization] where First Nation students are absorbed [as problems] into the dominant society” (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 14).

While educational programs for Indigenous people have “been considered one of the primary vehicles of forced [colonization] and integration by the settler state” (Dhillon, 2017, p. 89), Indigenous people have never been passive recipients of these genocidal policies. Indigenous leaders reacted to and protested the lamentable conditions of their people (Kirkness, 1999). It was during this time, in the 1960s, when the National Indian Brotherhood (now known as the Assembly of First Nations) established a working committee to prepare a national position on education (Kirkness, 1999). In his book, Cardinal (1969), a former resident school student and a college graduate, writes that Indigenous control over Indigenous education will require a shift in power. His discussion of power relates to what I discussed earlier regarding policy being steeped in power relations. In order for transformative changes to be made, the power to decide what needs to get done would have to shift dramatically (Bell & Stevenson, 2006). Cardinal (1969) explained how critical it is for Indigenous people to have complete control over the education of their children. He further described the integration policy as another form of the continued colonization of Indigenous people by the Canadian government and public school systems (Cardinal, 1969). Cardinal (1969) explained that the “whole question of education has to be rethought in the light of the total needs of the Indian people” (p. 51). He also stated that the “obvious first step is the transfer of power from the people responsible for the administration of education to the people whose lives will be determined by it" (Cardinal, 1969, p. 51). Further, Cardinal (1969) insists that “education will continue to be an unpleasant, frightening and painful experience for” (p. 61) Indigenous children, as long as the Canadian government remains in control of Indigenous education. The assimilative educational policies enacted by the Canadian government reflects the historically developed relationship between the state and the citizen and the citizens' ability, in this case Indigenous peoples' ability, to influence education policy is restricted due to their exclusion and "the dominant discursive practices that set the policy agenda" (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999, p. 408).

In response to the outcry from Indigenous communities about the White Paper of 1969, the Canadian government unveiled a new federal policy of multiculturalism in 1971, which claimed to respect all cultures in Canada (Bear, 2001). However, anticolonial scholars have critiqued multiculturalism as a "political strategy that was introduced as a way to address contesting language, cultural, and land claims within the nation, and it has since been widely explained, defeated, and critiqued" (St. Denis, 2011, p. 307). The multiculturalism policy was largely a "reiteration of the White Paper…where Indigenous people were concerned" (Bear, 2001, p. 15). The multiculturalism policy "became the official rationale (or excuse) for continuing to push the full integration of Native People into Canadian schools and society" (Bear, 2001, p. 15). This period was one of "continuing and intense internal colonialism merely masquerading….as benign and humanitarian" (Bear, 2001, pp.15-16). The multiculturalism policy was made into national law by the Mulroney government in 1988 as the Multicultural Act (St. Denis, 2011). Multiculturalism does not address racism and may even provoke it, as it functions as a method of colonialism that "works to distract from the recognition and redress of Indigenous rights" (St. Denis, 2011, p. 308).

### The 1972 Indian Control of Indian Education Policy

Education became "an important site of resistance to the onslaught of" (St. Denis, 2002, p. 97) ongoing colonialism for Indigenous people. In response and resistance to the oppression enacted by the Canadian government through the integration policy, the White Paper (1969), and the multiculturalism policy, the National Indian Brotherhood created the Indian Control of Indian Education Policy (1972), which articulated a viable alternative to Canadian's ongoing colonial policies. It is important to state that the ICIE (1972) policy was written about First Nations education specifically and does not directly apply to Métis or Inuit education. I chose to examine the 1972 ICIE policy as one of many examples of Indigenous resistance and response to re-establish or assert Indigenous control over Indigenous education. This section of my thesis more specifically examines Status First Nations education policies from the 1970s-1990s.

The Indian Control of Indian Education (ICIE) policy is "based on two education principles recognized in Canadian society: parental responsibility and local control" (Kirkness, 1999, p. 18). These two education principles were both taken for granted by settler parents. This policy recognized that Indigenous "parents must enjoy the same fundamental decision making rights about their children's education as other parents across Canada" and "it promotes the fundamental concept of local control" (Kirkness, 1999, p. 18). Regarded by Indigenous people as holistic, an Indigenous philosophy of education "looks at learning and teaching as an integral part of living both for the teacher and the child" (Kirkness, 1999, p. 24). It is not "a five hour, five-day-a-week exercise for a dozen years" (Kirkness, 1999, p. 24), it is a lifelong commitment. Kirkness (1999), a Cree scholar, educator, and the principal author of a study commissioned by the Canadian Education Association to determine the state of Indigenous education in Canada, argued that after years of the church and government making decisions for and about Indigenous people, it needs to be understood that Indigenous people will do a better job of educating their people than the state. Indigenous people need to be given their "right to speak for [their] children, to actively participate in determining what they should learn, how they should learn, and who should teach them" (Kirkness, 1999, p. 24).

The ICIE policy made it very clear that "Indian parents must have FULL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONTROL OF EDUCATION [emphasis in original]" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 27). This would require the "determined and enlightened action on the part of the Federal Government and immediate reform, especially in the areas of responsibility, programs, teachers, and facilities" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 27). The document states that "until now, decisions on the education of Indian children have been by everyone, except Indian parents" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 27) and that this must discontinue. The National Indian Brotherhood (1972) made clear that "those educators who have had authority in all that pertained to Indian education have, over the years, tried various ways of providing education to Indian people" (p. 30). While the answer to providing a successful education has not been found there "is one alternative which has not been tried before: in the future, let Indian people control Indian education" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 30). If the ICIE policy was recognized and implemented, "then eventually the Indian people themselves [would] work out the existing problems and develop an appropriate education program for their children" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, pp. 30-31). The Indian Control of Indian Education (1972) policy did discuss the problems of integration, acknowledging that it cannot be only Indigenous people that are asked to give up their identity to adopt new values and a new way of life and that the "restricted interpretation of integration must be radically altered if future education programs are to benefit Indian children" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 26). The National Indian Brotherhood's (1972) Indian Control of Indian Education policy called for education to give First Nations children "the knowledge to understand and be proud of themselves and the knowledge to understand the world around them" (p. 1). As stated previously, ICIE was predicated on two critical policy adoptions: parental responsibility and local control. The document summarized what First Nations people wanted for their children: parents having control of the education of their children, reinforcing Indigenous identity, providing "the training necessary for making a good living in modern society", acknowledging that Indigenous peoples are the "best judges of the kind of school programs which can contribute to these goals without causing damage to the child," (p. 3) and reclaiming the right to direct the education of their children. Indian Control of Indian Education (1972) highlighted the need for a radical change in education and also reaffirmed that First Nations people have the treaty right to an education paid for in advance by the Government of Canada. It needs to be recognized that these "treaty rights to education have not been implemented, but have been subverted by governmental interests and policies" (Battiste, 2013, p. 24).

The Indian Control of Indian Education policy document made recommendations for curriculum changes that included: adequate funding for Indigenous people to work with curriculum planners in order to test relevant curriculum, the appointment of Indigenous people to curriculum staff in order to supervise the "production and distribution of [Indigenous] orientated curriculum materials", the removal of textbooks or any teaching materials "which are negative, biased, or inaccurate in what concerns [Indigenous] history and culture", "augmenting [Indigenous] content in curriculum to include [Indigenous] contributions to Canadian life", co-operating with Indigenous people in developing Indigenous studies programs at all levels of education, and "eliminating the use of I.Q. and standardized tests for [Indigenous] children" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, pp. 9-10). The document also highlighted the grave concern of "the training of non-[Indigenous] teachers for teaching [Indigenous] children", as the role teachers play in "determining the success or failure of many [Indigenous youth] is a force to be reckoned with" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 19). Educational research was also discussed and the document highlighted the importance of research being under the direction and control of Indigenous people (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 24). These are all recommendations made almost half a decade ago and yet, as none of these recommendations have been realized or implemented in a genuine way by the Canadian government, are still deeply relevant.

In February of 1973 the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, now Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, officially recognized the National Indian Brotherhood's 1972 Indian Control of Indian Education (ICIE) policy and in May of 1973, "a joint announcement from the Ministry and George Manuel, then President of the Brotherhood, assented to bilateral agreement and adoption of Indian Control of Indian Education as a policy" (Binda & Calliou, 2001, p. 1). Jean Chretien, Minister of Indian Affairs in 1973, responded to the policy by stating, "I have given the National Indian Brotherhood my assurance that I and my Department are fully committed to realizing the educational goals for the Indian people set forth in the Brotherhood's proposal" (Kirkness, 1999, Cardinal, 1977). This was the promise given to Status First Nations people by the Canadian government at the time. However, even with the official adoption of the ICIE policy by the Canadian government, "overall, [almost three decades later] Native education is still in an atrocious state from almost any perspective" (Bear, 2001, p. 18). Over the years, "and without authority, ill-conceived sections of the Indian Act have given the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs a nonlegitimate mandate of exclusive power in the Aboriginal education field" (Burns, 2001, p. 72). This is in spite of the fact that First Nations education is a “fully protected Aboriginal right which was never ever delegated to others, including the Crown and the federal government” (Burns, 2001, p. 72).

The Canadian government is in clear breach of its promise to First Nations people to enact the Indian Control of Indian Education policy. In their critique of colonialism, many Indigenous scholars and policy makers have shown that it is critical to “disestablish many of the current educational practices related to foreign ethos and institutions that have failed” (Kirkness, 1999, p. 22) to meet the needs of Indigenous people. Indigenous people have also clearly stated that the need for “radical change, a complete overhaul of the educational system for [Indigenous] people” (Kirkness, 1999, p. 22), and by Indigenous people, is at the center of the required change. It is clear that white settler educators need to stop feigning a stance of “what more can we do to help?” and instead move out of the way of Indigenous people and their right to control over the education of their own children.

In 1988, the Assembly of First Nations completed its national review of First Nations education, which was “intended to identify the progress and obstacles related to the implementation of the policy of Indian Control of Education and to recommend policy and legislative changes” (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 20). This review resulted in a three-volume study called *Tradition and Education, Towards a Vision of the Future* and one of the most “revealing facts found in the study was that after 16 years, many of the educational shortcomings identified in 1972 were still in existence” (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 20). This study highlighted that “education programs to which [Indigenous youth] are exposed are predominantly [colonial] in the curriculum, learning materials, pedagogy, learning objectives and in the training of teachers and educational assistants” (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 20). The study also stated that “it is obvious from the statistics of First Nations education that the services delivered by provincial, territorial, and federal schools are ineffective and inadequate" (Assembly of First Nations, 1988, p. 14) and do not meet the needs of First Nations students. Upon reflection, three decades later, it was clear that the adoption of the ICIE policy by the Canadian government was "not generous or surprising because the ambivalent position of the ICIE policy on integration was, at best, naïve, for it gave the federal government another rationale and the leeway needed to carry on with its policy of [ongoing colonialism] under the cover of multiculturalism and integration" (Bear, 2001, p. 18). Measures taken in response to the ICIE policy were "mostly cosmetic and they were, in fact, subverted to promote the purposes of [ongoing colonialism], rather than cultural survival", basically, the measures "made integration appear benign while forcing no fundamental change in the assimilative design of the public schools" (Bear, 2001, p. 19). The federal government failed to implement the policy for Indian Control of Indian Education and Indigenous education remains "under the firm control of the Government of Canada which has consistently defined Indian control to mean merely First Nations participation and administration of previously developed federal education programs" (Assembly of First Nations, 1988, p. 13). The same can be said for the *Report Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* (1996), published almost a decade after ICIE, which was a commission mandated to explore and propose solutions to the challenges affecting the relationships between Indigenous peoples, the Canadian government, and Canadian society. In 1998, the federal government responded to only a few of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples 440 recommendations in their plan called *Gathering Strength: Canada's Aboriginal Action Plan.*

## What is Control?

It is important to understand what control over education is and how it was co-opted, trivialized, and violated by the public education system in order to understand why the Indian

Control of Indian Education (1972) policy failed to be adequately implemented by the Canadian government. Pidgeon et al. (2013) explain that "First Nations control [of education] is about doing what the mainstream hasn't been doing for [Indigenous] children" (p. 16). Building an Indigenous education system based in an Indigenous worldview would be radically different than what currently exists, the philosophical differences would be dramatic and lead to "very different understandings of the purpose of education" (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 28). The ICIE policy "was explicitly and intentionally designed to reaffirm the learner as an Indigenous person, to prioritize Indigenous ways of knowing and being as central to learner empowerment" (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 28). Therefore, one of the challenges with the ICIE policy is that there is no definition of, or agreement about, control and thus far Indigenous control has meant "nothing more than Indian management (or worse, mere participation in management) of federal programs and policies" (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 18).

Controlling and operating are two entirely different notions. To control is to "have power over, to exercise directing influence, whereas to operate means to manage or keep in operation" (Kirkness, 1999, p. 21). This is an example of how, as earlier discussed, policy is about power. Those who develop policy will "interpret its content differently, and those receiving policy will do similarly" (Bell & Stevenson, 2006, p. 23). Pidgeon et al. (2013) explain that after the ICIE policy was officially accepted, Indigenous people "saw [themselves] as free to create a new system: a system where [they] learn how to read, write, do all the things we have to do, such as science, but based on [their] Indigenous knowledge as the foundation to [their] learning" (pp. 7-8). Instead, Indian Affairs' interpretation of the ICIE policy was that Indigenous people "would be administering Indian Affairs' programs" (Pidgeon et al. 2013, pp. 7-8).

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) supports and recognizes “that Indigenous people have the right to self-determination” (King, 2012, p. 194). However, it is clear that neither Canada nor the United States has much interest in any meaningful recognition of  Indigenous sovereignty, though both governments are concerned with “cutting the cost of Native Affairs” (King, 2012, p. 196), as they have always been. There has been little shown interest by the Canadian government “in prolonging the authority of the treaties” (King, 2012, p. 197), including the treaty right of education. To Canada, treaties were a means to accelerate regional economic and political development, the state viewed treaties as “an obstacle to overcome before settlement could proceed in earnest” (Daschuk, 2013, p. 79). This is an explicit example of the Canadian government creating and achieving failure for Indigenous peoples (McDermott, 1997). Treaties and Indigenous rights are predicated on Indigenous sovereignty, which the Canadian government has refuted to revisit the matter of, aside from the consideration of the elimination of “federal responsibility for Indians” (King, 2012, p. 199), like the abolishment of the Indian Act.

Kirkness and Selkirk Bowman (1999) recognize that greater Indigenous control of Indigenous education will “not lead to better education of [Indigenous] children, if no provision is made for enhanced support systems and more funding to facilitate the transmission” (p. 18). Indigenous education also runs the risk of “simply mirror[ing] the curriculum, programs and policies of provincial schools, because of a lack of support and funding necessary for promoting the programs which would encourage [Indigenous] distinctiveness” (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, pp. 18-19). A critical factor in this is that First Nations’ schools are required to follow the Canadian provincially mandated curriculum documents. Legal recognition is needed of First Nations jurisdiction over education, the Indian Act provides no “direct legal basis for the transfer of control of education from the Minister to Indian bands" (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 20), making the central obstacle to Indian Control of Indian Education a lack of legislation. It is well documented that the involvement that has occurred of Indigenous people in the education of their children has resulted in greater retention of students, improved attendance, inclusion of relevant curriculum, better graduation rates, development of early childhood programs, introduction of adult education programs, and the teaching of Indigenous languages (Kirkness, 1999). However, even with these improvements that can be attributed in part to the ICIE policy, "overall, Native education is still in an atrocious state from almost any perspective" (Bear, 2001, p. 18).

With the closing of the last residential school in 1996, and with the apology of the Canadian Government to those who suffered this tragedy, there is a tendency to assume that the Canadian state has changed its ways (Bear, 2001). Colonialism continues to be the "primary ideology underlying the education of Indigenous People in Canada today" (Bear, 2001, p. 10). Canada is continuously framed as the "gentle colonizer" (Dhillon, 2017, p. 52). The colonial element of Indigenous education needs to be deconstructed (Bear, 2001). It is only through "unveiling the truth about reality that one can come to a critical understanding of the present and learn what needs to be done for the future" (Bear, 2001, p. 10). From a system's failures, the most can be learned and the question of who gets to continue to define success needs to be asked (Bear, 2001). In order to answer this question, the factors, such as the purpose and goals of Western education, that impede Indigenous peoples' rights to define their own success and the success of their children need to be understood.

Bear (2001) has argued that Indigenous controlled schools "in Canada are almost nonexistent" (p. 16). It has been incredibly difficult for Indigenous people to gain control over their own schools. In places where small amounts of control exist, “it is soon discovered that administration and control are two different things” (Bear, 2001, p. 16). It is clear that “[ongoing colonialism] is still the driving force in Native education policy” (Bear, 2001, p. 17). As Bear (2001) explained, some of the reasons for the lack of full autonomy over education for Status First Nations people include:

> [E]xisting legal impediments in the Indian Act and Indian Affairs regulations, the failure of the Canadian state to uphold the treaties, the undue influence of provincial interests, and the lack of a constitutional framework and/or enabling legislation which would presumably allow full jurisdiction for education to be transferred from the federal government to native communities and education authorities as directly and easily as it is currently transferred to provincial authorities. (p. 17)

Federal regulations inhibit, rather than support, “the development and implementation of education, which is relevant, equitable and qualitatively defensible” (Burns, 2001, p. 60) to Indigenous peoples. Federal educational funding is insufficient, unequitable, and does not “keep with the tenant of a sacred trust” (Burns, 2001, p. 61). Indigenous people continue to have “ongoing proxy involvement” in a “state-owned monopoly” (Burns, 2001, p. 64) of education under full control of the federal government. The federal government continues to “insist that schools conform to provincial regulations with respect to curriculum, graduation requirements and so on”, the federal government also “continue[s] to retain legal and financial responsibilities for Indian education” (Burns, 2001, p. 70). It continues to retain “self-imposed nonlegitimate authority over Aboriginal education” and is “not morally committed to a restorative process that is equitable or just in attending to its fiduciary responsibilities and obligations" (Burns, 2001, p. 70). Because of this, “self-determining Aboriginal control and jurisdiction of education is nothing but a federally perpetuated myth and always falls short of Aboriginal expectations and aspirations" (Burns, 2001, p. 71). The more things change, the more they stay the same in regard to control and jurisdiction of education (Burns, 2001). As long as the curriculum “and personnel in Native education can be manipulated from the outside, Native children can be molded to a) know nothing of the integrity of their own political culture, b) become absorbed (through citizenship) in the Canadian political system, and c) accept as normal the political subordination of their own nations to the Canadian state” (Bear, 2001, p. 21).

## The Future of Indigenous Education

Indigenous scholars have argued that we must work towards “creating a new educational world” (Kirkness & Selkirk Bowman, 1992, p. 103), which includes Indigenous people as integral and active participants. There has been no significant increase in the number of Indigenous teachers in public schools and the “business of training non-Native teachers to teach Native children seems to have been somewhat of a growth industry reminiscent of the old missionary impulse” (Bear, 2001, p. 18). As Kirkness (1999) explains, the most common approach that has occurred under Indian Control of Indian Education today is to interject parts of Indigenous culture “into the curriculum rather than having culture as the basis of” (p. 22) provincial curricula. First Nations’ education, whether provincial or federal, is legally legislated to follow curriculum and the standard is set by the colonial system. How can Indigenous people pursue their own way of gaining education that enables them to participate in society while being mandated to operate under the colonial systems’ rules and policies? This is also true for teacher undergraduate and graduate programs. At all levels and in all institutions of education, Indigenous people have the right to put in place quality education for their people (Kirkness, 1999). The education that has been provided to Indigenous people by Canadian schools has had dismal results for Indigenous people and continues to fail Indigenous youth (Kirkness, 1999).

The original ICIE (1972) document was written “assuming that Indigenous knowledge would be the basis for the content, the methods, and framework for understanding education, with provincial educational benchmarks added to support Indigenous ways of knowing and being in the classroom” (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 25). When the federal government accepted the ICIE document, “it was done so assuming a Euro-Western Canadian worldview, in which some Indigenous content was sprinkled into provincial educational systems, but the power structure remained unchanged” (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 25). There has been little evidence of any tangible curricular change since the policy of Indian Control of Indian Education (1972) was released (Kirkness, 1999). Indigenous people have repeatedly articulated that quality education for their people must be based on their culture and history and yet, “we continue to base education on white, urban culture and history” (Kirkness, 1999, p. 25). We cannot continue to mirror a system that has not worked and was built to assimilate and fail Indigenous youth (Kirkness, 1999, p. 27). Indigenous education in Canada has been “historically ineffective” (Kirkness, 1999, p. 29). Although formal education has been available in some form for over 300 years, it has not been until recently that Indigenous people themselves have been allowed to be involved in its design and delivery (Kirkness, 1999).

Despite the articulation by Indigenous peoples’ of their own right to education that I have examined in this chapter, we continue to make insignificant and token changes to the education system. The “scholarship of Indigenous researchers, policy makers, educators, leaders, and allies has articulated the shared visions of meaningful Indigenous education, self-determination, and self-governance” (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 32). The Indigenous “philosophical approach continues to push and create radical changes, while the colonial philosophical approach has remained locked as it always has” (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 28). In order to further understand how our Western, colonial education practices continue to attempt to integrate and fail Indigenous youth, I need to look deeper into the origins of schooling in Canada, who it was created by and for, and its purposeful, ongoing legacy of attempted genocide. I need to better understand the colonial Western educational system that is forced by law on Indigenous people.

# CHAPTER TWO

# THE ORIGINS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN CANADA

## Introduction

The second chapter of my thesis will examine the history, origins, and development of the public education system in Canada and will explore the following questions: What was the system of public education set up to accomplish? Who was the system established for and by? What was the system, the administration, and running of public schools designed to achieve? What was, and what remains, the purpose of schooling according to Western white settler philosophies and what are the key tenets of Western philosophy that continue to inform mandatory public schooling? This chapter will also focus on educational administration and their graduate preparation programs as the gatekeepers and champions of white settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy within the public education system in Canada. I will claim that educational administrators in public schools are largely socialized to maintain the status quo. I will also claim that white administrators in particular are the main instrument for upholding colonial state structures of whiteness in schools, as well as playing an essential role in reproducing discipline and punishment. I will focus on the history of public education in Canada in an effort to further understand the politics and social history of why our Western, colonial education practices continue to attempt to integrate and fail Indigenous youth.

Few historians "have questioned the basic premises which appeared to motivate the expansion of schooling" (Prentice, 2004, p. 13). Schools, and school systems, are "generally taken for granted, as requiring little to no explanation of their origin, or justification for their continuing existence" (Prentice, 2004, p. 13). As a result of this lack of questioning, "the myth of a school movement largely motivated by democratic and humanitarian impulses has been allowed to persist" (Prentice, 2004, p. 14). The origins of public education formed "part of four critical developments that reshaped North American society during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century" (Katz, 1976, p. 384). These critical developments include invention of institutionalization as a solution to social problems, such as crime, poverty, cultural heterogeneity, and the *crisis of youth*, and industrialization and urbanization (Katz, 1976). This chapter will also discuss the birth of institutions, the early development of public education in Canada, the shift to compulsory education, dominant narratives about civilization, the Scientific-Management model of education, public education's views of human nature, school regulations, and societal anxiety about cultural heterogeneity and the need for conformity.

Early and mid-nineteenth century school promoters "argued that public educational systems could [tackle] five major problems, which, with hindsight, appear products of early capitalist development" (Katz, p. 392). These five major problems were: "(1) urban crime and poverty; (2) increased cultural heterogeneity; (3) the necessity to train and discipline an urban and industrial work- force; (4) the crisis of youth in the nineteenth-century cit[ies]; and (5) the anxiety among the middle classes about their adolescent children" (Katz, p. 392). The exploration of these themes in this chapter will show how Western public schools were set up in direct opposition to the humanity of Indigenous people. This chapter of my thesis will expose the deeply embedded legacy of a system that refuses to change.

## Educational Administration: Defenders of the Status Quo

In order to understand the history of public education in Canada, and how the original guiding philosophies that supported the creation of the public education system have changed very little over time, it is also very important for me to explore how Western, colonial worldviews, philosophies, and policies are maintained and upheld in the public education system today. Therefore, the first half of this chapter will focus on white educational administrators and their post-secondary training programs throughout Canada and will argue that educational administrators in public schools are largely trained as gatekeepers of the status quo within the Western, colonial education system. Other than tokenistic attempts at educational reform, I will argue that educational administrators participate in the system as barriers to change and are the champions of colonialism within the public school system. It is nearly impossible to implement any radical change or reform in the Canadian public education system when those in charge of the system are trained, hired, and expected to uphold the status quo.

Principals are often viewed as respected individuals who rarely engage in racist acts and yet, few principals would be willing "to serve as anti-racist school leaders that undo institutionally racist school practices, address teacher misunderstandings about race, or combat biased behaviors from all school community members" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 524). If teachers are the "transmitters of the common social values as defined by communities, as well as by state statute" then public school administrators are tasked to be the "guardians of the status quo" and the 'Managers of Virtue" (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006, p. 281). Virtue is "equated with upholding the social expectations for polite compliance and acquiescence" (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006, p. 281) and administrators who depart from this role are rare. While there are, of course, examples of administrators that move beyond this role, they are often extraordinary leaders that are far from the norm (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006). Leaders that challenge the status quo are often working in "largely hostile socio-political environment[s]" (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006, p. 285). Past issues within educational administration, like the business, efficiency models that many administrators were trained to adhere to, are an "all-too-present reality" (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006, p. 285) when examining contemporary educational administrators.

Canadian public schooling is “involved in the creation and dissemination of knowledge, which is permeated with ideological and political values” which normalizes and idealizes “white, middle class, male, heterosexual experiences and worldviews, and exacerbate the injustices of the larger society” (McMahon, 2007, p. 684). In this chapter I will argue that educational administrators and their university preparation programs are largely complicit in the ongoing normalizing of these experiences and worldviews and are often ill-equipped to deal with issues of race, justice, and antiracism. Principals often view racism as a peripheral issue and when they do identify racism “they often conceptualize it as teacher specific or one teacher’s problem, not as a prevalent institutional or societal issue that works in and through school policies and practices at all levels” (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 524).

Educational administrators in public schools “have the capacity to influence the day-to-day actions of teachers and students perhaps more than any other single individual” (James, 2010, p. 146). Therefore, administrators’ limited understanding of racism has “significant consequences for what they do about the actions associated with racism” (James, 2010, p. 146). Educational administrators working in the political and bureaucratic frameworks of Canadian public schools do not often induce notions of “promise, liberation, hope, empowerment, activism, risk, social justice, courage, [nor] revolution” (Shields, 2010, p. 559). This is problematic as it is exactly these commitments that are needed to truly begin to combat, deconstruct, and undermine the ongoing colonialism, genocide, and the maintenance of the status quo perpetuated by the Canadian public education system.

## Administrators and the Implications of Discipline Practices

In Canada, authority relations in the institution of public education “are mediated, to a large extent, by race” (Solomon & Palmer, 2006, p. 193). In the next section of this thesis I will examine the origins of the public systems' obsession with institutional discipline. These disciplinary philosophies and practices have continued into modern public schooling. In fact, discipline practices of administrators and the permanent exclusion of students can be seen as a "critical incident" (Carlile, 2011, p. 1) through which to investigate the effects of institutional racism. The "institutional aspects of racism that influence educational leadership broadly and the ways principals engage in student discipline practices" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 522) are often unquestioned. The "racial discipline gap has been documented in numerous empirical articles and reports, which has contributed to an increased federal scrutiny of school discipline practices" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 520). Principals hold some responsibility for this gap because, while they are "tasked with maintaining positive and safe learning environments that meet the needs of all students, they often do so by adhering to policies and broader cultural norms that place" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 520) Indigenous students, and other marginalized students, are targeted for school failure and exclusion. Race is a "critical variable informing student disciplinary decisions particularly for principals, who hold considerable power to alter the trajectory of students' lives" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 520). These negative school outcomes often relate to negative social outcomes (DeMatthews et al., 2017). There is a close "alignment existing between school discipline trends, school exclusionary practices, dropout/pushout, youth unemployment, and eventual prison outcomes for poor and non-White youth and young adults" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 521).

Principals are critical in maintaining "discipline gaps because they make determinations about suspensions, alternative school placements, and expulsions" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 525). Rules are often spoken about by principals "as inherently neutral, impartially exercised, and impervious to individual feelings or personal responses" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 525).

The colonial public education system “emphasizes rational, value-neutral, and objective notions of actions or ‘hard facts’” (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 525). This neutral-appearing decision making approach “can be justified by institutional norms and a desire to close gaps between marginalized and privileged student groups, but in reality they maintain the status quo” (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 526). Principals often “prioritize consistency in implementing district policy over considering student needs and circumstances” (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 536).

Discipline and exclusion of students involves “the exercising of normative power” (Carlile, 2011, p. 2). Discipline, suspension, and expulsion of students can be described as “instances of ‘institutional racism’ because they do not necessarily constitute the direct prejudice of one person” (Carlile, 2011, p. 2). Instead, it is a form of objective violence, which is the “deeper effects of the practice of exclusion protocol, often expressed through ‘gatekeeping’ practices” (Carlile, 2011, p. 3). This institutional racism is woven into the public school system through years of colonialism and is practiced and upheld by educational administrators (Carlile, 2011). School administrators are often complicit in the disparity policing of Indigenous students, often quick to involve the police with Indigenous students, where they are more likely to handle similar behaviour by Whites students internally (Solomon & Palmer, 2006).

In Saskatchewan, young Indigenous men are “more likely to go to prison than to finish high school” (Gebhard, 2013, p. 1). The links between schooling for Indigenous people and incarceration are under examined in Canada and the links between schools and jails are “less a pipeline, [and] more a persistent nexus or web of intertwined, punitive threads” (Gebhard, 2013, p. 1). Colonialism “remains the primary ideology underlying the education of Indigenous peoples in Canada today” (Gebhard, 2013, p. 2), which helps to explain the high rates of school pushout and undereducation that are typical amongst Indigenous students across Canada. Penitentiaries have replaced residential schools as the new form of containment for Indigenous people (Gebhard, 2013). Schools, teachers, and educational administrators play a critical role in the overrepresentation of Indigenous people in the correction system in Canada. Discipline is deeply rooted in the history of education for Indigenous people and Indigenous youth are disproportionately targeted for discipline in schools, which is "part of a process that sets them up for a future imprisonment" (Gebhard, 2013, p. 3).

This pattern of punishing Indigenous youth was one I witnessed first-hand in the alternative public education program in which I worked. That program could not have existed without the practice of disproportionately targeting Indigenous youth for punishment and incarceration. It took a network of institutions and individuals to keep those youth stuck in cycles of school pushout that inevitably led to their further incarceration and punishment. Educational administrators must begin to support the removal of the carceral elements of schools and must "examine the underlying racist motivations of naturalized and taken-for-granted policies and practices governing schools in order to resist their complicity in the school-to-prison nexus" (Gebhard, 2013, p. 7) for Indigenous youth.

Administrators who made decisions about discipline without regard to "racial realities" (Gooden, 2012, p. 74) will continue to, sometimes unconsciously, promote the same negative result. Student failure is a result of a "myriad of factors, with one of the most important being systemic and interpersonal racism plaguing the lives of" (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 549) students, their families, and their communities. Principals must become "tireless anti-racist advocates, refuse color-bind ideologies in themselves and their colleagues, and become adroit in teasing out undercurrents of racial discord that frame" (DeMatthews et al., pp. 549-550) administrator and student interactions. Principals must recognize their role in the school-to-prison nexus and understand that while they are not “solely responsible for race-based social inequities and are often constricted in their efforts to bring social justice to schools, they are in a conspicuous location and must use their power to interrupt racism operating in their schools” (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 550).

## The Whiteness of Educational Administration

The field of educational administration is overwhelmingly white. Because of this, it is important to examine how the whiteness of educational administration helps to uphold and maintain a deeply problematic, colonial public education system. To claim that “White educators and educational leaders are racist is controversial and provokes disbelief and outrage from many” (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 374). However, scholars largely agree that White principals do not have a thorough or adequate understanding of racism in its many forms and they also do not understand how they are contributing to White racism in their schools (DeMatthews et al., 2017). The topic of racism “disrupts [the] comfortable complacency” (Aveling, 2007, p. 69) of whites because those of us who are white can afford to ignore racism because it does not happen to us. Seeing and understanding Whiteness ideology is a starting point for educational administrators to begin dismantling it (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). The system’s definition of good leadership has “created and sanctioned unjust and inequitable schools” (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011, p. 1348). White leaders are capable of understanding whiteness but require intellectual and emotional work to begin this journey (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011).

Whiteness signifies a “set of locations that are historically, socially, politically, and culturally produced and which are intrinsically linked to dynamic relations of dominations" (DiAngelo, 2006, p. 214). Whiteness is “a socially constructed understanding of race that is defined by what is non-White" (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011, p. 1334). Whiteness is not just about skin colour, it is a racial discourse and a performance" (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). Whiteness is invisible, unnamed, and unmarked (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). The power and privilege "attached to whiteness is so pervasive that it becomes invisible" (McMahon, 2007, p. 691).When educational administrators efforts "fail to systemically address issues of inequality, specifically those related to race, racism, and power, and to uncover the remnants of White privilege, 'liberal' or progressive efforts benefit those in power" (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011, p. 1335). If left unexamined, "Whiteness ideology inscribes White privilege [in public schools] through everyday values, practices, and norms" (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011, p. 1335). White racism "is ultimately a White problem and the primary responsibility for interrupting it must be carried by White people" (DiAngelo, 2006, p. 236).

Prior to becoming principals, white leaders should engage in "racial discussions, seeing racial implications, and reflecting on their own paths, struggles, and privileges as occurring in a racialized context" (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011, p. 1338). White school leaders can actively participate in undermining racism (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). For this to happen, it is critical for white administrators to understand how white racism functions and become aware of its harmful effects (Young & Laible, 2000). It is also time for educational administration training programs to "take seriously the call to dismantle and fight against White racism" (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 405) as these programs and their faculty function as agents of socialization for future school leaders. White racism is a "monstrous disease" that "permeates the very fabric of our institutions, society, and civilization" (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 404-405). White racism is also "unnecessary, inexcusable, and unacceptable in all places, but especially in our educational institutions where the achievement, and ultimately the lives, of millions of children are at stake" (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 405).

The creation of our public education system that "codifies the superiority of the white race over others" (McMahon, 2007, p. 687) was in no way accidental. Since white educators benefit from "and are implicated in inequitable institutions, the onus is on all whites to work to dismantle them" (McMahon, 2007, p. 687). Race will always matter (Ladson-Billings, 1998). To be white has meant something, "means something now, and will always mean something—an automatic affordance of rights and privileges—that Whiteness is property" (Capper, 2015, p. 803). Public schools can be "viewed as property that Whites will fiercely protect for themselves" (Capper, 2015, p. 804). The permanence of racism "can help White educational leaders acknowledge that they themselves are racist, that all leaders regardless of race are complicit in racism, and that all schools and districts embody and perpetuate racisms throughout the culture, organization, policies, and practices, and will always do so" (Capper, 2015, p. 800). The pervasiveness of racism will exist even if "educational leaders may have addressed their own racist assumptions and beliefs, participated in diversity training, engaged in meaningful work or relationships with persons of color, or made progress with their students of color in their schools" (Capper, 2015, p. 800-801). Educational leaders need to understand that actively working against racism is a life-long process (Capper, 2015).

## Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, and Liberalism

Canada remains the "only nation with its multicultural ideals entrenched into its constitution and a range of national government policies" (Lund, 2006, p. 257). As I examined in chapter one, policy initiatives "such as multicultural education have failed to reverse the chronic underachievement of racial minority youth" (Solomon, 2002, p. 175) and were implemented in order to uphold the ongoing colonization and oppression of Indigenous peoples. Larger systemic changes in the public school system will require “a more radical pedagogy than the popular benevolent multiculturalism” (Solomon, 2002, p. 175). This benevolent multiculturalism approach is “superficial and reductionist” (Aveling, 2007, p. 78). Despite, and because of, decades of official multiculturalism, colonial attitudes remain “well entrenched in the dominant group Canadian psyche” (Solomon, 2002, p. 182). The federal and provincial “human rights codes that prohibit discrimination based on race, color, creed, religion, ethnicity, and nationality have not liberated groups perceived as” (Solomon, 2002, p. 182-183) different or other.

Educational administrators often default to narratives of multiculturalism, liberalism, and colorblindness rather than to making a commitment to antiracist and anti-oppressive pedagogy. Most educational administrators use multiculturalism as their starting point for understanding antiracism, which raises the issues of “school leaders’ limited or truncated understanding of antiracism” (Solomon, 2002, p. 183). Many school practices and curriculum materials that have been described by administrators as antiracism initiatives do not actually directly investigate racism (Solomon, 2002). Maintaining an “institutional culture of harmony, rather than a more critical emancipatory leadership that may evoke tension and conflict” (Solomon, 2002, p. 188) may be considered by administrators to be in their own best interest. In this way, school leaders end up “being more like social pacifiers than political change agents” (Solomon, 2002, p. 189). Multiculturalism “falls into the liberal reformist framework that does not acknowledge or challenge the structural sources of White racism” (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 390). The reluctance of educational administrators to engage in antiracist pedagogies might be related to “a broader school and societal culture of liberalism with a strong focus on a kind of individualism that” (Solomon, 2002, p. 187) restricts administrative action. Liberalism must be critiqued “because to counter racism and White supremacist ideologies, liberalism is not a mechanism for substantive, real change” (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011, p. 1335).

Colorblind ideologies and the myth of meritocracy are still pervasive in schooling (Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). The belief that “colorblindness will eliminate racism is not only shortsighted but reinforces the notion that racism is a personal—as opposed to systemic—issue” (López, 2003, p. 69). Colorblindness has only “served to drive racism underground, making it increasingly difficult for people of color to name their reality” (López, 2003, p. 82). Administrators’ “narrow view of what constitutes racism combined with a desire to project a positive image of themselves and their school community renders” (McMahon, 2007, p. 693) them blind. Intentional or not, this blindness inflicts real damage and privilege (McMahon, 2007). Educational administrators also “manifest color blindness when they remain unconscious or deny the ways their school reflects White culture” (Capper, 2015, p. 816). School leaders need to recognize and understand that participating in colorblind ideologies reflects their own racist assumptions (Capper, 2015). School leaders “must develop a historically informed and politically shaped conception of antiracism pedagogy that extends beyond multiculturalism” (Solomon, 2002, p. 190), liberalism, and colorblindness.

When there is “racialized conflict between Aboriginal and white Canadians”, often what is recommended is “not anti-racism education but cross-cultural awareness or race relations training for the primarily ‘white’ service providers” (St. Denis, 2009, p. 163), including teachers and educational administrators. Typically this training “does not include a critical race theory analysis that might explore how a regime of white supremacy and its subordination of people of color have been created and maintained” (St. Denis, 2009, p. 163). Rather than critically exploring how and why race matters in society, “it is often suggested that it is Aboriginal people and their culture that must be explained to and understood by those in position of racial dominance" (St. Denis, 2009, p. 163). When administrators seek solutions to "low achievement and high dropout rates for Aboriginal students, the call is usually made for 'culturally relevant' education rather than the need for a critical race and class analysis" (St. Denis, 2009, p. 164). The "cultural framework for analyzing educational failure" (St. Denis, 2009, p. 164) suggests that Indigenous youth are culturally different from the norm. When the effects of oppression against Indigenous people are "attributed to a 'conflict of values' it is easy to see how the remedy then becomes cross-cultural" training that maintains the status quo of "structural inequality while seemingly responding" (St. Denis, 2009, p. 168) to it. The objectification of culture allows cultural determinism to become possible, which "has been used to justify racism; hence the notion of 'cultural racism' that becomes another way to justify discrimination" (St. Denis, 2009, p. 169). Cultural assumptions have often informed equity endeavors within Indigenous education (Keddie et al., 2013). While involving Indigenous community members in the daily functions of education is something to be encouraged, often these inclusions are tokenistic and "focus on the exotic aspects of cultural difference and ignore the causes and effects of racism" (Aveling, 2007, p. 79).This recognition does not "promote an anti-racist politics that rejects notions of culturalism and racial incommensurability" (Keddie et al., 2013,  p. 105). Further, what school divisions and their leaders now refer to as "culturally relevant pedagogy" or culturally responsive teaching practices often are a "distortion and corruption of the central ideas" (Ladson-Billings, 2014, p. 82) they claim to be supporting.

Cultural revitalization, therefore, "misdiagnoses the problem" and "cultural awareness workshops can provide another opportunity for non-Aboriginals to resent and resist Aboriginal people" (St. Denis, 2009, p. 178). Institutions, like schools, may also "simply put up Indigenous artwork and argue, de facto, that the institution is relevant and respectful to Indigenous peoples" (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 20). These token acts of inclusion perpetuated by cultural awareness training reinforce systemic racism within public schools (Pidgeon et al., 2013).

## Social Justice Administration: Inadequacies and Limitations

Social justice pedagogy is often offered and supported as a positive and effective alternative to multiculturalism, liberalism, colorblind ideologies, and cultural relevance discourses. While some definitions of social justice frame the pedagogy as "largely about changing inequities and marginalization" (Theoharis, 2010, p. 333), I argue that it is insufficient in combating the larger systemic racism and inequities championed by public schools and their administrators. The term social justice "is an elusive construct, politically loaded, and subject to numerous interpretations" (Jean-Marie et al., 2009, p. 3). Educational accountability policies "tend to construct the meaning of social justice in narrow market-based terms that attempt to remedy the so-called deficits students from diverse backgrounds bring to school" (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 202). Many conceptions of social justice are "seen as neutral or blind to locatedness, and instrumental in the maintenance of the existing social order" (McMahon, 2007, p. 686). If they fail to "challenge the underlying assumptions on which education as cultural reproduction are based, social justice initiatives" (McMahon, 2007, p. 686) may actually reinforce the status quo.

There are "three main limitations of *social justice* as a term: 1) It is too often used as buzzwords rather than a substantive core of education as a profession, …it is little more than rhetoric", it is also "a politically loaded term, subject to numerous interpretations" and often is "policy praxis that is not aimed on undoing" (Celoria, 2016, p. 205) oppressive structures or practices. It is in the interest of white school administrators to adopt the language of social justice rather than to use antiracist pedagogy as the foundation of their work (Knaus, 2014). This is especially true when considering that educational administration, both as an academic field and as a profession, has historically been in direct opposition to social justice (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006). It is likely that "educational administrators working in public schools will adopt and adapt a social justice perspective that prioritizes and personalizes specifics to meet their needs" (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006, p. 286). This "anti-change stance makes individuals who challenge racism subject to personal, professional, and institutional punishment, exacerbating racism" (Knaus, 2014, p. 422) that students and staff of color already face. Administrators often see what they want to see and use "politically correct language to justify a vision of equity" (Knaus, 2014, p. 440) that is directly challenged by antiracist theories and pedagogy. This is especially true for administrators "seeking promotion because the rhetoric of equity is present in academic institutions and school mission statements" (McMahon, 2007, p. 691).

## Educational Administration Training and Preparation Programs

As McMahon (2007) explains, although administrators need to be held accountable for their own roles in "maintaining inequitable hierarchies, school districts, faculties of graduate studies and administrator preparation programs providers are ultimately responsible" (p. 693-694). In Canada, there are serious concerns about administrator preparation programs' lack of commitment in addressing the crisis conditions in many schools (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). The combination of "the development of specialized graduate work in school administration, and the growing influence of business on education with the subsequent conception of education as a business, led to the idea of school administration (and especially the superintendency) as a 'profession' distinct from teaching" (Callahan, 1962, pp. 215-216). By 1918, the idea of a separate profession of school administration was firmly instituted (Callahan, 1962). If we critically examine the graduate training programs of educational administrators in Canada, it becomes clear that this idea is alive and healthy and that, in order to see any substantial change in the practices of administrators in public schools today, there will first need to be a radical transformation in the way educational administrators are prepared in their university graduate preparation programs. Many administrators leading Canadian public schools have inappropriate and inadequate training in antiracism (Callahan, 1962). To break this cycle, a major effort will be needed to require that our school administrators have a strong education at the graduate level where students are trained as “scholars, not accountants or public relations men” (Callahan, 1962, p. 261). Even seven decades ago, Callahan (1962) was highlighting the issues with educational administration and their inadequate training. It is alarming how little has changed in the past seventy years; many of the issues Callahan (1962) discusses remain relevant in today’s education system. Indeed, the quality of graduate work in educational administration must be greatly improved (Callahan, 1962; Young & Laible, 2000; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; McMahon, 2007; Jean-Marie et al., 2009). However, the trend seems to be moving away from raising the expectations for preparing educational leaders and towards lowered standards that are “reductionist and serve as a form of deprofessionalization” (Celoria, 2016, p. 201). It is essential that this trend move towards the preparation of educational leaders who are “well prepared to serve as activists and advocates for change based on their awareness of explicit and implicit forms of oppression and marginalization within schools” (Celoria, 2016, p. 210). Race and racism in society must become “a central and integral aspect of the leadership knowledge base” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 204). This inclusion must go beyond surface level discussions of inequitable treatment and instead focus on “probing the pervasive and systemic nature of racism in society” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 204).

Research shows that antiracist theory, practice, and pedagogy are “often marginalized within educational leadership degree and certificate programs as such orientation is considered ‘soft’ in comparison to more traditional topics such as organizational theory, principalship, school law, and finance” (Jean-Marie et al., 2009, p. 1). Traditionally, “university-based leadership preparation programs are best characterized as preparing aspiring administrators for the role of a top-down manager and are overloaded with courses on management and administration…rather than on the development of relationship and caring environments within schools to promote student learning” (Jean-Marie et al., 2009, p. 5-6). Educational leaders therefore are not prepared to adequately “change the social order”, especially when ‘social change challenge[s] local norms” (Jean-Marie et al., 2009, p. 8). However, educational leadership scholarship has much it can learn from critical race theory, queer theory, and feminist theories (Jean-Marie et al., 2009). These theories, among others, “can disrupt [students] taken-for-granted assumptions of what leadership is, what it can be, and what purposes it ultimately serves” (Jean-Marie et al., 2009, p. 11).

Educational administration preparation programs often focus their attention primarily on effectiveness and efficiency (Callahan, 1962; Zembylas & Iasonos, 2010). This inadequate emphasis “fails to prepare school leaders to engage in difficult work that requires a shift in values, attitudes and practices and limits their ability to address fundamental” (Zembylas & Iasonos, 2010, p. 180) issues in education, particularly race. This focus not only embodies “ a very limited understanding of race and race relations but also presumes that racism is not an important topic of study for today’s educational leaders” (López, 2003, p. 70). When the topic of racism is introduced in leadership preparation courses, it is often not included in the core curriculum and is considered addition or non-essential learning (López, 2003). In most graduate preparation programs, “issues of one’s own racial identity development and its potential impact on schooling in racially diverse communities are not explored, nor are institutionalized systems of white privilege” (Solomon, 2002, p. 189) and oppression. This “unexplicitness of antiracism creates a serious gap” (Solomon, 2002, p. 189).

It is often the case that educational administration graduate school faculty are “also entrenched in the structures which work to preserve their power and privilege” (McMahon, 2007, p. 690). Higher education faculty “must model the kinds of organizations they expect their graduates to create” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 216). As scholars preparing future educational leaders, educational administration faculty members “have a duty to know and raise questions about race and racism in society, as well as an ethical responsibility to interrogate systems, organizational frameworks, and leadership theories that privilege certain groups and/or perspectives over others” (López, 2003, p. 70). The largest problem in changing educational administration graduate programs lies in changing the faculty of these programs. Faculty “cannot teach about creating and leading [antiracist] schools with credibility if they are not modelling these principals in their own department” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 216-217). This effort needs to involve educational administration faculty members in “providing their vision for preparation program change via new approaches to student recruitment, curricular content, and the induction process” (Gooden & Dantley, 2012, p. 239). Educational leadership faculty members will need to create “a new language of asking new questions and generating more critical practices” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 214). This new language would have to “reformulate traditional notions of authority, ethics, power, culture, and pedagogy” (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 214). Faculty will need to draw on “wide-ranging fields including educational leadership, curriculum, instruction, learning theory, communication, political theory, cultural studies, childhood education, [antiracist theories], and systems theory" (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 215) in order to prepare a new type of school leader who is strongly committed to antiracism.

Given the increasing call for educational leadership preparation programs to improve and to address issues of racial inequalities in the system's their students lead, it will be tempting for these programs to claim they are grounded in social justice (Capper et al., 2006). However, leadership preparation programs give very little genuine consideration to antiracist issues (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). The greatest challenge for the educational administration field may be to change was it means to be a school leader, as opposed to a school administrator (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). This "reconceptualization of who will lead and what they do reaches far beyond university administrator preparation programs to teacher preparation, school communities, and state policy makers" (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005, p. 210).

Many administrator preparation programs are working out of outdated multicultural education models, which means very few of these programs truly explore antiracism (Young & Laible, 2000). Antiracist and anti-oppressive teaching pedagogy and content should be integrated into all aspects of educational administration programs (Young & Laible, 2000). Learning to become an antiracist educator is a lifelong process and is not "something that can be fully taught or learned in a single semester or even a year, but the process *can begin* in a single semester" (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 393), which means educational administration training programs can begin the lifelong learning process of becoming antiracist with their students. Canadian educational administration programs need to "re-examine their programs, to identify courses in which antiracism education can be meaningfully infused, and to join in the effort to increase antiracist practice in [Canadian] schools" (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 403). This will require the willingness of these programs to hire new faculty who are willing and able to teach antiracism (Young & Laible, 2000).

Clearly what is currently taught in leadership preparation programs is insufficient (Young & Laible, 2000). If changes are not made, "educational administration programs will continue to produce primarily white, middle class administrators with little understanding of or interest in the institutionalized system of white privilege, oppression, and racism" (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 388). What is needed in educational administration preparation programs is the preparation of a new type of leader who is committed to antiracism and draws on many different fields (Zembylas & Iasonos, 2010). There is a "need for centering race in educational leadership preparation" (Gooden & Dantley, 2012, p. 240). There also needs to be a "call to undermine and indeed usurp the power structure that currently exists, and to replace it with one that signalizes racial equity" (Gooden & Dantley, 2012, p. 241) and a commitment to antiracism. This requires a "deeper commitment to educational leadership as a route to addressing racism at the local, national, and global levels" (Brooks et al., 2015, p. 2). Future educational administrators should "not be granted licensure or graduate from their preparation programs without an understanding of racism, racial identity issues, racial oppression, and how to work against racism in schools" (Young & Laible, 2000, p. 388).

## Institutions, Civilization, and the State

Now that I have explored how whiteness and colonial worldviews, philosophies, and policies are maintained and upheld in today's public education systems by administrators and their preparation programs, I need to examine the history of the creation of the public education system in Canada and how it helps to frame and better understand the origin of the markedly contrasting philosophies of education held by Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state. The way in which public education developed in Canada has had lasting consequences for the relationship between schools and the communities which they serve and “for the nature of the educational experience itself” (Katz, 1976, p. 399). Institutions that claimed to embody “a passionate commitment to social reform turned relatively quickly into large, rigid, and unresponsive bureaucracies” (Katz, 1976, p. 399). The “popular acceptance of public education represented ideological hegemony: the unselfconscious and willing acceptance of a direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group” (Katz, 1976, p. 400). The belief in the myth of meritocracy prevailed as the “school system became a miniature version of the social order”: the “hegemony of democratic capitalism” (Katz, 1976, p. 401). Meritocracy is “the assumption that everyone has equal opportunity because we are all basically the same; all that is required to get ahead is hard work, talent, and effort” (Schick & St. Denis, 2003, p. 8), which is a major promise of capitalism. As McLean (2018) explains, “the myth that Canadian society is created on individual work ethic ignores how racially dominant groups gain access to social and political power” and “this discourse also masks how racialized groups are denied access to these same resources and opportunities” (p. 32). The way in which public schools in North American have been a success is that most people “spontaneously have accepted the structure of inequality which circumscribes their lives” (Katz, 1976, p. 402). Schools have failed in that they have not “eradicated crime, poverty, [or] immorality” and indeed, schools cannot and will not solve social problems without “a [massive] redistribution of power and resources”, otherwise they will do no more “than [continue to] reflect the social structure in which they exist” (Katz, 1976, p. 403).

The mid-nineteenth century in Canada saw a vast change in education. In 1841, Upper Canada and Lower Canada joined to form the Province of Canada. Then, with Confederation in

1867, it became the Province of Ontario (Prentice, 2004). The School Act of 1871 mandated "the provision of free common schools by each municipality" (Prentice, 2004, p. 16). It is interesting to know that schooling prior to Confederation was largely voluntary: "schools, teachers, and times of attendance were generally of" parents' and guardians' "own choosing" (Prentice, 2004, p. 16). By 1871, the choice of schooling was "clearly in the hands of central bodies—either provincial or municipal—as were the complex rules and regulations which increasingly governed the qualifications, hiring, and behaviour of teachers and other previously unheard of functionaries within the growing public school systems" (Prentice, 2004, p. 18). On a provincial level, "a chief superintendent of education, soon to be translated into a minister of education, presided over all publicly financed" schooling "as well as the training of teachers in Ontario" (Prentice, 2004, pp. 18-19). This was a drastic change from informal and mostly voluntary education to "formal, institutionalised and compulsory education under the aegis of the state" (Prentice, 2004, p. 19).

The shift to compulsory education indicated a changing relationship between the school and the state (Prentice, 2004). By the latter part of the nineteenth century, "the organization, scope and role of schooling had been fundamentally transformed" (Katz, 1976, p. 383). In the place of casual schools, "true educational systems: carefully articulated, age graded, hierarchically structured groupings of schools, primarily free and often compulsory, administered by full-time experts and progressively taught by specially trained staff" (Katz, 1976, p. 383) had been developed. Schools became "highly formal institutions designed to play a critical role in the socialization of the young, the maintenance of social order, and the promotion of economic development" (Katz, 1976, p. 383). As Katz (1976) details, within forty to fifty years, "a new social institution had been invented, and it is this startling and momentous development that we must seek to understand" (p. 383). It is important to remember that institutions are a modern invention and that "none of the large social institutions which dominate our lives today existed in anything more than embryonic form [more than] one hundred and fifty years ago" (Katz, 1976, p. 403). At the time of the creation of these institutions, "sane, intelligent people believed in alternatives", and therefore, "those who cannot see beyond the asylum or the bureaucracy have a foreshortened view of history" (Katz, 1976, 403). The "the timidity of our efforts at reform reflects the narrowness of our imagination, not the limits of the possible" (Katz, 1976, 403). The intentional and "prolonged institutionalized dependency to which we subject the young today is neither a product of their biology nor their psychology; it is a product of culture and of history" and "yet we reform schools as if the life cycle were immutable" (Katz, 1976, p. 404).

From the onset of the creation of what is now Canada's public education system, Indigenous people were set up as the ultimate *Other*. The main goal of the public education system at the time of its conception was to make future generations better than each existing one, which led to the recurring belief and theme that "human beings could be, and indeed would have to be improved" (Prentice, 2004, p. 27). The argument for "improving man through education was in fact deeply rooted in an overwhelming fear of a man's physical nature" (Prentice, 2004, p. 29). Egerton Ryerson, a minister, educator, and one of the leading school promoters in Ontario at the time, the mid-to-late nineteenth century, claimed the physical nature of Indigenous people was a critical factor in their weak "intellectual development" (Prentice, 2004, p. 29). The belief became largely that "the child was to remain 'an animal' if education did not intervene" (Prentice, 2004, p. 32). The goal of educators, therefore, became to elevate children "from the grossness inherent in their physical nature"; the belief among educators was that "animal passions could not be allowed to go their own way completely unchecked" (Prentice, 2004, p.

40) and education was the best way to prevent these animalistic tendencies from developing. Hence a Western philosophy of human nature tended to believe that humans would become inherently *bad* and animalistic if left to their own devices.

As AbdelRahin (2013), an anthropological scholar interested in the underlying premises of civilization, explains, institutions are “what organizes and authorizes the establishment we refer to as education as well as the other interrelated social organs of civilization” (p. 99). The colonial nature of institutions seeks to undermine and delegitimize Indigenous knowledge and worldview. The institution first has to “delegitimize [Indigenous or “Others”] knowledge and then institute authority in order to legitimize the needs of the hierarchy while alienating people from their own needs, because the needs of the institution usually are in conflict with the needs of the people it colonizes” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 99). This model of Eurocentrism “postulates the superiority of Europeans and their descendants over non-Europeans, founded on a false polarity between ‘civilized’ and ‘savage’ peoples” (Battiste, 1998, p. 22). All four of anticolonial scholar Memmi’s (1969) interrelated racist strategies are evident in the Canadian school promoters’ beliefs about the institution of Canadian public schools:

> (a) stressing real or imaginary differences between the racist and the victim; (b) assigning values to these differences to the advantage of the racist and the detriment of the victim; (c) trying to make these values absolutes by generalizing from them and claiming they are final; and (d) using these values to justify any present or possible aggression or privileges. (Battiste, 1998, p. 21)

This is all documented in the history of education for Indigenous people. These strategies train the *civilized* to begin to see Western institutions as “natural, inevitable, and organic”

(AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 99). Because of this, the ability of the colonizer to imagine alternatives to Western institutions becomes very difficult.

An institution is more than just structure as “it acquires a life of its own rooted in people’s beliefs” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 99). The institution of public education in Canada “educates people accordingly to accept their social roles, ideally domesticating them to desire and ‘choose’ the imposed positions and functions” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 99). Depressed or unhappy individuals “are ‘integrated’ or recycled into civilization by means of medication, therapy and other ‘professional’ methods of intervention designed to make the person ‘adapt’ rather than accept depression as a symptom of resistance” and “the most profound decisions about justice are not made by individuals as such, but by individuals thinking within and on behalf of institutions” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 101). These individuals include civil servants, teachers, and professors of education. Institutions “bestow sameness”, “they confer and reproduce themselves with and through individuals” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 101). Education, war, colonialism, and globalism “(i.e., the main ingredients of civilization) are all driven by bribery, threat, greed and fear” making clear that “the institution does not [and could never] love its children” (AbdelRahin, 2013, pp. 109-111). Civilization and education “are irreconcilable with mutual relationships and self-purpose; they are antithetical to knowledge and life” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 117). These beliefs about institutions can be seen in the guiding philosophies that informed, and continue to shape, the creation of the Canadian public education system, which was set up in direct opposition to the humanity of Indigenous people. How can we seek to reconcile with Indigenous people while continuing to force them, through mandatory attendance, to participate in an education system created, in part, to bring about their destruction?

The historical foundations of our institutions are often “veiled with a grammar for ‘manners’ and ‘politeness’ but construction and normalization of this violence constitutes the purpose itself of our domestication, socialization and education” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 1). As AbdelRahin (2013) states, “to be educated in civilization is to be taught how not to know life” (p. 1). The question of “what is knowledge and how knowledge gets constructed, transmitted and assimilated” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p.1) remains central to understanding institutions like the public education system in Canada. It is important to understand that concepts of humanity, animality, personhood, childhood, adulthood, nature, etc. are all social constructs (AbdelRahin, 2013). Civilization can be defined as “the sum outcome of the products of domestication” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 3) and relies on permanence, ownership, and time. Therefore, through a complex epistemological process, “a victim is thus constructed as existing for the purposes of domestication” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 3). Domestication and civilization “thus constitute the process of colonization of space and its resources” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 3) and naturalize violence and ignorance. This is at the expense of humanity and environmental sustainability.

If we understand institutions in this way, we can then understand that civilization and education are “thus about securing the status quo of inequality, immobility, consumption, and ignorance; they are both driven by an impetus for colonization of the mind and space of personal desires, aspirations, imagination and will” and “the methods and contents of education inform the larger narrative of civilization” (AbdelRahin, 2013, pp. 3-4). Civilization starts with “naturalizing hierarchy and violence and then devising methods of training the ‘human resources’ to want to spend their lives doing what their superiors want of them” (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 5) and the most effective way to do this is through standardized, mandatory education. Just like the colonialist market economy, “obligatory schooling has been globalized and today constitutes the norm for almost all human societies" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 5). This rationalization of violence "informs the very concept of 'management' that is responsible for the control of labor, resources, and space" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 8). Management practices' goals are to sanitize spaces for human use and to construct them as separate from the *other* and therefore, civilized child-rearing pedagogies are "thus rooted in the ontology of suffering and punishment" (AbdelRahin, 2013, pp. 8-13). An example of this ontology of suffering and punishment is Canadian residential schools, which sought to civilize Indigenous children through punishment, suffering, removal from their families and communities, and discipline. This makes it clear how the institution of public schooling is steeped in racist strategies that seek to maintain colonial power over Indigenous people (Battiste, 1998).

In Latin, the term *instruction* has two components: education and directives, where education is primarily about following orders (AbdelRahin, 2013). The institution of "education is necessary to show people their place in the realm of human resources whose lives are to be consumed by work" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 17). The purpose of existence then becomes to serve the interests of someone else, a dehumanizing practice; "the civilized can then claim that 'power' and 'ethics' are compatible" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 24). The relations of power "in which some people are endowed with the knowledge and responsibility to confine, exploit, and direct others, are referred to as 'relations of trust,' thereby projecting a sense of benign necessity for abuse" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 26). This definition of power helps to explain "how individuals whose overall power may be limited can simultaneously be complicit in their own subjection and that of others" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 118). Because of this power, the group defining the norm becomes hard to see, so people are left in a state of anxiety, making them "more dependent on authorities, like doctors, teachers, etc. to tell [them] if [their] actions, personalities and bodies are normal or not" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 120). Individuals also begin to "internalize the function of supervision, even in the absence of a supervisor, as [they] begin to interrogate [them] 'selves' to see if they are acceptably normal" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 120). This undertow of "observation not only allows for individuals to be graded and ranked, punished and rewarded, but it exerts a constant pressure to conform and enforces a desire to be normal" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 120).

A mutual relationship of trust in the institution of education, "would not have needed the backing of the whole apparatus of laws, military, police and other civilized professions to protect trainers, rulers and owners from being treated the same way they treat their subject-objects" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 27). Cruelty "towards the victims of oppression becomes institutionalized as legitimate treatment that is depicted in civilized epistemology as having been chosen and desired by the victims themselves" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 35). In the institution of education, "the methods of socializing and institutionalizing a person that span from the period from infancy through university, that is, any social institution that claims to have the right to impose civilized knowledge and transmit essential skills to members of its society" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 91). For example, Willinsky (1998), in a critical investigation of school curriculum, examines how we have been directly taught though the public education system, and its related institutions, to discriminate "so that we can appreciate the differences between civilized and primitive" (p.1). Even the "initial intent in literacy [which remains a major focus within educational research and schools in Canada] was to establish relationships of dependence rather than to search for "higher truth" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 95). Foucault (1995) might describe this as the discovery of the body as an object that can be "manipulated, shaped, trained and which obeys, responds, becomes skilful, and increases its forces" (p. 136). This is a two-stage process as "the body must first be made submissive and docile before it can be subjected, used, transformed and improved" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 98).

Public education largely received popular assent in Upper Canada, though Indigenous people resisted this process. As Katz (1976) explains, "public education received popular assent at least partly because it did not differ from the dominant ideology of democratic capitalism in nineteenth-century North America" (p. 401). Public educational systems "crystalized key components of social ideology into an institutional form and assured its transmission" (Katz, 1976, p. 401), the school system became a smaller version of the social order. The myth of meritocracy continued to be broadly accepted during this time (Katz, 1976). Therefore, "the connection between achievement in school and achievement within the social order made even more intimate the ties between schooling and life" (Katz. 1976, p. 401). However, the underside of the meritocracy is failure, "it is an axiom of the same ideological theorem that failure, within democratic capitalism and its schools does not reflect artificial barriers" (Katz, 1976, p. 401). Under the belief in meritocracy, any semblance of unfairness disappeared and failure was therefore a reflection of a lack of individual responsibility and ability (Katz, 1976).

Participation in the institution of public education continues to be "widely seen as a key component to future success not only for the individual children who receive that education, but also for the society to which they belong, as a whole" (Âpihtawikosisân, n.d., para. 1). We continue to "use graduation rates and post-secondary degree attainment numbers to help determine the efficacy and accessibility of a system of education" (Âpihtawikosisân, n.d., para. 3). Beyond "simply informing us of how many individuals are meeting educational standards, these numbers give us fundamental information about the overall health of a society" (Âpihtawikosisân, n.d., para. 1). The "popular acceptance of the ideology of public education reflected popular acceptance of the ideology of democratic capitalism" (Katz, 1976, p. 401) where schools reflect and maintain the social order. Therefore, "any attempt to explain the successful imposition-in the definition used here-of public education must be part of a larger inquiry into the hegemony of democratic capitalism in North America" (Katz, p. 401).

## The Scientific Management Model

The policies "that created institutions arose in response to shifting social conditions: most directly from pressures felt within cities and regions experiencing a shift to a capitalist mode of production" (Katz, 1976, p. 391). Callahan (1962), a American professor of education, explored the origin and development of the adoption of business values and practices in educational administration, which started around 1900. By the 1930s, among other things, school administrators perceived themselves as business managers and school executives, rather than as scholars and educational philosophers (p. vii). While Callahan (1962) believes that education is not a business and schooling is not a factory, he makes clear that industrialism was the most powerful force in North American at the time and the achievements of industrialism had a great effect on society and education. Business influence was exerted upon education in various ways and many newspapers even began to attack politics in education, demanding that the public school systems be run as business models (Callahan, 1962). School boards became increasingly dominated by business-men and Callahan observed a strong current of anti-intellectualism arising in public education (Callahan, 1962).

John Strachan, an Upper Canada "chief promoter of formal education during the first third of the nineteenth century" (Prentice, 2004, p. 27), believed that education should be a science. The new model of Scientific Management created by Fredrick W. Taylor and endorsed by Theodore Roosevelt in the United States in 1910 echoed this business model by promoting a public education system that encouraged standardization and efficiency in education (Callahan, 1962). In this context, "efficiency is concerned with doing things right in the sense of having achieved reductions in education/schooling expenditures to lowest common denominator benchmark levels" (Bear, 2001, p. 72). This means that the lowest possible amount of success, defined by the people who were measuring it, is achieved in the least expensive way possible.

In Canada, there was an attempt to apply the Scientific Management model of efficiency and standardization to the army, the legal profession, the home and family, the household, the church, and, of course, education (Callahan, 1962). In this way, "institutions become equal", they all "[nod] to each other and collaborate to create a network of control, radiating outward to blanket all aspects of society" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2015, p. 121). According to AbdelRahin (2013), these institutions "acquire a life of [their] own rooted in people's beliefs, their logical and mostly illogical faith, and their feeling of belonging through similarity and routine"; institutions materialize themselves through "our actions, experiences, emotions, and aspirations" (p. 99). Foucault (1995), also theorized that power is a strategy, a set of "manoeuvres, tactics, techniques, [and] functionings" (p. 26) that are exercised rather than possessed. Because the micro-powers have "multiple points of contact, some might be defeated without damaging the general network", power is "a network rather than a static structure" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 44). Foucault (1995) believes that "the body is directly involved in a political field" and the "political investment of the body is bound up...with its economic use" (pp. 26-27). He also states that "it is largely as a force of production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination" (pp. 26-27). Bodies can "only be useful if they are made to be productive (coerced and exploited labour) and subject (made docile)" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 41). According to

Foucault’s theory, the historical roots of public education in Canada therefore encourage socialized individuals to continue to reproduce their institutions at any cost (AbdelRahin, 2013).

### Societal Anxiety About Cultural Heterogeneity and the Need for Conformity

Educators continued to argue that the best place for children was in institutions designed by the state, and for the majority of people, this meant school (Prentice, 2004). Teenagers and older children were of particular concern for, “who knew what horrible growths might occur if children were neglected during their adolescence” (Prentice, 2004, p. 38)?  Further, it was believed that the perceived “impending rot of Anglo-American civilization could be averted through a concerted effort to shape the still pliable characters of their children into a native mold” (Katz, 1976, p. 394), which amounts to a massive task of ongoing colonialism.

The societal “anxiety about cultural heterogeneity propelled the establishment of systems of public education; from the very beginning public schools became agents of cultural standardization” (Katz, 1976, p. 394). As Battiste (1998) has argued, this process of cultural standardization serves as a form of “cognitive manipulation” as “cultural imperialism”, used to “discredit [Indigenous] knowledge bases and values and seeks to validate one source of knowledge and empower it through public education” (p. 20). The settler colonial state continues to depict Indigenous people as fundamentally incapable of integrating into the modern capitalist world (Dhillon, 2017). Central to the arguments “school promoters made for the improvements of Upper Canadian children and their teachers was their expanding conception of the role of the state in education” (Prentice, 2004, p. 170), causing the promoters to push for the government to maintain control over schooling. This was the ultimate vision of the school promoters in Canada, “the perfecting of a Canadian nation whose status in the scale of nations would be second to none” (Prentice, 2004, p. 170). When people complain about “too much state interference in education, they are making a powerful, and perhaps questionable, assumption" (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 12), the assumption that the state and education are separate operations.

The past 150 years of public education in Canada has shown "a transformation of the state and a vast extension of state power" (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 13). There has been an increased merging of education with schooling, though the school has always been and remains a mechanism of governmentality (Flint & Peim, 2012). It is clear that education has always been, and remains, "one of the most critical sites for imagining national futures and creating ideal citizens" (Dhillon, 2017, p. 87). It is also clear that, according to the state, those ideal citizens cannot, and should not, be Indigenous. Our current educational standards are created to blame the victim rather than examine the system itself, which has set up Indigenous youth to fail and creates the circumstances in which it becomes very difficult for youth to meet these deficit-based benchmarks. As I will explore in the next chapter of my thesis, the historical and ideological structures of Canadian public schools remain detrimentally unhealthy.

# CHAPTER THREE

# DISCIPLINE, PUNISHMENT, AND SURVEILLANCE IN CANADIAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

## Introduction

This chapter will examine the public education system's focus on discipline, surveillance, and punishment, the values that founded public education, as well as poverty and class. I will examine the disciplinary and surveillance practices revered by the early school promoters in Canada. Through this exploration, it will become clear that one of the main goals of these disciplinary practices in the public school system was to civilize what and whom is viewed as *savage*. The public education system that has, and continues to, value civilized pupils, docility, discipline, and punishment is in direct opposition to the humanity of Indigenous peoples. From the onset of the creation of the public school system in Canada, school promoters condemned those they viewed as *savage,* often using what the settlers viewed as Indigenous peoples' uncivilized nature as the antithesis of successful, contributing citizens. Through this chapter, I will make the claim that from the onset of creation of the institution of schools, Indigenous peoples were positioned as the undisciplined, uncivilized *Other* and therefore, "any contemporary focus on educational initiatives/social intervention must be understood as an institutional instrument in domination" (Dhillon, 2017, p. 92).

## Institutional Obsession with Discipline, Punishment, and Surveillance

As discussed earlier, the Upper Canada school promoters viewed human nature as being essentially "susceptible and weak" (Prentice, 2004, p. 170). This philosophy led to the belief that the improvement of society should occur though public education and the school promoters had several ideas in mind for how to realize this improvement agenda (Prentice, 2004). One of their major aims was the "promotion of an intelligent and respectful class" (Prentice, 20, p. 171).

Therefore, the education of future citizens required “the parental interference of the state” (Prentice, 2004, p. 171). This fueled and reinforced the narrative that the state knew best. Disharmony and disorder were to be feared and encouraging discord in society was “to reverse the order of nature” (Prentice, 2004, p. 173). The school promoters believed that “the planting of civilization in the ‘savage haunted wastes’ of Upper Canada” (Prentice, 2004, p. 175) was a goal that could and should be shared by everyone.

It is clear that one of the main goals of disciplinary practices in the public school system was to civilize what and whom is viewed as *savage*. Civilization and industry through discipline were to replace what the school promoters described as “the engulfing wildness” (Prentice, 2004, p. 175) of early Canadian society. This civilizing criteria justified and required domination and dehumanization (Starblanket, 2018). The “invocation of words like *tribe, savage* and *heathen* is an attempt to dehumanize peoples and deflect attention away from [Indigenous] identity as Nations” (Starblanket, 2018, p. 30). These “designations of racial inferiority such as *savage, pagan,* and *heathen* applied against Indigenous Nations justified the colonial claim on Indigenous lands by deeming them to be in a primitive state” (Starblanket, 2018, p. 160). As Starblanket (2018) explains, “the dehumanizing designation of *savage* to the Original Nations of Great Turtle Island then justified the formation of laws and policies that maintained domination and oppression” (p. 160). Because Indigenous people were viewed as existing in an uncivilized state, “they should be compelled to assimilate into the colonial society by such means as imposing Canada’s system of private property ownership and the forced transfer of children to residential facilities in which they could be compelled to view the world in eurocentric terms” (Starblanket, 2018, p. 90). The deficiency in society, even among settler/colonizing citizens, was seen to be in the people themselves and it was the job of the schools to change them (Prentice, 2004). This act of civilizing, especially "*forcing* of a particular cultural pattern on a population to whom it is foreign" exposes "the civilization-colonization process as *necessarily* being one of imperial expansion by means of colonists, colonies, and a host of colonial and empire-expanding activities for the purposes of asserting dominion over the land, population, wealth and power" (Starblanket, 2018, p. 184).

Because the school promoters of early Canadian public schools believed strongly in the importance of shaping human nature through the institution of education, the majority of educators also believed "that corporal punishment was a necessity both in the home and at school" (Prentice, 2004, p. 34). Divine law was used to justify the use of corporal punishment (Prentice, 2004). Because divine law argues that there are rules inherent in human nature that are essential to maintaining a civilized human society, corporal punishment seemed like a logical response to behaviour that threatened the state's goals of shaping human nature through mandatory public education. Even though Ryerson argued that educators in 1846 no longer believed that children should be treated like machines, the major compulsion always seemed to be "to emphasize the need for restraint" (Prentice, 2004, pp. 33-35). School organization and discipline were the "prescribed topics for the theses of aspiring school inspectors" (Prentice, 2004, p. 35).

Good behaviour is often based on standards of obedience that are almost impossible for many children to achieve and are learned from an exploitative system (Lagerwerff, 2016). School promoters and reformers had hoped that by "classifying [students] as in particular need of protection and discipline" (Prentice, 2004, p. 39), they could perhaps save the children from prematurely aging. One of the most prominent concerns was respectability, and indeed "want of respectability was an absence to be deplored" (Prentice, 2004, p. 68). Certain demonstrations of respectability were encouraged such as “refined manners and taste, respectable religion, proper speech, and, finally, the ability to read and write proper English” (Prentice, 2004, p. 68). The concept and possession of private property were also portrayed as a way to distinguish respectable, *civilized* society from *savage* societies (Prentice, 2004). Educators believed humans to be “creatures of imitation” and believed that “children especially will adopt more or less the habits and manners of those who are placed over them” (Prentice, 2004, p. 69). Rules governing personal tidiness were insisted upon and Ryerson believed and promoted that a “dirty person” could not be a “good Christian” (Prentice, 2004, p. 70), during a time where Christian religious and social attitudes were indistinguishable. Both written and spoken English words were important and as society became more dependent on written communication, the “ability to write correctly became even more important than proper speech” (Prentice, 2004, p. 78). In fact, the development of the provincial education system “itself was accompanied by a proliferation in written communication on an almost unimaginable scale” (Prentice, 2004, p. 80).

School regulations “published during the mid-century years stressed punctuality, orderly conduct, and industry, while the whole school system seemed designed to create order and uniformity where there had been none” (Prentice, 2004, p. 131). One of the system’s main goals was “the development of the practical habits and values that were held to be necessary to all working men in an urban, industrial economy” (Prentice, 2004, p. 131). Superintendents and school trustees stressed discipline as being important by purchasing bells to encourage punctuality, and, “in increasing numbers of schools around the province, children who came late began to find the school door locked” (Prentice, 2004, p. 131) in order to prevent them from disturbing the order of the classroom. Time, therefore, was used to regulate the individual, time “penetrates the body and with it all the meticulous controls of power” and “maximizes the productivity of both the individual and the collective body" (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 25). In the hands of the teacher "was the wand of the enchanter, by which savages were transformed into men" (Prentice, 2004, p. 132). School promoters expected public school systems to encourage and create modern habits "of punctuality, regularity, docility, and the postponement of gratification" (Katz, 1976, p. 395). It is not by accident that "the mass production of clocks and watches began about the same time as the mass production of public schools" (Katz, 1976, p. 395). The disciplinary goals of schooling became obvious where the "obsessions—and difficulties—were punctuality and regularity of attendance, where the villains were parents uneducated to the importance of schooling who allowed or encouraged their children to remain at home" (Katz, 1976, p. 395).

Educators believed that the alternative to schooling and discipline was crime (Prentice, 2004). Therefore, educators felt no regret in "describing a school system as a branch of the national police, designed not only to occupy a large portion of the population, but also to support and restrain many of the grownup population" (Prentice, 2004, p. 132). Public schools were believed to be the "cheapest form of moral police" (Prentice 2004, p. 132). Schools were viewed by many superintendents as the "easiest and cheapest as well as the best response that the community could make to the perennial problem of poverty", in which all "communities would have to drag along with them a certain number of poor and helpless" (Prentice, 2004, p. 132). It was believed that the most "pleasant and cheapest and most effectual way" (Prentice, 2004, p. 132) of reducing the number of poor and helpless being dragged along was to educate the children of the poor. However, school reformers gave financial rewards to "those who were already most improved, thereby adding to rather than diminishing existing inequalities" (Prentice, 2004, p. 140). In fact, "equality was interpreted as getting everyone into the system, with all kinds of incentives and improvements provided to those who did well, and increasing pressure and even coercion for the rest" (Prentice, 2004, p. 140). As Foucault (1995) states, we must "rid ourselves of the illusion that [punishment] is above all (if not exclusively) a means of reducing crime" (p. 24). Foucault (1995) regards punishment as a "complex social function" and a "political tactic" (p. 23). In fact, "human and social sciences are a part of the symptoms of [this] development of power relations" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 34).

One of the most obvious effects of "universal schooling was that children, en masse, became subject to a new regime of surveillance" (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 19). The "whereabouts of children came under a political scrutiny, a change that represented a significant shift in the labour market and the politics of childhood" (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 19). There were fears about the potential dangers of mass education, as some people "feared that the working classes might lose sight of their proper station and get ideas above themselves" (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 19). In other words, there was a fear of emancipatory potential. It was ensured then, that education by the state would prevent the working classes from self-educating and self-liberating (Flint & Peim, 2012).

The need for order was also highly stressed, as "dozens of pupils all doing something different in the same room seemed disorderly" (Prentice, 2004, p. 140). If separate rooms for each class was impossible because of economic restraints, then "prescribed class groupings, lots of military drill and mechanical exercises, as well as rigid timetabling" (Prentice, 2004, p. 140) were alternate solutions. Classification of students contributed to orderliness, as it made for better supervision of the students (Prentice, 2004). The schools moved away from using benches and replaced them with individual desks and "space and separateness became the creed of progressive school authorities" (Prentice, 2004, p. 140). The most obvious way to "classify and segregate children, of course, was according to achievement" (Prentice, 2004, pp. 148-149). Large, graded school systems encouraged competition amongst students, teachers, and schools (Prentice, 2004). Children were also classified by age, though it was of secondary importance to achievement (Prentice, 2004). The segregation desired by the school promoters could only truly be carried out in large schools and school systems (Prentice, 2004). Ryerson and his "fellow school promoters wanted large, graded schools because it was only in such institutions that distinctions of age, sex and achievement could be made" (Prentice, 2004, p. 156). It was also within these educational environments that competition would thrive (Prentice, 2004). Eventually, teachers began to use their power to "expel or suspend pupils for reasons having to do with discipline or differing notions of proper school behaviour" (Prentice, 2004, p. 161).

## Modern Discipline and Punishment in Canadian Public Schools

As a result of the focus on discipline, surveillance, and punishment in the early guiding Western philosophies of public schools in Canada, modern schools continue to "exist to produce good students" (Thompson, 2010, p. 413). Schools, then and now, are "places where binaries act to constitute subjectivities in hierarchical ways" (Thompson, 2010, p. 415). Gender, class, sexuality, ethnicity and race are all "highly significant in how the good or ideal student is represented in specific school sites" (Thompson, 2010, p. 415). This ideal of the good student has lasting effects on people for years after they leave school (Thompson, 2010). Schools enhance the value of "a hegemonic good student", where the hegemonic good is exclusive and acts as micro-practices of power "symptomatic of the institution" (Thompson, 2010, p. 416). The "notion of the good student is often presented as the defining purpose of what schools exist to do and be" (Thompson, 2010, p. 417). The disciplined student will behave in a way that shows "respect for the authority figures in the school, particularly the teachers and school hierarchy"

(Thompson, 2010, p. 422). Meritocracy plays a role in the constructed image of the *good* student, as academic success is seen as "an expression of moral values of hard work and discipline" (Thompson, 2010, p. 4224). The students who are viewed as the most successful are often those who take the "most opportunities to attach themselves to the institution" (Thompson, 2010, p. 426).

It is through the early school promoters' obsession with order, discipline, and punishment that we can see how "cruelty and apathy become invisible in the legitimate, civilized discourse" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 35). It is not a coincidence "that the term discipline applies to punishment/incarceration and to the scientific domains of knowledge thus revealing the tight relationship between the two institutions of control" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 43), prisons and schools. One state institution "legitimizes the infliction of pain, while the other calls it love" (p. 43). It seems that the category of *human* is "provisional and conditional; people are not born 'human,' they are born wild and have to be educated, 'corrected' and forced to become civilized apes who accept pain and suffering as a given" (AbdelRahin, 2013, p. 44). As AbdelRahin (2013) explains:

> Institutionalized possibility of violence--be it through grades, spanking, getting sent outside or locked inside, the withholding of candy or retraction of scholarships, the promise of future joblessness, homelessness and starvation or whatever other form of punishment--paves for a permanent state of violence cemented into the culture of civilized education and exercised in 'correctional' facilities (preschools, schools, universities) by certified tyrants called experts. (p. 47)

In *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975), Michel Foucault, a French philosopher, historian, and social theorist, examines "the strategy and tactics in punishment's changing forms from the late 17th century to the mid-19th century and beyond" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 3). Foucault believes that "state party politics obscure the ways in which modern power relations and class stratification operate" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 7). Modern punishment moves away from bodily harm and, as Foucault (1995) explains:

> the body now serves as an instrument or intermediary: if one intervenes upon it to imprison it, or to make it work, it is in order to deprive the individual of a liberty that is regarded both as a right and as property. ( p. 11).

The move away from bodily harm helps hide punishment from the public and makes punishment more private.

According to Foucault (1995), discipline and capitalism could not succeed without each other, because the "growth of a capitalist economy gave rise to the specific modality of disciplinary power, whose general formulas, techniques of submitting forces and bodies, in short, 'political autonomy', could be operated in the most diverse political regimes, apparatuses or institutions" (p. 221). The less "visible and corporal punishment becomes, the easier it is for justice authorities to shift the responsibility of punishment away from themselves" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 19). As a result, "justice no longer takes public responsibility for the violence that is bound up with its practice" (Foucault, 1995, p. 9). This makes it easier for authorities to claim that the intent of punishment is "intended to correct, reclaim, 'cure'; a technique of improvement represses, in the penalty, the strict expiation of evil-doing, and relives the magistrate of the demeaning task of punishing" (Foucault, 1995, p. 10). Those who "carry out the penalty tend to become an autonomous sector; justice is relieved of responsibility for it by a bureaucratic concealment of the penalty itself" (Foucault, 1995, p. 10). This technique of *swarming* reduces the individual burden anyone would have to carry for punishing someone

(Schwan & Shapiro, 2011). The decentralization of justice creates a "bureaucratic network where the figures that have power over individuals can sanitize or deny their responsibility for enacting punishment" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 21). The modern system of punishment had "to create a set of assessing, diagnostic, prognostic, normative judgements that can help determine what are the normal ways of life against which crime can be differentiated" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 27). Foucault also believes that "liberal politics enshrines the rights of the individual at the heart of most of its constitutional and legal theories and actively seeks to make collective groupings, like class or ethnicity, invisible and unremarkable" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 8).

It is important to understand how discipline operates within Western and colonial institutions in order for it to be challenged. Discipline remains effective today because it has not been wholly challenged and works in ways almost unseen in daily life (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011). Foucault argues that society did not stop using torture as punishment because "we became enlightened , humanitarian, and respectful of individual rights", modern society is not more civilized and "codes of 'justice' always represent and materially enact social power" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 11). This highlights the "larger social transfer and transformation of power from the aristocracy to the middle class" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 11). This form of power, a "dual process of authority maintained through modern forms of subjectivity", works "by producing knowledge, a defining truth, about individuals' behaviour and personality, only in order to discipline them through social definitions of normality, material institutions (like schools, hospitals, and prison reformatories), and the supervising judgements of professionals" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, pp. 11-12), like teachers. This form of power highlights the shift from "excessive public punishment to private, invisible discipline of our psychological self-hood" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 12). Knowledge, power and subjectivity function "as a scheme that often operates below our radar, since its procedures usually seem trivial and not worth protesting" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 13).

It is a mistake to think that we live in a time where "our society is somehow 'smarter' than prior ones or that we live in a more advanced ethics" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 50). Foucault (1995) believes that the "shift from a criminality of blood to a criminality of fraud forms part of a whole complex mechanism, embracing the development of production, the increase of wealth, a higher juridical and moral value placed on property relations, stricter methods of surveillance, a tighter partitioning of the populations, more efficient techniques of locating and obtaining information" (p. 77), which highlights the refinement of punishment practices. This shift called for "a new police network to create surveillance techniques that paid more attention to the movement of the lower classes as a means of ensuring 'security' by isolating the population into even smaller groups and seeking to gain more information about individuals than previously" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 71). The desire to protect property was the guiding force behind the creation of police surveillance of the public (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011). Prison and institution reformers are more concerned with fixing "a bad economy of power" rather than addressing the "weakness or cruelty of those in authority" (Foucault, 1995, p. 79). The motivation was not to punish less, but to punish more effectively in order to "insert the power to punish more deeply into the social body" (Foucault, 1995, p. 82). A goal of the rise of the prison system therefore is the "institutionalization of the power to punish" (Foucault, 1995, p. 130). The first Canadian penitentiary was built pre-Confederation in 1835 in Kingston (Government of Canada, 2014). The penitentiary was originally under provincial jurisdiction, but shifted to federal responsibility when the first *Penitentiary Act* was passed in 1868, following the passing of the *British North American Act* (1867) (Government of Canada, 2014). There was a significant increase in the building of these institutions across Canada through the 19th century (Government of Canada, 2014). All of these prisons were maximum-security institutions administered by a “strict regime—productive labour during the day, solitary confinement during leisure time” (Government of Canada, 2014). A rule of silence was also enforced in these prisons at all times (Government of Canada, 2014).

Foucault describes four aspects of modern discipline which involve “the control, classification and regulation of space, time, human development and its dynamics”  (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 104). The art of distribution shows that “discipline sometimes requires enclosure” (Foucault, 1995, p. 141). This requires individuals being “contained within nonpermeable spaces, like barracks, schools and factories” (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 104). The goal is to prevent rebellion by exercising control over the space. The second aspect of discipline, the control of activity or *partitioning*, requires “each individual had his own place; and each place its individual” (Foucault, 1995, p. 143). Making a divided, exclusive space is necessary to meet this goal of discipline to “prevent those who should be ruled from gathering in groups whose movement cannot be ascertained or controlled” (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 104). The third aspect of discipline, *functional sites*, allows people to be “more easily supervised individual[s]” but also functions to “make them become more economically useful in these spaces” (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 105). Finally, for discipline to work, spaces must have *rank*, they must be divided and “organized in a hierarchical sequence” (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 105). The example Foucault (1995) provides for this fourth aspect of discipline is the school classroom, “by assigning individual places [within a classroom] it made possible the supervision of each individual and the simultaneous work of all” (p. 147). This practice ensured the educational space “function[ed] like a learning machine, but also as a machine for supervising, hierarchizing, [and] rewarding" (Foucault, 1995, p. 147). In fact, some dreamed of a classroom "in which the spatial distribution might provide a whole series of distinctions at once: according to the pupils' progress, worth, character, application, cleanliness and parents' fortune" (Foucault, 1995, p. 147). This spatial distribution made the classroom a place supervised by the "classificatory eye of the master" (Foucault, 1995, p. 147), the teacher.

The public school system that values and defines its own ideals of civilized pupils, docility, discipline, and punishment is in direct opposition to the humanity of Indigenous peoples. Education has not been benevolent for Indigenous peoples in the public education system nor in "other various systems of boarding schools and educational institutions" (Battiste, 1998, p. 19). Indigenous worldviews, and the people who hold them, have been and continue to be attacked (Battiste, 1998, p. 19). From the onset of the creation of the public school system in Canada, school promoters' condemned those they viewed as *savage*, often using what the settlers viewed as Indigenous peoples' uncivilized nature as the model for how not to be successful, contributing citizens. Spaces inhabited by Indigenous peoples continue to be "taken for granted by outsiders as dangerous spaces ripe with violence and degeneracy…and schools are no exception" (Gebhard, 2018a). A dominant assumption remains that Indigenous students misbehave at school, the antithesis of what the Canadian settler state and its public education system has set up to create (Gebhard, 2018a, p. 7). The belief that Indigenous students are "disrespectful and in need of discipline is the same discourse that justified harsh punishment in residential schools and is connected to the larger project of criminalizing Indigenous peoples" (Gebhard, 2018a, p. 7). Indigenous children have been "subjected to persistent violence, powerlessness, exploitation, and cultural imperialism, only to become impoverished and devastated in the cognitive and physical aftermath of school" (Battiste, 1998, p. 19).

Through exploring the history and foundational philosophies of public schools in Canada, we can see how from the onset of the creation of the institution of schools, Indigenous peoples were positioned as the undisciplined, uncivilized *Other*. Therefore, "any contemporary focus on educational initiatives/social intervention must be understood as an institutional instrument in domination" (Dhillon, 2017, p. 92). This highlights how "intrusive state interventions become justifiable, even morally defensible when Indigenous youth are portrayed as deviant, criminal, neglected, undisciplined, uncivilized, disorderly, and so on" (Dhillon, 2017, p. 152), interventions such as the removal of Indigenous youth from their families by state social and welfare services and the disproportionate policing and incarceration of Indigenous youth. This stance becomes "easily accepted when the social problem is located within the bodies of Indigenous youth and not within the system" (Dhillon, 2017, p. 163) and its original guiding philosophies. It also makes clear that state institutions, programs, and agencies and indeed, public schools, will not be the place where justice is found (Dhillon, 2017). Foucault uses the term *carceral* to describe "a society dominated by penitentiary techniques in realms beyond the actual prison that form a great carceral continuum or carceral net" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 168). It is no longer "simply the prison [and school] that needs reforming, but nearly all of civil society within a capitalist-dominated economy" (Schwan & Shapiro, 2011, p. 172).

## Poverty and Class

Another major aim of the early Upper Canada school promoters was the "elevation and improvement of the labouring poor" (Prentice, 2004, p. 171). The punctuality, cleanliness, obedience, and order that schools were tasked with enforcing were to be taught to lower class children in the hope that "poor families would learn to take care of themselves, and also that some of their children could be recruited to middle class professions and offices" (Prentice, 2004, p. 182). It was hoped that the grading and classification of students “would gradually create new class hierarchies to replace the old” (Prentice, 2004, p. 182). It was widely believed that exposure to public education “would provide the lower-class child with an alternative environment and a superior set of adult models” (Katz, 1976, p. 393). A school system would “prove a cheap and superior substitute for the jail and the poorhouse” (Katz, 1976, p. 393) as school was to become a form of police. This social policy also “equated cultural diversity with immorality and deviance”, making the “ethnic composition of expanding cities…a source of special anxiety” (Katz, 1976, p. 393). It appears that “school systems have reflected social class differences from their inception” (Katz, 1976, p. 403).

Property, and the desire to attain it, were marks of civilization, distinguishing the civilized from the *savage*, which Ryerson related to the intelligence of the individual as the “savage knew little, and therefore wanted little; but as his knowledge increased, so did his desire for exchange” (Prentice, 2004, p. 82). Because of this belief, Ryerson also asserted that “there was a definite connection between education and the consumption of goods” (Prentice, 2004, p. 82). He also believed that a war on property was ultimately “a war against the first elements of civilization” (Prentice, 2004, p. 83). Ryerson argued that property would have more worth in a country of free schooling (Prentice, 2004). Education was a good investment, therefore, because education added to the value of property (Prentice, 2004).

Ryerson compared the labouring classes to Indigenous people, claiming both groups were “controlled by their feelings – as almost the only rule of action – in proportion to the absence or partial character of their intellectual development” (Prentice, 2004, p. 29). This resulted in more power for teachers who were framed as having incredible powers for good or bad, they became the dictators of respectability and “the Guardians of [their pupil’s] Virtues” (Prentice, 2004, p.

31). This led to important distinctions being made “not only between ‘civilized’ and ‘savage’ societies, but also within any given society, between the respectable classes and the lower orders” (Prentice, 2004, p. 67). The solution, school promoters believed, “was to be found in the institutionalized state and a new educational order under the general direction and control of the state” (Prentice, 2004, p. 171). This is another example of the hidden curriculum, which suggests that “going to school is less about learning mathematics or literacy and more about learning how to behave, how to conform and how to accept your position in the order of things” (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 153). As explained earlier, the hidden curriculum is the “elements of socialization that take place in a school but are not part of the formal curricular content” (Margolis et al., 2001, p. 6). These elements of socialization include “the norms, values, and belief systems embedded in the curriculum, the school, and classroom life, imparted to students through daily routines, curricular content, and social relationships” (Margolis et al., 2001, p. 6). Knowing this, “it is hard to represent [public] education as a gift that is offered freely for those who would apply themselves” and rather, it seems to “conclude that for certain social groups, education makes you an offer you [cannot] accept” (Flint & Peim, 2012, p. 154).

### Inclusion as Symbolic Colonialism

The white men, the school promoters, responsible for the promotion and co-creation of the public education system in Canada “claimed to believe in progress; indeed they promoted it” (Prentice, 2004, pp. 182-183), but their greater pessimism cannot be ignored. While their worldview positioned Canada as a place of chaos and the “question uppermost in their minds often seems to have been how to tame rampant nature and the devil in man” (Prentice, 2004, p. 183), their real quest was one for control. They desired those who were “reasonable, civilized and respectable elements of society, to exert control over the unreasonable, savage and disreputable at all social levels" (Prentice, 2004 ,p. 183). They hoped this control would be exercised through schools and as "more and more children were brought into the schools, there arose the urgent need to classify and define, separate and organize, in order to control these more and more unmanageable institutions" (Prentice, 2004, p. 183). This resulted in a "complex and ever expanding educational system, which seemed increasingly to be run by and for the state" (Prentice, 2004, p. 183) rather than for the children to be educated within the system. This is the system in which we now attempt to integrate and include Indigenous youth. Understanding the foundational values and philosophies that our current public education system in Canada was established on makes it difficult to conceptualize this inclusion, secured through mandatory attendance laws, as anything but a state effort in the ongoing colonization of Indigenous people.

Connected to my discussion in chapter one about the integration policy movement in Indigenous education is the concept of inclusive education. Originally, "inclusive education was offered as a protest, a call for radical change to the fabric of schooling" (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 277). Inclusion is still often cited as a goal of the public education system, we are "still wanting to include, yet speaking as if we are already inclusive" (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 278). The "uninterrogated normative assumptions that shape and drive policy about identity, difference, and academic trajectories inform the construction of reform agendas that do more than tinker at the edges to produce an appearance of more inclusive schools" (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 278). These "cosmetic adjustments to traditional schooling simply work to (re)secure an invisible centre from which constructions of Otherness and the designation of marginal positions become possible" (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 278). The solution is not "to 'integrate' [Indigenous youth] into the structure of oppression, but to transform that structure so that they can become ‘beings for themselves’” (Freire, 2005, p. 74). However, as Freire (2005) explains, “such transformation, of course, would undermine the oppressors’ purposes” (p. 74). There remains “a firmly embedded notion of what regular schooling is and who it is for” and “limited notions and models of inclusion, such as those realised through resourcing mechanisms that ensure that objectivization of individual difference, result in not only an ever more complex and insidious exclusion but arguably work to refine schooling as a field of application for disciplinary power” (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 280). Therefore, “inclusive schooling derails into symbolic colonization” (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 288) and we have to ask ourselves if these relations are worth perpetuating. When we talk of including Indigenous youth into the Canadian public education system, what do we mean? What happens when we seek to include Indigenous youth and whose interests are being served when we do? We must ask ourselves “into what do we seek to include” (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 290)? When we ask ourselves this, we are faced with harsh realities about public education in Canada that I have examined throughout this thesis.

# CONCLUSION

## Antiracism: Challenging Racialization and Mitigating Violence

My examination of Indigenous education, the origins, history, and ongoing colonialism of the Canadian public school system, and the administrators that uphold the status quo has highlighted the deeply colonial, genocidal, and foundational philosophies, goals, and insidious nature of our public education system. As an educator working within the system I have heavily critiqued, I am left grappling with the fact that even though I have remained dedicated to my own life-long journey of antiracism, I am still working for, participating in, and benefiting from the public education system. I feel deeply conflicted in my positionality as an antiracist educator in the public education system in Canada. While I do believe that antiracist training and pedagogy for educators and administrators will alleviate some of the harm inflicted on marginalized groups by the colonial education system, I am inevitably participating in the system I work to disrupt. I am finding it increasingly difficult to remain working as a classroom teacher whose main role, regardless of my passionate antiracist pedagogy, is that of a "gatekeeper, perpetuating the very stratification and inequity" (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 23) I seek to disturb.

I do not mean to undermine or dismiss the work of antiracist educators who work tirelessly to make the public education system a less violent place for youth. We need that work to continue; it is lifesaving work. Antiracism can help white educators be less violent and that is always a good thing. As Stanley (2014) explains, antiracism does not "guarantee an end to racisms, but can help to open up antiracist spaces in the lives of young people" (p. 4). I do believe that antiracist teaching pedagogy can mitigate some of the harmful state reproductions of white settler colonialism, which will make the public education system more bearable for Indigenous students and teachers who are already finding ways to thrive and survive in public schools. Indigenous people have and continue to maneuver the system despite the violence. This violence occurs in a white patriarchal system because administrators hold all of the power to shift practices and policies, all of which mirror federal government structures.

Antiracism training for teachers and administrators serves as a way to minimize the harm and mitigate the threat of the system until Indigenous people can have control over the education of their own children within the public education system. While I believe support for Indigenous control is possible, it is unlikely to come from public state institutions, institutions like public education, because of its long history of violence and because of how the state is reproduced through white teachers, white administrators, and inadequate teacher and administrator education programs. The issues of education and land, which cannot be separated, have been and will continue to be a constant struggle. Until a time where Indigenous leadership is supported and valued within the public education system, a commitment to antiracism is a violence-reducing necessity.

Principals and other school administrators are "in the precarious position of needing to be critical of the current system but needing to experience some level of success within it" (Gooden, 2012, p. 79). It is for this reason that I am skeptical of any radical systemic change coming from within the public education system and its educational administrators. However, I do believe that because of the power they hold within the system, public school principals and administrators could be a small part of the work needed to minimize the harm the institution of education perpetuates. A critical part of this goal would be antiracism training for all current and future public school administrators.

## The Importance of Antiracist Education for Administrators: Goals and Barriers

The goal of antiracism "is to analyze, challenge, and change power relations; advocate for equitable access of people of color to power and resources; and ensure their full participation in racially diverse schools" (Solomon, 2002, p. 176). Educational administrators are "ideally located in institutional structures that can disrupt" (Solomon, 2002, p. 176) the policies and practices that support and perpetuate racism in public schools. However, antiracist leadership operates "within difficult, often punitive contexts" (Brooks et al., 2015, p. 4). Antiracist leaders must understand the importance of restricting their own power within the public education system (Solomon, 2002). A barrier to the restriction of their own power is many school administrators who say they are committed to the idea of antiracism but are limited in moving the idea into practice (Solomon, 2002). Another barrier to the development of antiracist leaders is that educational administrators have "limited theoretical and practical knowledge about antiracism, preference of stability over change, [promote] the maintenance of a positive working relationship with teachers" (Solomon, 2002, p. 179) and are often unaware of their own tunnel vision created by their whiteness.

Antiracism is often "criticized as being a term that is too harsh in Canada because there is a reluctance to acknowledge structural and individual forms of racism, which contradict our image as fair people" (McMahon, 2007, p. 688). In combination with their own personal growth in antiracist theory, practice, and pedagogy, educational administrators "must turn their attention to creating an antiracism environment for their students, teachers, parents, and the communities served by the school" (Solomon, 2002, p. 191). Without a holistic school approach involving the entire school community, "antiracism becomes nothing more than a symbolic gesture" (Solomon, 2002, p. 191). School leaders must be called upon to "establish antiracism as an ethical and moral imperative within their schools and set the expectations that all staff should work towards" (Solomon, 2002, p. 192) their own journeys towards antiracist understandings and pedagogy. School leaders must also take more responsibility to ensure that Indigenous people are well reflected on the teaching and support staffs especially because research literature "has revealed that white, dominant group teachers do not perceive, are not committed to, or embrace antiracism education the way their racial minority colleagues do" (Solomon, 2002, p. 192). Administration hiring and selection procedures are often more about "homosocial reproduction; appointing low risk applicants who [do] not challenge comfort zones or who" (Blackmore, 2006, p. 183) were just like the current administrators in terms of best fit. Educational administration "leadership pipelines that foster well-meaning White educators, without augmenting their experiences with knowledge about the structures of racism, will only continue to" (Knaus, 2014, p. 440) harm Indigenous youth in Canadian public schools. Educational administrators must begin to "approach antiracism with the understanding that interrogating inequities in a culture that sees itself as equitable could be [and should be] a disquieting experience" (Solomon, 2002, p. 194). School leaders need to move away from "trying to manage their school communities in ways that discourage and conceal conflicts and disharmony" as "such a contrived harmony restricts divergent voices" (Solomon, 2002, p. 194).

It is true that antiracist training and teaching approaches have changed lives (Young & Laible, 2000). As Baker (2006)**,** a Métis educator, scholar, and professor in The Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education program (SUNTEP), explains, while antiracism is a difficult, lifelong, ongoing process, "human lives depend on the ability to challenge racism in local communities and across the planet" (p. 103). While the training of antiracist educational administrators will reduce the harm that Indigenous youth face in the public education system, it is not a permanent solution to combat the insidious nature of the institution and its foundational philosophies. Antiracist training for educational administrators functions as an important and necessary reduction in violence, and access to social and material power, in a colonial, genocidal Canadian public education system. If public schools survive, “leaders will [need to] look very different from the way they presently look, both in who leads and what these leaders do” (Elmore, 2000, p. 3). Principals are critical in shaping the culture of schools and “can have a decisive effect on racist and anti-racist practices in their respective schools” (Aveling, 2007, p. 82). However, this can only happen through strong and radical leadership, which is currently practically non-existent.

## Uncomfortable Stories

There will always be waves of educational reform “that seek to alter the substantial structures we have built” (Tyack, 1990, p. 188) but this constant tinkering with school reform will not achieve any genuine or affective status quo disruption or shifts in power. Overcoming the resistance of “those who are vested in ‘the way things are’ requires the development of will to transform schools into the way they ought to be” (Solomon, 2002, p. 193). At the time of the creation of these public state institutions, including public education, “sane, intelligent people believed in alternatives” (Katz, 1976, p. 403). As discussed earlier, the failure at our efforts at reform “reflects the narrowness of our imagination, not the limits of the possible” (Katz, 1976, 403). The intentional and “prolonged institutionalized dependency to which we subject the young today is neither a product of their biology nor their psychology; it is a product of culture and of history” and “yet we reform schools as if the life cycle were immutable” (Katz, 1976, p. 404). It is clear that the colonial public education system and its white educational administrators cannot continue to tinker with the status quo, and must begin to tell more uncomfortable stories

(St. Denis, 2009). As King (2003) reminds us, “the truth about stories is that that’s all we are” (p. 2). The Nigerian storyteller Ben Okri (1997) says that,

> In a fractured age, when cynicism is god, here is a possible heresy: we live by stories, we also live in them. One way or another we are living the stories planted in us early or along the way, or we are also living the stories we planted – knowingly or unknowingly – in ourselves. We live stories that either give our lives meaning or negate it with meaninglessness. If we change the stories we live by, quite possibly we change our lives. (p. 46)

I hope that my thesis can serve as one of these uncomfortable stories, an exploration that has transformed my own journey and that can challenge other white settlers to do the same. Co-resistance in solidarity with Indigenous peoples is the responsibility of white settlers and we can move towards achieving it by working to change our own systems and each other (Irlbacher-Fox, 2012).

# REFERENCES

AbdelRahin, L. (2013). *Wild children-domesticated dreams: Civilization and the birth of education.* Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Anuik, J., & Gillies, C. (2012). Indigenous knowledge in post-secondary educators' practices: Nourishing the learning spirit. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 42*(1), 63-79.

Âpihtawikosisân. (n.d.). From residential schools to the first nations education act, colonialism continues. Retrieved from http://www.idlenomore.ca/_from_residential_schools_to_the_first_nations_education_act_colonialism_continues

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2000). *Post-colonial studies: The key concepts.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Assembly of First Nations. (1998). *Tradition and education: Towards a vision of our future*. Ottawa: Author.

Aveling, N. (2007). Anti-racism in schools: A question of leadership? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*(1), 69-85.

Baker, C. (2006). *Historical racial theories: Ongoing racialization in saskatchewan* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Ball, S. (1995). Intellectuals or technicians? The urgent role of theory in educational studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 43*(3), 255-271.

Barman, J. (1986). Separate and unequal: Indian and white girls at all hallows school, 1884-1920. In J. Barman, Y. Hebert, & D. McCaskill (Eds.), *Indian Education in Canada Volume 1: The Legacy.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to aboriginal knowledge, language, and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 22*(1), 16-27.

Battiste, M. (2000). *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing Limited.

Bear Nicholas, A. (2001). Canada's colonial mission: The great white bird. In K.P. Binda & S. Calliou (Eds.), *Aboriginal education in canada: A study in decolonization* (pp. 9-34). Mississauga, ON: Canadian Educators' Press.

Bell, L., & Stevenson, H. (2006). *Education policy: Process, themes and impact*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bentham, D., Wilson, A., McKenzie, M., & Bradford, L. Sustainability education in first nations schools: A multi-site study and implications for education policy. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 191*, 22-42.

Berkhout, S. J., & Wielemans, W. (1999). Toward understanding education policy: An integrative approach. *Educational Policy, 13*(3), 402-420.

Binda, K. P., & Calliou, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Aboriginal education in canada: A study in decolonization.* Mississauga, ON: Canadian Educators' Press.

Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructing diversity discourses in the field of educational management and leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 34*(2), 181-199.

Burns, G. E. (2001). Finance, equity, and equality: Broken trust in education. In K.P. Binda & S. Calliou (Eds.), *Aboriginal education in canada: A study in decolonization* (pp. 59-75). Mississauga, ON: Canadian Educators' Press.

Brooks, J. S., Knaus, C. B., & Chang, H. (2015). Educational leadership against racism: Challenging policy, pedagogy, and practice. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 17*(1), 1-4.

Calderon, D. (2014). Anticolonial methodologies in education: Embodying land and indigeneity in chicana feminisms. *Journal of Lationo/Latin American Studies, 6*(2), 81-96.

Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Calliou, S. (2001). Introduction: Situating the puppet masters. In K. P. Binda & S. Calliou (Eds.), *Aboriginal education in canada: A study in decolonization* (pp. 59-75). Mississauga, ON: Canadian Educators' Press.

Cambron-McCabe, N. & McCarthy, M. M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy, 19*(1), 201-222.

Canadian Council on Learning. (2007). *Learning links: Lessons in learning – Aboriginal science education.* Retrieved May 11th 2020 from https://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/education/5._2007_redefining_how_success_is_measured_en.pdf

Capper, C. A. (2015). The 20th-year anniversary of critical race theory in education: Implications for leading to eliminate racism. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 51*(5), 791-833.

Capper, C. A., Theoharis, G., & Sebastian, J. (2006). Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *44*(3), 209-224.

Cardinal, H. (1969). *The unjust society: The tragedy of canada's indians*. Edmonton, AB: M. G. Hurtig Ltd.

Carlile, A. (2011). An ethnography of permanent exclusion from school: Revealing and untangling the threads of institutional racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 1-20.

Celoria, D. (2016). The preparation of inclusive social justice educational leaders. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development, 27,* 199-219.

Daschuk, J. (2013). *Clearing the plains: Disease, politics of starvation, and the loss of Aboriginal life.* Regina, SK: University of Regina Press.

Daza, S. L., & Tuck, E. (2014). De/colonizing, (post)(anti)colonial, and indigenous education, studies, and theories. *Educational Studies, 50,* 307-312.

DeMatthews, D. E., Carey, R. L., Olivarez, A., & Saeedi, K. M. (2017). Guilty as charged? Principals' perspectives on disciplinary practices and the racial discipline gap. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*(4), 519-555.

Dhillon, J. (2017). *Prairie Rising.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

DiAngelo, R. (2006). "I'm leaving!": White fragility in racial dialogues. In D. E. Armstrong & B. J. McMahon (Eds.), *Inclusion in Urban Educational Environments: Addressing Issues of diversity, equity, and social justice* (pp. 213-240). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Dua, E., Razack, N., & Warner, J. N. (2005). Race, racism, and empire: Reflections on Canada. *Social Justice*, *32*(4), 1-10.

Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership.* Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute and Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Flint, K. J., & Peim, N. (2012). *Rethinking the education improvement agenda: A critical philosophical approach*. London, UK: Continuum.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975)

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Bergman Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc. (Original work published 1968)

Gebhard, A. (2013). Schools, prisons and aboriginal youth: Making connections. *Journal of Educational Controversy, 7*(1), 1-10.

Gebhard, A. (2017). Reconciliation or racialization? Contemporary discourse about residential schools in the canadian prairies. *Canadian Journal of Education, 40*(1), 1-30.

Gebhard, A. (2018a). Discursive (re)productions of (im)possible students in the canadian prairies. *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 40*(6), 1-30.

Gebhard, A. (2018b). ‘Let’s make a little drum’: Limitations and contradictory effects of cultural approaches in Indigenous education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 21*(6), 757-772.

Gooden, M. A. (2012). What does racism have to do with leadership? Countering the idea of color-blind leadership: A reflection on race and the growing pressures of the urban principalship. *Educational Foundations*, 67-84.

Gooden, M. A., & Dantley, M. (2012). Centering race in a framework for leadership preparation. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 7*(2), 237-253.

Government of Canada. (2014, December 20). *Penitentiaries in canada.* Government of Canada: Correctional Service Canada. Retrieved May 10, 2020, from https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/about-us/006-1006-eng.shtml

Graham, L. J., & Slee, R. (2008). An illusory interiority: Interrogating the discourse/s of inclusion. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 40*(2), 277-293.

Hawthorne, H. B. (Ed.). (1967). *A survey of contemporary indians of canada: Economic, political, educational needs and policies* (Vol. 2). Ottawa, ON: Indian Affairs Branch.

Hunt, S, & Holmes, C. (2015). Everyday decolonization: Living a decolonizing queer politics. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 19*(2), pp. 154-172.

Irlbacher-Fox, S. (2012). #IdleNoMore: Settler responsibility for relationship. Retrieved from Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society. http://decolonization.wordpress.com/2012/12/27/idlenomore-settler-responsibility-forrelationship/

James, R. (2010). Educational administrators' perceptions of racism in diverse school contexts. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 6*(2), 145-164.

Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A. H., & Brooks, J. S. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 4*(1), 1-31.

Karpinski, C. F., & Lugg, C. A. (2006). Social justice and educational administration: Mutually exclusive? *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(3), 278-292.

Katz, M. B. (1976). The origins of public education: A reassessment. *History of Education Quarterly, 16*(4), 381-407.

Keddie, A., Gowlett, C., Mills, M., Monk, S., & Renshaw, P. (2013). Beyond culturalism: Addressing issues of indigenous disadvantage through schooling. *Aust. Educ. Res., 40*, 91-108.

King, T. (2003). *The truth about stories: A native narrative.* Toronto, ON: House of Anansi Press Inc.

King, T. (2012). *The inconvenient indian: A curious account of native people in north america*. Canada: Anchor Canada.

Kirkness, V. J. (1999). Aboriginal education in canada: A retrospective and a prospective. *Journal of American Indian Education, 39*(1), 14-30.

Kirkness, V. & Selkirk Bowman, S. (1992). First nations and schools: Triumphs and struggles. Toronto, ON: Canadian Education Association.

Knaus, C. B. (2014). Seeing what they want to see: Racism and leadership development in urban schools. *Urban Rev, 46*, 420-444.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the remix. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*, 74-84.

Lagerwerff, K. (2016). Prizes as curriculum: How my school gets students to "behave". *Rethinking Schools, 30*(3).

Larocque, E. (1991). Racism runs through Canadian society. In O. McKague (Ed.), *Racism in Canada* (pp. 73-76). Saskatoon: Fifth House Publishers.

Lowman, E.B., & Barker, A.J. (2015). *Settler: Identity and colonialism in 21st century canada.* Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

López, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(1), 68-94.

Lund, D. E. (2006). Addressing multicultural and anti-racist theory and practice within canadian teacher activists. In D. E. Armstrong & B. J. McMahon (Eds.), *Inclusion in Urban Educational Environments: Addressing Issues of diversity, equity, and social justice* (pp. 255-274). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa māori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *MAI Review*, *3*, 1-16.

Margolis, E., Soldatenko, M., Acker, S., & Gair, M. (2001). Peekaboo: Hiding and outing the curriculum. In E. Margolis (Ed.), *The hidden curriculum in higher education* (pp. 1-20). New York, NY: Routledge.

Martin-Sanchez, M. & Flores-Rodriguez, C. (2018). Freedom and obedience in western education. *Journal of Pedagogy, 2*, 55-78.

McDermott, R. (1997). Achieving school failure. In G. D. Spindler (Ed.), *Education and cultural process: Anthropological approaches* (pp. 110-135). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

McLean, S. (2007). *Beyond the pale: Whiteness as innocence in education* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

McLean, S. (2013). The whiteness of green: Racialization and environmental education. *The Canadian Geographer, 57*(3), 354-362.

McLean, S. (2016). *Disturbing praxis: A foucauldian analysis of student subjectivities and classroom pedagogy in public schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

McLean, S. (2018). “We built a life from nothing”: White settler colonialism and the myth of meritocracy. Retrieved from https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2017/12/McLean.pdf

McLean, S., Wilson, A., & Lee, E. (2017). The whiteness of redmen: Indigenous mascots, social media and an antiracist intervention. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems, 27*, 1-16.

McMahon, B. (2007). Educational administrators’ conceptions of whiteness, anti-racism and social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *45*(6), 684-696.

Million, D. (2013). *Therapeutic nations: Healing in an age of indigenous human rights.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

National Indian Brotherhood. (1972). *Indian control of indian education.* Ottawa, ON: Author.

Okri, B. (1997). *A way of being free.* London: Phoenix House.

Pidgeon, M., Muńoz, M., Kirkness, V. J., & Archibald, J. (2013). Indian control of indian education: Reflections and envisioning the next 40 years. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 36*(1), 5-35.

Prentice, A. (2004). *The school promoters: Education and social class in mid-nineteenth century Upper Canada.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Raby, R. (2004). There is no racism in my school, it’s just joking around: Ramifications for anti-racist education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 7(4), 367-384.

Raptis, H., & Bowker, S. (2010). Maintaining the illusion of democracy: Policy-making and aboriginal education in canada, 1946-1948. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 102,* 1-21.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Schick, C., & St. Denis, V. (2003). What makes anti-racist pedagogy in teacher education difficult? Three popular ideological assumptions. *Alberta Journal of Education, 49*(1) 55-69.

Schick, C., & St. Denis, V. (2005). Troubling national discourses in anti-racist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 3,* 295-317.

Schwan, A., & Shapiro, S. (2011). *How to read foucault's discipline and punish*. London, UK: Pluto Press.

Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 558-589.

Smith, L. T. (1998). Towards a new millennium: International issues and projects in indigenous research., *Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research & Development Conference proceedings*, July 1998 (pp. 12-31). Palmerston North: Massey University.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Solomon, R. P. (2002). School leaders and antiracism: Overcoming pedagogical and political obstacles. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*, 174-197.

Solomon, R.P., & Palmer, H. (2006). Black boys through the school-prison pipeline: When "racial profiling" and "zero tolerance" collide. In D. E. Armstrong & B. J. McMahon (Eds.), *Inclusion in Urban Educational Environments: Addressing Issues of diversity, equity, and social justice* (pp. 191-212). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. (1947). *Plan for Liquidating Canada's Indian Problem Within 25 Years* presented by Diamond Jenness. Special Joint Committee, *Minutes, No. 7,* Tuesday March 25, 1947, 310-311.

Spoonley, P. (1995). The challenges of post-colonialism. *Sites*, *30*, 48-69.

Stanley, T. J. (2014). Antiracism without guarantees: A framework for rethinking racisms in schools. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 8*(1), 4-19.

Starblanket, T. (2018). *Suffer the little children: Genocide, indigenous nations and the canadian state.* Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press.

St. Denis, V. (2002). *Exploring the socio-cultural production of aboriginal identities: Implications for education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Stanford University, California.

St. Denis, V. (2009). Rethinking cultural theory in aboriginal education. In C. Levine-Rasky (Ed.), *Canadian perspectives on the sociology of education* (pp. 163-182). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

St. Denis, V. (2010). *A Study of Aboriginal Teachers' Professional Knowledge and Experience in Canadian Public Schools*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Teachers' Federation and Canadian Council on Learning.

St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "There are other children here". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 33*(4), 306-317.

Theoharis, G. (2010). Disrupting injustice: Principals narrate the strategies they use to improve their schools and advance social justice. *Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 331-373.

Theoharis, G. & Haddix, M. (2011). Undermining racism and whiteness ideology: White principals living a commitment to equitable and excellent schools. *Urban Education, 46*(6), 1332-1351.

Thompson, A. (2008). Resisting the “lone hero” stance. In M. Pollock (Ed.), *Everyday anti-racism: Getting real about race in school* (pp. 327-333). New York, NY: The New Press.

Thompson, G. (2010). Acting, accidents and performativity: Challenging the hegemonic good student in secondary schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 31*(4), 413-430.

Tyack, D. (1990). “Restructuring” in historical perspective: Tinkering toward utopia. *Teachers College Record, 92*(2), 170-191.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire’s end.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Woolford, A. (2015). *This benevolent experiment: Indigenous boarding schools, genocide, and redress in canada and the united states.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Young, M. D., & Laible, J. (2000). White racism, antiracism, and school leadership preparation. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*, 374-415.

Zembylas, M., & Iasonos, S. (2010). Leadership styles and multicultural education approaches: An exploration of their relationship. *Leadership in Education, 13*(2), 163-183.