12. Speaking to Water, Singing to Stone
Peter Morin, Rebecca Belmore, and the Ontologies of Indigenous Modernity

The phrase “Indigenous modernity” has sometimes been used to address the postcontact impact of settler-colonial culture on Indigenous peoples. It lays out one of many non-Western histories of modernity that, according to Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, “have arrived not suddenly but slowly . . . awakened by contact, transported through commerce; administered by empires; bearing colonial inscriptions; propelled by nationalism; and now steered by global media, migration and capital. And [they] continue to ‘emerge and arrive,’ as always in opportunistic fragments accompanied by utopian rhetorics, but no longer from the West alone” (1999, 1). Historians of both Western and subaltern forms of modernity, note Gaonkar, have often situated the concept along positive and negative axes, or what he calls “the irresistible but somewhat misleading narrative about the two types of modernities, the good and the bad.” The narrative of “bad” modernity is a narrative of societal modernization characterized by “the emergence and institutionalization of market-driven industrial economies, bureaucratically administered states, modes of popular government, rules of law, mass media, and increased mobility, literacy, and urbanization” (2). Implicit in this societal modernization are colonial ideologies that sought to remake subaltern subjects literate (in English), productive (for the state), and law-abiding (of Western law). While historians of Indigenous and settler-colonial history continue to deconstruct the narrative of “bad modernity” that positions Indigenous peoples as helpless victims (Raibmon 2005; Thrush 2016, among others), much work remains in documenting Indigenous perspectives on the histories
and impacts of colonial modernity, to trace the particularity of these histories across different Indigenous communities across Canada and the United States, and to understand the agency, refusal, and response of Indigenous subjects in such histories.

In contrast with “bad modernity,” Gaonkar characterizes the scholarship of “good modernity” as that which affirms cultural innovation. Here there are “no aesthetic limits that could not be transgressed, no moral norms that could not be subverted. One must explore and experience everything . . . that would spur imagination, quicken sensibilities and deepen feelings” (1999, 2–3). With the rise of Indigenous rap, noise music, opera, and throat boxing, we witness one aspect of what has been called—in this collection and elsewhere—the musics of Indigenous modernity that bring Indigenous story, worldview, and song presented within new contemporary musical forms. Responding to Gaonkar’s call to reconsider such binary narratives of modernity, this chapter critiques the usage of the phrase “Indigenous modernity” in ethnomusicological research as a consistently affirmative marker for contemporary Indigenous musical genres and questions how the rise of the term “Indigenous modernity” has predominantly tended toward Gaonkar’s category of “good modernity.”

The phrase “Indigenous modernity” is often used to periodize or aesthetically categorize contemporary Indigenous practices. The phrase is seldom, if ever, used to examine the ontological or epistemological aspects of Indigenous musical practices. Here we see in operation the same binary principle identified by Kofi Agawu (2003) in scholarship on African music: a separation between music’s function and its aesthetic aspects. Agawu critiques ethnomusicology about African music as reinforcing traditional music’s primary significance as ritual or function (such as in talking-drum practices, for example) instead of its aesthetic. In response to this binary, Agawu proposes that traditional African music should be analyzed using formalist and structural models of analysis, a position that has since been expanded through the work of Michael Tenzer (2006) and challenged by Gabriel Solis (2012).

One could similarly note how analyses of traditional Indigenous music (here using Solis’s expansive and forward-thinking conception of analysis that focuses on interdisciplinary approaches rather than applying Western forms) have been a rare occurrence in ethnomusicological research of the twenty-first century. Solis’s proposal for expanded conceptions of ethnomusicological analysis is important in another sense as a prompt to those who study Indigenous music to reformulate the practice of analysis itself. More particularly, Solis’s work incites us to ques-
tion how Indigenous-centered models of formal and structural analysis might be developed (cf. Avery, in this volume). How might specific principles drawn from Indigenous worldviews develop into what I call “sensory-formalist” models of music analysis (D. Robinson n.d.) and in doing so deconstruct the binaries of form/context and function/aesthetic that continue to underpin scholarship on Indigenous music? Questions pertaining to the development of new forms of Indigenous analysis hold great potential for the future of Indigenous studies and Indigenous sound studies.\(^1\) In particular, given that Indigenous song has the ontological status of “work” or “doing,” it is important to question how formal, structural, and aesthetic analysis proceeds along similar lines of inquiry. Beginning from an examination of how scholarship has to date neglected the ontological significance of contemporary Indigenous music and performance, this chapter contributes to a redefinition of Indigenous sound studies through analysis of the work that Indigenous contemporary sound art does.

A number of contributors to this collection theorize the complexity of Indigenous modernities beyond the conflation, “Indigenous contemporary music equals Indigenous modernity.” Several authors also question whether the term should be employed at all and instead insist on establishing alternative ways to describe how innovation and change take place from the standpoint of Indigenous languages and epistemologies. Despite such reevaluation, writing about Indigenous music and modernity continues to employ the phrase “Indigenous modernity” as a synonym for “contemporary Indigenous music.” One explanation for this use of the phrase to simply describe contemporary Indigenous music might be located in the history of the discipline of ethnomusicology itself. That is, “Indigenous modernity” as a phrase used to describe contemporary Indigenous music arises out of an effort to counter the binary specters of “authenticity” and “tradition” that haunt the Western discourse of ethnomusicological modernity. Using “Indigenous modernity” to describe contemporary Indigenous music effects a certain degree of legitimization that belies a history (and persistent haunting) of the disciplinary denigration of the popular and contemporary. In considering the academic credibility and affective impact (to an academic readership) that the phrase “Indigenous modernities” boldly announces, we must understand its connotations of a temporality that counters “bad modernity”: “Step right up, folks, and see the amazing Indigenous modernities!” Like the circus call that proclaims a promise, the trick behind this illusion is the exceptionality and spectacle of the act that overcomes the negative perception of the

\(^2\)Dylan Robinson
aberrance. If Indigenous modernities is the miracle elixir, an “Indian Sagwa,” then what are we hoping it might cure?

My critical orientation to this phrase is not mutually exclusive of scholarship that seeks to affirm the vitality and diversity of contemporary Indigenous music, and the critical perspective I offer here is not one that intends to criticize others’ acknowledgements of contemporary Indigenous musical practices’ significance and social efficacy. My critique instead asks how we might consider some of the blind spots and spectacle of the phrase that may not follow through on its promise. Yet I am not content to leave behind the potential of this term either, what it “imagines otherwise” (Chuh 2003; Justice 2014, 298). Rather than conceptualizing Indigenous modernity as an aesthetic or genre difference, I argue that in examining Indigenous musical modernities, we must go well beyond merely describing the contemporary aesthetics of Indigenous cultural practices and question when and how ontologies of Indigenous song continue to be articulated, renegotiated, and transformed in contemporary artistic media. To study Indigenous ontologies of expressive practice is to study how those practices and their components (oration, regalia, dance, song, ceremony, storytelling) serve functional purposes other than the equivalent Western forms of artistic expression. Specifically, this chapter’s examination of Indigenous ontologies of music and oration focuses on the ways in which Indigenous songs and speech “do” things beyond their aesthetic function (for contemplation) or communicative function (for conveying information). Understanding ontologies of Indigenous cultural practice requires that we attend to the ways in which such practices achieve, enact, or bring something into being. To illustrate this, I consider how sound art by the Tahltan Nation artist Peter Morin and the Anishinaabe artist Rebecca Belmore have functional efficacy, given their situation in public, non-Indigenous presentation contexts.

SITE SINGING TO THE FOUNDATIONS OF EMPIRE

If asked to imagine the iconic landmarks of London, one might think first of Big Ben, Buckingham Palace, or London Bridge. To visit these sites is to encounter crowds of tourists snapping selfies, preserving the memory of the visit through photos. Much less frequently, however, do we encounter tourists in active conversation with these sites, for example, speaking to Big Ben, telling a joke to the Houses of Parliament, or singing to Buckingham Palace. Selfies are ubiquitous,
but the “singie” has yet to materialize as a phenomenon. Singing to objects, sites, and architectures, though they may not have taken hold among tourist publics, are exactly the kind of public interactions employed by the Tahltan Nation artist Peter Morin in his 2013 series, Cultural Graffiti.

Whereas Morin’s interventions might seem less out of place when considered alongside other musical performance occurring at tourist sites, such as busking or summer festivals, there is an important distinction between these forms of performance and Morin’s work. Unlike the intention of busking to entertain a live audience, Morin’s performances are—like the act of graffiti itself—created under a certain level of concealment. Although they are located in highly public tourist areas, Morin’s acts of cultural graffiti are importantly “hidden in plain sight” or, perhaps, “doubly voiced in open earshot.” The Western ontological understanding of song and the phenomenological framework of listening here act as screens that afford a certain level of privacy between Morin and his intended interlocutors. Though they are certainly present in great numbers at the sites of Morin’s cultural graffiti interventions, the hundreds of selfie-taking tourists are not the primary public to which Morin sings. Instead, in the midst of this crowd, Morin’s public is one more intimate, consisting of ancestors, both British and Indigenous, as well as other-than-human relations.

The cultural graffiti interventions that Morin vocalized across the city of London in June 2013 resulted from an invitation to take part in an artistic residency extended by the Indigeneity in the Contemporary World project at Royal Holloway, University of London. The “counter-monumental” (Young 1993) work that emerged from this residency questioned the assumption that public art must be for the broadest range of viewers (i.e., the general public). Yet these works were not the first of Morin’s work to engage ancestral and other-than-human publics, nor were they the first to imbricate Western and Indigenous forms of public engagement. Morin’s cultural graffiti work developed as part of a long-term exploration of the intersections between contemporary performance art and ceremony in Tahltan and Pacific Northwest First Nations traditions.

Before working with Morin on his Cultural Graffiti performance interventions in London, I had previously worked with him on a project called The Aesthetics of Reconciliation, on the role of the arts in Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) on the Indian Residential Schools. As part of this project, Morin attended several of the TRC national events with a group of Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars. After attending several of these events, Morin created a work in response and an essay that described his experience of the
Speaking to Water, Singing to Stone

TRC and the work he created. Writing about his participation in the TRC national events, Morin conveyed his disjointed experience through the poetics of a list:

Residential School survivors making public testimonies. Residential School Survivors making private testimonies. Residential School survivors sitting in a circle to make testimony with other survivors. town hall meetings. public forums for “our Canadians” to speak to the difficult histories of residential school. didactic panels that share a carefully determined language about this difficult history. linear histories. stand at one end and read your way backwards or forwards. panels to help you to get a better picture.

——

The survivors who give public testimony are projected on large screens for viewers at the back of the room. The event is carefully choreographed, with imagined attendance numbers. Our emotions are also carefully choreographed. Volunteers walk through the aisles with tissue and kind words. Don’t interrupt the live stream broadcast of the testimony.

——

The difficult task is finding actions to activate this space where Indigenous knowledge meets settler ways of being. they are bodies of knowledge that mingle and impact each other. And often their meeting requires yet another meeting. (Morin 2016, 60, 70, 71; lowercased words are in Morin’s original quotations throughout)

Key for Morin in attending the TRC events was a decided lack of ways to share his thoughts and experiences outside of the sanctioned spaces of the TRC and its predetermined forums of testimony taking. As Morin notes, different spaces for testimony included private, community-supported, and public forums, town-hall gatherings to address a largely settler public, church areas to speak with members of the churches, and even a talent show open to anyone willing (and confident enough) to take the stage. Yet, despite these various spaces, there were few culturally specific forums for sharing experiences and for spending time exclusively with the larger Indigenous community. The space that perhaps came the closest to a culturally specific forum was the talent show. Yet even this took
place within a Western performer-audience dialectic on stages where survivors and intergenerational survivors shared their work in the venues’ cavernous atmospheres. Although there were numerous performances by Indigenous musicians, singers, and artists, throughout the TRC’s spaces not limited to the talent show, there were few instances of space dedicated for nation-specific forms of community gathering.

Similarly, as expressed by Morin, the format of the expressions of reconciliation sessions largely precluded other forms of contribution, for instance, singing to the Bentwood box, as he had hoped he might do upon attending the TRC for the first time at the Victoria Regional Event. These formats, as Morin notes, fit Indigenous experience into a series of “gathering spaces, spaces that divide up intention and accessibility. This division also effectively splits up time. Scheduled events are taking place throughout these separate locations simultaneously. This results in a disjointed experience, a broken connection with the events of the day(s).” Rather than engendering complementary relationships among its constituent parts, the TRC’s segmentation of truth and time-tableing of reconciliation prescribed a decidedly non-Indigenous epistemological framework that to a large degree disallowed Indigenous practices of visiting and culturally specific formats and protocols for engagement. In such an environment, notes Morin, “My truth and reconciliation is not invited. It feels like my truth and reconciliation is not invited to the party” (2016, 70).

Motivated by this fact, for the final meeting of the Aesthetics of Reconciliation project at the Montreal TRC event in April 2013, Morin was commissioned to create a new work that would reflect on the TRC events he had attended over three years. His response to the range of testimony he witnessed at the TRC was a two-part, two-evening long work titled this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land. The first evening of this work was a multiact performance involving videos contributed by numerous Indigenous and ally artists, as well as new regalia, dances, and oration in a contemporary potlatch, where the components of the ceremony were replaced by a range of artistic contributions from honored contributors. Drawing on the form of potlatch, our research team assembled in the performance area as honored witnesses (figure 12.1). Describing the role of witnesses within potlatch ceremony, Morin notes that “witnesses are selected to act as the memory of the event. they watch, record, document, and perform the order of events. these witnesses become living memories of the potlatch. . . . we were holding something like a potlatch. we were invited to become living memories of the events” (Morin 2016, 76).
On the second evening the work unfolded in the form of a dance. This dance, however, was not a dance performance for an audience but a dance where everyone present was invited to participate for a specific aim. Its explicit intention was to give strength to the TRC commissioners as they continued to hear hundreds of stories from Residential School survivors about the various forms of abuse they endured while attending Residential School. In creating this two-part, two-evening performance, Morin describes his objective of continuing tradition by hosting a contemporary (art) potlatch involving settler-ally participants and Indigenous artists from across Canada who contributed video oratories, new regalia, and new dances to tell this part of the shared history of Residential Schools and to contribute to a stronger future:

a new ceremony. a new dance to address a current historical trauma. much like a dance to remember small pox. or a mask that remembers death. thinking about the commissioners of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. thinking about the work that is required of them. thinking about how to keep them strong. I offer this work. this dance. this remembrance. to them. to their work. to keep them strong. because we need them. we need them to finish strong. we need them to look at these stories and tell us their opinion. we need this

12.1. *this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land*, August 2013.
Photo by Dylan Robinson. Used by permission.
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because it helps us to see the next steps. I honour them and their work. and I
ask ahdighi denetia to keep them safe. (Morin 2016, 89)

This work, like other pieces in Morin’s extensive artistic output, emphasized
creating new traditions that bring together popular culture and contemporary
artistic practices with Tahltan-specific ceremony, song, and regalia. During the
second evening Morin used a dance remix by Calvin Harris featuring Florence
and the Machine singing “Sweet Nothing.” With its repeated chorus, “You’re
giving me such sweet nothing,” Morin noted that it was “a perfect song to sing to
colonization. a perfect song to dance to” (Morin 2016, 88).

As is the case for many First Nations peoples of the Pacific Northwest, the work
that we do in our longhouses and big houses have important functions and is in
most cases not carried out primarily through an epistemology of performance
(and spectating) that is for an audience’s aesthetic contemplation. The function
of song—what Gary Tomlinson (2009) in reference to the Aztec cantares has
called “songwork”—operates in numerous ways that include reaffirming rights
and privileges of families and individuals, documenting important changes in-
cluding marriages and the transfer of rights and privileges, healing, documenting
history and rights to territory, and conveying knowledge about the lands of which
Indigenous people are caretakers. These functions are what many Northwest
cost First Nations communities call the “business” of longhouse gathering. In
Morin’s ceremony, during the second evening of this is what happens when we
perform the memory of the land, we danced to acknowledge the magnitude of
the work that the TRC commissioners had undertaken in listening to thousands
of survivors but also to help give them strength and support them in finishing
their work over the remaining two years, when the commission concluded in
the summer of 2015 and the findings were reported (TRC 2015a). Our work, as
dancers, here served a function other than as an aesthetic object of spectatorship.
Our work that evening was for the commissioners.

ANCESTRAL AND OTHER-THAN-HUMAN PUBLICS

Like Morin’s this is what happens when we perform the memory of the land, the
work that resulted from Morin’s London residency in 2013 was not, in the first
instance, a performance directed to a physically present audience. Although
tourists and members of the British public were present in large numbers at the
sites where Morin sang, his intended public was one of ancestors and other-than-
human relations. For example, in visiting Buckingham Palace, Morin spoke to directly to British ancestors who effected colonization. Morin describes speaking and singing to these ancestors:

buckingham palace. thousands of people. set up the blanket. put on your armour. sing the song. the song that is a tahltan river rushing inside of me. the drum speaks. it says “this drum supports indigenous voice.” the drum beats are bullets. does anyone know this? (only me). sing the song. fall down and sing the song into the land. drum and sing around the monument. overheard conversations: 1. i think he thinks he’s an indian, 2. shhh. this is an indigenous performance.

walk up to the gate. wearing the amour. use your voice to write on the gate. the words “we are still here. we remain. we are still vibrant. you did not fucking win anything. today. you lose everything.” (Morin, email corr., July 19, 2013)

In creating Cultural Graffiti, Morin visited two different kinds of sites over the course of several weeks in June. The first set of sites were British landmarks, many of them the support structures of colonial power and monarchy. These monuments, as Morin states, “cement colonial history, and are foundational to that history. . . . They reinforce it” (Peter Morin and Dylan Robinson, interview, Royal Holloway, University of London, May 23, 2013). The landmarks Morin tagged with song included the Houses of Parliament and Big Ben, the Magna Carta monument, the Tower of London, Buckingham Palace, the Canada Gate at Buckingham Palace, the memorial to Princess Diana in Hyde Park, and a statue of Queen Victoria at Royal Holloway, University of London (figures 12.2 and 12.3).

As is apparent in these images, Morin sang to the foundations of former empire quite literally by singing to the physical foundations of the statues and structures. In an interview with Morin following these interventions, he describes his relationships to these works, including the statue of Queen Victoria:

A lot of Indigenous communities believe that the artwork is alive; that the creation or production of artwork is imbibing it with a spiritual existence. So in some respects there is a little bit of Victoria’s spirit in that statue. And so coming into contact with it, engaging it from that knowledge production framework, it becomes quite serious . . . and a little bit overwhelming. And so these interactions have been about singing Tahltan Nation songs—cultural knowledge—singing those songs into the stones; understanding that the stones are alive, they are the ancestor peoples. And so part of the work is
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12.2. Peter Morin singing to the pavement at Buckingham Palace, August 2013.
Photo by Dylan Robinson. Used by permission.

12.3. Peter Morin walking away after speaking and singing into the Canada Gate of Buckingham Palace, August 2013. Photo by Dylan Robinson. Used by permission.
singing directly and saying directly to the spirit of Victoria for example “we are alive, we remain, we are vibrant, you did not win.” And leaving these acts as . . . I’m trying to frame them as cultural graffiti. But the act is going inside of the monument, inside of the stone . . . trying to enact direct challenge to the colonial power. (Morin and Robinson, interview)

Using his voice to tag these sites of colonial power, Morin asserted cultural resilience by singing what is commonly referred to as the “Tahltan national anthem” composed by Beal Carlick. In doing so, Morin also participated within the habitual sonic framework of public culture at these sites where the British national anthem is commonly heard. Some interventions also concluded with Morin declaring, “We are still here,” to those British ancestors who took part in the colonization of Indigenous lands and waterways now known as Canada. In contrast with his visits to British landmarks, Morin visited a second set of sites in which he used a different strategy of song intervention. These visits focused on lesser-known Indigenous monuments and sites of Indigenous presence in London and included Pocahontas’s gravesite in Gravesend and Kwakwaka’wakw carver Mungo Martin’s totem pole at Great Windsor Park.

In a subsequent visit to London in October 2013 Morin staged a related intervention (related to this set of performances but taking place in a subsequent visit to London in October 2013) inside and outside of St. Olave’s Church, where the first captured infant from the Americas was buried. In 1577 Martin Frobisher took captive an Inuit man, woman, and infant from Baffin Island. Whereas the man and woman died shortly after arriving in Bristol, the infant was taken to London, where Queen Elizabeth I was keen to claim him as a royal subject. In considering this history, Morin saw connections with the much longer history of First Nations children being taken from their families to Indian Residential Schools. After much conversation and attempted negotiation between Morin, myself, and an increasingly anxious Anglican minister at St. Olave’s, Morin asked the minister, “What would you allow us to do in the church in order to honor this child?” The minister responded, “You are welcome to have a ceremony in your head.”

Rather than considering this defeat, Morin responded to the minister’s steadfast refusal of all “pagan” as well as all artistic proposals to honor the child by creating a silent ceremony. For this intervention Morin gathered together a small group of people to honor the captured infant, beginning with a procession toward St. Olave’s Church. Morin led the way, silently drumming, allowing each
beat of his drum stick to stop just before it hit the drum. Yet as we walked, these visual beats carried just as much resonance, if not more, than if they were aurally present, perhaps because of their sonic censorship. Morin asked us to follow behind him and take turns singing or speaking messages for the infant into a jar of devil’s club tea. This act, although again nearly silencing our songs and messages, had an even more palpable resonance individually as our voices filled the jar. Before we individually entered the church, Morin asked that we each bring some of the devil’s club tea into the church, take a moment to remember this child or “have a silent ceremony in our head,” and then leave the tea somewhere in the church. To conclude the performance Morin took the remaining tea and washed the exterior wall of the church with it. The entirety of this action took place in silence, yet the sensory resonance was palpable.

Morin’s written response on Facebook, postperformance, shared our work with members of the Tahltan community and Indigenous arts communities and was reshared widely by other networks of the small group who participated. Morin described the work we undertook that day as part of what I consider a “Facebook oratory”:

today. singing. singing to this baby. remembering this inuit baby. remembering and respecting all of our stolen babies. sitting in silence in the church. holding the medicine of our land. an important collaborator. seeing the baby. holding the baby. reminding the baby we have not forgotten. we do not forget. we love you. we are holding you. crying. laughing. dancing. heart singing. heart drum beats. holding medicine. we are working together. thank you to all of our collaborators. here in london. and there on the land. thank you medicine. you are a powerful force. and then. washing the church with our medicine tea. the words. even a buried heart is still a beating heart. thank you all for helping to remember this still a beating heart. (Morin, Facebook post, October 31, 2013)

This Facebook oratory offered a different way for the larger Indigenous community to witness the interventions that we enacted. In response to his intervention at St. Olave’s one woman noted “every time I hold my daughter when she cries . . . I think of all the ancestor moms who got that chance taken from them. . . . So your post and the event hit home” (Facebook comment, October 31, 2013).

In each of these interventions, Morin enacts a form of Indigenous nation-to-nation contact with ancestors, while his Facebook oratories communicate this work across larger Indigenous communities in which Morin is a part. Whereas
the phrase “nation-to-nation” has become commonplace as a way to assert the necessity for sovereign forms of dialogue between the government of Canada and First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples across the country, it is equally important to remember our longer history of nation-to-nation relationships, negotiations, and solidarities between Indigenous peoples. Building on contemporary protocols of acknowledgment, Morin’s interventions constituted forms of visiting. In our visits he extended a similar Indigenous ethics of care we have for ceremonial objects, drums, and other-than-human relations toward the sites of Indigenous presence in London. Yet this ethics of care was not for the site itself, nor was it for the public who happened to be physically present. Rather, Morin’s interlocutors in these visit-interventions were our ancestors. Although he repeated the same phrases—“we are still here” and “we have not forgotten”—as he did at colonial monuments, the meaning of these phrases differed. Instead of declaring survival, when visiting Indigenous ancestors Morin intended the phrases to provide comfort. We were visiting with kin, reassuring our ancestors that “we are still here. We have not forgotten you. You are not alone, though you may be far from home.” Morin described our visit to Pocahontas’s gravesite at Gravesend, for example, as a visit to “our aunty.” In these instances of visiting with Indigenous ancestors, we approached the site through a nation-to-nation politics of care and solidarity of responsibility that did not differentiate between visiting kin at home in our communities and visiting abroad.

AYUMEE AAWACH OOMAMA MOWAN ON TORONTO ISLAND: NOT SPEAKING TO OUR MOTHER:

As a precursor to Morin’s work, Rebecca Belmore’s Ayumee aawach Oomama mowan: Speaking to Their Mother (1991) demonstrates another instance of speaking to place and form of care. Created by Belmore during a residency at the Banff Centre for the Arts, the central object in the work is a large ten-by-twelve-foot wooden megaphone that contains a working megaphone inside it. Over its long history of use, Speaking to Their Mother has traveled to a diverse range of locations and allowed participants to speak to Indigenous lands, to the Canadian Parliament buildings, and to Group of Seven landscape paintings at the Art Gallery of Ontario from 2003 through 2005. Far from being an object confined to gallery display, “the megaphone,” as it is often called, is what activates community (figure 12.4). As Belmore notes, “it doesn’t belong to me, it belongs to the people, it belongs to the earth. It came from the earth, it was made of materials
12.4. *Ayumee aawach Oomama mowan*: Speaking to Their Mother, the megaphone pointing toward the city of Toronto and the CN Tower, August 2014.

Photo by Dylan Robinson. Used by permission.
form the earth . . . so I feel it’s not mine, it belongs to people, and it belongs to
the human voice to speak out to mother earth to talk about her and talk to her”
(Beaucage 1992).

In 1992 Belmore brought the work to the Protectors of Mother Earth Wiggins
Bay Blockade in Northern Saskatchewan for three days, where people spoke to
the land in Cree and, more specifically, to a recent clear-cut that had occurred
there. As Belmore describes, although her original idea for the work was to
direct it toward the Canadian government and aim it toward Parliament Hill, it
eventually transformed into a tool for affirming the voices of Indigenous com-
munities: “Instead of aiming it at the government, and taking it and aiming it
at that building or at those people, I wanted to instead take it out to the people,
to native people, and turn it towards the land so the people could speak to our
mother, to the earth, and feel very positive about speaking out and not be afraid
to speak out” (Beaucage 1992).

In August 2014 Singing to Their Mother was situated at Gibraltar Point on
Toronto Island. Many Torontonians consider the island, only a twenty-minute
ferry ride from downtown Toronto, to be their refuge from the city. The island
is also home to an amusement park, nude beaches, a tourist area, and Billy
Bishop Airport, to which many Toronto Island residents fiercely but by and large
unsuccessfully opposed plans for expansion. Toronto Island has also been a site
for cruising in the queer community. For Belmore’s purposes, Gibraltar Point,
an area somewhat sheltered from the airport and amusement park, offered a
clear vista of the city of Toronto and Lake Ontario, to which she spoke with the
following oration:

Boozhoo, Ahnee, Tansi.
Boozhoo.
Boozhoo, Ahnee, Tansi.
Hello, good people of greater Toronto.
How are you?
Toronto, I’m talking to you.
Hello.
Hello, Good people of greater Toronto.
How many people are you?
How many people are you?
How much water do you have?
How much land do you own?
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How much water do you have?
How much land do you need?
How much water do you need?
How much land do you want!?

In addition to Belmore’s oration, a small number of others spoke that day, including myself, the Anishinaabe curator Wanda Nanibush, the Mohawk curator Ryan Rice, and settler-musicologist Patrick Nickleson, among several others (figure 12.5). With our voices aimed at Lake Ontario as well as Toronto’s iconic skyline, we voiced our concern about water pollution; about our relationships to the rivers, lakes, and oceans in our home territories; and about drinking water from our territories and becoming ill. I spoke about the theft of 265 million liters of water taken from S’olh Temexw (Stó:lo territory) by Nestlé to turn into bottled water. Yet despite these important messages, what struck me most significantly was the lack of voices speaking. When Belmore first toured the work in 1992, she noted that “people readily embraced the idea of speaking directly to the earth through this strange object that had come to them” (Belmore and Nanibush 2014). In a conversation at the Toronto Island gathering, Belmore noted also that in many of these community contexts, speakers often followed one after the other, immediately picking up where the last speaker had left off (pers. comm., Gibralter Point, Toronto Island, August 9, 2014). Yet this sense of oratorical fluidity was far from the case that day in August on Toronto Island.

There were resounding silences between speakers, despite the fact that many had gathered to watch, from young art students to tourists trying to figure out what was taking place. Despite the large number of bodies, the few voices who chose to rise to the occasion of speaking was notable. In contrast to Belmore’s desire for the megaphone to engender the feeling of “not being afraid to speak out” (Beaucage 1992), I wondered whether this particular group on Toronto Island—as more spectators than active orators—felt afraid to speak or perhaps even apathetic. Describing her own first experience of speaking to the earth, Belmore notes, “I first spoke through it, when I spoke through it in Banff, and it echoed off the mountains and all over the place and it was my voice, I could hear my voice way over there separated from my body and bouncing off and echoing off mother earth, the land, I felt that ‘wow’! I felt really humble. I felt so small . . . and I felt my place as a human being as part of the land and part of her but also I felt really strong at the same time. . . . It made me feel really good, it made me feel . . . like I belong here” (Beaucage 1992).
That day on Toronto Island our voices seemed to neither resound nor reverberate. Rather than hearing an echo from the city of Toronto itself, our voices seemed to be swallowed up by the sound of the tourist water taxis and ferry and by the flights arriving and departing from Billy Bishop Airport. According to the Cree-Métis singer and artist Cheryl L’Hirondelle, her participation in a previous Speaking to Their Mother gathering at the Banff Centre engendered a sense of feeling the strength of community belonging (pers. comm., February 19, 2015). The impact of such a feeling must not be understated in light of the intergenerational legacies of Indian Residential Schools and resultant shame and lack of belonging many Indigenous peoples feel within their communities. Compared to Belmore’s experience of feeling her place as part of the land, the silence of speakers on Toronto Island points toward the lack of community constituted by itinerant tourists and art students alike but perhaps also illuminates their disconnection from place in addition to the foreignness of speaking to place as a relation. Importantly, in contrast to Belmore’s experience of belonging, perhaps it also made some of those who spoke feel that we did not belong there. As part of the xwelmexw diaspora—that is, as a person of Stó:lō descent who is a guest in the territory of the Wendat, Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee, and the New Credit
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Mississauga—speaking to a land that is not my own, Ayumee aawach Oomama mowan provides recognition of the fact that I have a responsibility to take part not just in learning about the lands on which I am a guest but speaking with those communities when I am asked to stand with them in opposing the ongoing resource extraction and destruction of their lands and waterways.

**SONG, ORATORY, AND INDIGENOUS MODERNITY**

In an interview with Wanda Nanibush, Belmore explained, “My strategy was simple, bring a conceptual artwork in the form of a functional tool to the people and ask them to speak directly to the issue, to the land itself, as we have always done” (Belmore and Nanibush 2014). The phrase “as we have always done” is particularly apposite for considering the ways by which Belmore’s and Morin’s actions are part of a continuum of tradition. In each of their interventions, song and oration are not merely aesthetic; they operate within a performative tradition that Western theory would call “speech acts.” In the case of Morin and Belmore, we might more accurately name these “song acts” and “oratory acts.” As song acts and oratory acts, they continue the work that our songs and oratory do in ceremonial contexts—they communicate with our ancestors, honor our families, and affirm sovereign rights. While our nations struggle in Western courts of law to assert our traditional, ancestral, and inalienable rights to land and water across the country, artists like Morin and Belmore are asserting such rights in a nation-to-nation context as we always have: through Indigenous protocols of song and oration.

Indigenous hip-hop, rap, opera, throat boxing, country, and noise music assert the vibrancy of our cultures on a continuum with Indigenous tradition rather than a break from it. These contemporary genres carry our cultural knowledge into the present, as does throat singing or Cree hunting songs. As scholars who study contemporary Indigenous musical genres, we are more able to recognize this continuum of cultural practice rather than categorize new genres as subsidiary to older expressions of Indigenous cultural practice. Yet we must also recognize the ways in which contemporary Indigenous performance is on a continuum not only with older aesthetics of cultural practice but with the epistemologies of doing that these traditions enact. What would it mean to understand the function of contemporary Indigenous song not simply as aesthetic, but as doing something or bringing something into being through its performance or utterance? Recognizing this fact is to reframe our ontological understanding
of song and speech. When does Musqueam hip-hop, for example, not merely narrate our connection to land but act as an expression of sovereignty for the lands we have always cared for? When does Mohawk Classical music not only aestheticize history but serve as primary historical documentation, as precisely and rigorously as we consider our written research? When does Stó:lō rap not merely describe (re)conciliation but enact treaty? Importantly, these are not merely the questions I pose for the purposes of this chapter but also the questions First Peoples must now address within our own communities as we continue to innovate practices of what I call sensate sovereignty. While legal processes that seek to uphold Indigenous sovereign rights are appeals for political recognition in the eyes of the state, argued for on the terms of the state, such processes in many ways run counter to those cultural practices of sensate sovereignty, which is constituted by forms of doing in Indigenous cultural traditions—the materiality of wampum belt exchange and the singing of land rights (*Delgamuukw versus the Queen*).

Éy kws hákw'elset te ší:wes te siyolexwálh—it’s good to remember the teachings of our elders’ past. Remembering here is not a form of nostalgia but rather an action of making our traditions present across a range of contemporary forms. By doing so, we also continue the structural logics of our traditions and their power to do things in the world. Morin’s and Belmore’s sound art enacts healing for those not physically present, vocalizes sovereignty, and provides necessary forums for Indigenous peoples to aurally affirm kinship with other-than-human relations.
13. Purposefully Reflecting on Tradition and Modernity

The binary of modernity and tradition is underpinned by assumptions that are particularly problematic in relation to Indigenous expressive culture. The two terms are sometimes discussed in Indigenous contexts, as I illustrate initially by describing one event in a Sámi community in Norway. Extending out from this description are references to scholars who write about the colonialist construction of the terms. In particular, I discuss the “thingness” problem in relation to tradition. The dynamism and adaptability of Indigenous expressive practices, as I have encountered them, disrupt the static concept of “things” and imply an action-oriented definition. The purposeful action orientation of Indigenous tradition, in turn, leads me to think further about the social aims of ethnomusicologists’ practices. Building on Ana María Ochoa Gautier’s (2014) compelling analysis of the ways sound—and listening to Indigeneity in particular—is implicated in the settler definition of modernity, I focus on practices of listening. I reflect on the colonial readings of aurality that Ochoa Gautier observes and listening strategies of Indigenous interlocutors in hopes of extending conversations in our discipline about how we might contribute to more ethical and decolonized research.

A COMMUNITY CONVERSATION ABOUT INDIGENOUS MODERNITY

The first time I recall hearing the phrase “Indigenous modernity” in an Indigenous community was about fifteen years ago, in a seminar offered in a Sámi lavvu (conical tent) prior to a Riddu Riddu festival in Kåfjord, Norway—one of the
major celebrations of global Indigenous expressive culture in the world. Seated in this most traditional of dwellings, we first listened to the anthropologist Arild Hovland speaking on “Modern Indigenous People.” At the time I thought the “modern Indigenous” juxtaposition offered a fresh perspective on a binary that had so often conceptualized modernity as characterized by rupture, newness, flux, and mobility in opposition to the rootedness and supposed unchanging authenticity of the Indigenous. Most attendees seemed to embrace the modern Indigenous designation as an obvious descriptor of their lives, but there was discussion among this mostly Sámi audience about the terms of reference.

Some Sámi questioned the priorities of keeping tradition or using it—both entirely compatible with being modern Indigenous people but suggesting different strategies in their struggle for resource rights, for example. Some saw these divergent perspectives as differently embodied and place related. Language and traditional culture are vibrant and strong in the community of Kautokeino, but what about Sámi in New York, asked one individual. The comment was implicitly a challenge to the fixity of place that is so often ascribed to Indigenous people (Burton 2012, 492). “Sámi in New York” implied that geographies of circulation must be considered (J. Robinson 2013, 662). There was debate about hybridity and plurality (adopting, borrowing, or inventing new technologies, social practices, or expressive forms), which some saw as a defining feature of the modern, but others described as a negative feeling (perhaps sensing a loss of older cultural knowledge or maybe worrying about authenticity). The anthropologist Elizabeth Povinelli locates such negative feeling in what she describes as the “cunning of recognition” (2002) in relation to Aboriginal Australia in an analysis widely applicable in other Indigenous contexts: “To be truly Aboriginal, Aboriginal persons must not just occupy a place in a semiotically determined social space; they must also identify with, desire to communicate (convey in words, practices, and feelings), and, to some satisfactory degree, lament the loss of the ancient customs that defined their difference” (1999, 28). Further, she notes that because nobody inhabits these invented social spaces, “a present-tense indigenousness in which failure is not a qualifying condition is discursively and materially impossible” (29). Expectations of cultural continuity have long worked against the creation of histories of change within Indigenous society. At the same time, settler cultures—particularly in the twentieth century—have often appropriated Indigenous expressive culture to give new life to modernist art, literature, and music.

The cultural and political were explicitly linked at the Kåfjord gathering. The
conversation gravitated toward events since the Alta River crisis of 1979–80, when Sámi communities as well as reindeer habitats and migration routes were about to be flooded by a new Norwegian dam, when Sámi activists camped out in Oslo explaining their concerns to passersby and seeking support for their land and human rights. The protests did not prevent the dam construction but did generate considerable public support and led to a renaissance of cultural production and political change (Hilder 2015; B. Diamond 2007). At the Riddu Riddu gathering twenty-five years later, Sámi reflected on how this important historical juncture demonstrated another instance of false logic that Povinelli has also articulated: settlers often assume they possess land, whereas Aboriginal people are sometimes thought only to “need access for hunting and fishing and ceremony” (2002, 26). In the case of the Alta River, both access and living space were constrained by the building of the dam.

One Sámi political leader noted that people who have a literature in their own language (including written creations but also audio recordings, theater, dance, and other public performance) cannot be made invisible. Indigenous media in decolonization initiatives, then, were known to be critical. At this point Sapmi Indigenous theater was thriving and Sámi-run publishing and recording companies were (and still are) actively creating (missing) histories of cultural and social change.

A day or two later at the opening of the festival, another problem of modernity was referenced when the emcee noted that all introductions and announcements from the main stage would be made in Sámi, Norwegian, Tuvan (Tuvan musicians were special guests at this particular festival), and the “world’s most widely spoken language—broken English.” In this lighthearted manner, the necessity for English (a third, fourth, or fifth language for many Sámi but clearly a facility they had acquired in a cosmopolitan world) stood in for the connected histories of imperialism and colonialism about which many have written. I was reminded of Jodi Byrd’s invocation of Said’s contrapuntal reading, a reference to a musical practice that was certainly Euro-centered and governed: “As a musical form, counterpoint emphasizes dependent lines that exist relationally with rules to resolve harmoniously; and though counterpoint can entail secondary lines independent of the first, original line, counterpoint always relies on tension with the original melody to determine its existence and options” (2011, 93).

English is the “tonality” that governs many forms and contexts of communication. But, equally, I thought of Sámi comparative-literature scholar Harald Gaski’s discussions of joik texts, which cannot be fully understood without deep
local knowledge of individuals, places, and Sámi cultural practices. Gaski sees such knowledge as a mode of resistance to colonization, “where a subtle use of double meaning in the joik poetry made it possible to communicate on two levels at the same time, so that one type of message was conveyed to a Sami audience and quite a different one to outsiders” (2000, 196). Were the translations from the festival stage into Norwegian, Tuvan, and “broken English” more like tonal counterpoint or double meanings of joik texts, I wondered?

PROBLEMATIZING MODERNITY IN ETHNOMUSICOCOLOGY AND INDIGENOUS STUDIES

Scholarly attention to artistic Indigenous creation in what some might regard as modern genres or hybrid ones has a long history in North America. Prior to the late twentieth century, however, the impact of colonialism was often referenced generally and vaguely in ethnomusicological work. Politically aware interpretive strategies began to appear with the flourishing of postcolonialism, a particularly egregious term given the inequities that persist in Indigenous communities. By the 1990s scholars in all fields were aware of alternative modernities. In an influential, special-topics volume of *Public Culture* devoted to this theme, Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar urges us to “revise the distinction between societal modernization and cultural modernity.” He defines the former to include “the growth of scientific consciousness, the development of a secular outlook, the doctrine of progress, the primacy of instrumental rationality, the fact-value split, individualistic understandings of the self, contractualist understandings of society and so on.” He deems societal modernization acceptable, whereas he sees cultural modernization (centered on avant-garde artistic creation) as destructive with its “pretensions, complacencies, and hypocrisies” (1999, 2). I cringe at both definitions. Whose science, whose belief systems, and whose progress? Why privilege individual over community rights? More useful, however, is Gaonkar’s proposal to redefine modernity as an attitude rather than an epoch: to see modernities (plural) as multiple site-based questionings of the present (13–16), believing that “one can provincialize Western modernity only by thinking through and thinking against its self-understandings which are frequently cast in universalist idioms” (14). From an Indigenous-studies vantage, however, the broad term Western instead of settler is problematic since the Indigenous Americas are part of the Western sphere geographically, historically, and culturally. Bruno Latour (1993) had similarly argued that modernity was invented to distinguish the West—with
its particular brand of post-Enlightenment rationality, science, and law—from
the rest to instantiate hierarchies that relegated Indigenous cultures to premodern
status. Ochoa Gautier, however, describes how the colonial interactions of settler
and Indigenous people were mutually constituting in the creation of modernity
in the Americas. The aural was implicated in distinctions between human (clear
pitched and inscribable) and nonhuman sounds, in the “lettered city” (2014,
145) and in the identification of certain genres of non-Indigenous song with the
nationalist project in colonial Colombia. “Orality,” Ochoa Gautier writes, “was
not what, in the late nineteenth century, named the multiplicity and singularity
of divergent vocalities but rather what disciplined the production and perception
of the human voice” (167).

In the twenty-first century both settler and Indigenous intellectual leaders
often embrace the language of traditional knowledge, traditional Indigenous
knowledge, and traditional ecological knowledge. But the modern-traditional
binary is troubled by different configurations of temporality. Both elders and
scholars in various disciplines have discussed the recursivity and circularity of
Indigenous constructs of history (Nabokov 2002; B. Diamond 2013). Haundeno-
saunee composer and ethnomusicologist Dawn Avery (2012) has described the
Mohawk concept of non:wa, a “now” that encompasses both past and present.
The awareness of coexisting times, however, is not exclusively an Indigenous
ontology. British urban geographer Jennifer Robinson, for instance, writes about
the cotemporality of pasts, presents, and futures in cities. She advocates shift-
ing focus from the new to a now that includes “the conditions of possibilities
of emergence, and . . . the range of interconnections that produce [a city]—his-
torically and geographically” (2013, 663). Similarly, the literary theorist Mieke
Bal (2004) explores how different historical moments may be recast by means
of socially differentiated artistic genres that retain traces of the past. She recalls
childhood memories of the racist, black-face tradition of Zwarte Piet (Black
Peter) in the Netherlands, while studying portraits that draw on upper-class
modes of presentation for the Zwarte Piet actors. She demonstrates how dia-
logue about race and class can emerge in the temporal and social disjunctures of
these representations. Whereas literature or urban geography seem a long way
from ethnomusicology or Indigenous studies, such temporal reorientations are
fruitfully congruent. Although the teleology that defined modernity is disrupted
by rethinking temporality, the term tradition, which has been widely embraced
in Indigenous studies, often retains connotations of the past. I propose some
reasons for this in the next section.
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THE THINGNESS PROBLEM OF TRADITION

Modernity has been theorized more than tradition, but the latter has often taken a harder beating. In an anthology addressing the intellectual trajectory of the term, Mark Phillips and Gordon Schochet (2004) point to the dominance of authenticity issues and the influence of Eric Hobsbawm and Terence O. Ranger’s (1983) invented tradition concept in the humanities and social sciences. They describe tradition as a “residual” term that “for scholarly purposes at least we need no longer (or perhaps can no longer) speak of . . . except in tones of irony” (2004, 4). Arguments for the continuing relevance of tradition have sometimes been harshly dismissed as socially damaging; Arjun Appadurai (1996), for instance, critiques the black box of primordialism, a term he equates with recent antimodernism movements (many challenging the governance of the nation-state and asserting various fundamentalisms, often in violent ways) that claim rights rooted in a place and body of knowledge by which one lives.

A problem with regarding tradition either as invented or authentic, or as antimodern, however, lies in the assumption of its “thingness,” its inevitable casting as a noun in English rather than a verb. There is no “traditionize” to parallel “modernize.” I’m not suggesting there should be. Rather, I draw attention to what seems obvious in Indigenous contexts: that enactments of tradition are active, purposeful interactions among humans, other beings, and environments. Action-oriented ways of being that many people label traditional actually imply a dismantling of the problematic modern/traditional binary altogether. Indeed, Indigenous values underpinning customs, rituals, lifeways, stories, creative expression, or beliefs aim to manage relationships, social change, divergent perspectives, and conflict. In other words, the why of Indigenous tradition, rather than the what, is arguably more relevant to a global future than the why of modernity.

A purpose approach to Indigenous tradition easily accommodates a dynamic range of practices—some innovative or adaptive, others drawing on given repertoires and lifeways. In some cases, of course, traditional Indigenous processes require precise specialized knowledge that is replicated exactly, with care, by those charged with responsibility for that knowledge. As we consider how to bring peace to a currently unstable world, it is essential to recognize that the difficult moments of confronting change, foreignness, anger, and violence may require the repetition of a repertory of familiar and meaningful ways of acting, not simply free improvisation. This is true of all societies where formalities as simple as a handshake might be needed to mediate relationships. In other cases,
new forms of expression and action may be equally appropriate and readily adopted. Perhaps because of the destructive uprootings of colonial encounters, Indigenous nations have developed multiple forms of mediating change to a larger extent than settler societies.

Whereas the many purposes of Indigenous social practices, including ceremony, vary across the hundreds of sovereign Indigenous nations, a number of common needs and issues are addressed (albeit differently) by traditional activity. Among these are the following:

1. Needing regular personal and group renewal. These may be tied to the cycles of renewal of the earth, as in the case of the agricultural ceremonies, or to cleansing of mind and body, as in the sweat lodge ceremonies of Native Americans.
2. Following respectful ways of meeting and separating. Protocols for acknowledging and asking permission to visit the territory of another group or specific ways to begin and end gatherings ensure future relationships. Parting from life on earth always demands special attention in every Indigenous (and settler) culture.
3. Giving thanks for the gifts of the earth. This is a broad category that exists in virtually every ecologically attuned society, often enacted through song and dance that animates life.
4. Healing. Common to Indigenous wellness beliefs is the view that the physical, psychological, spiritual, and social are interlinked and that song plays a central role. Classic studies in our field such as Frank Mitchell’s autobiography (1978), edited by Charlotte Frisbie and David McAllester, have long taught us about some specific ceremonial practices such as the Navajo Blessingway. Recent work has explored intergenerational healing issues associated with colonial trauma, including the abusive systems of Indian Residential Schools, which operated in many countries (cf. Greenwood, Leeuw, and Lindsay 2015; Robinson and Martin 2016).
5. Rebalancing individual and group lives when they have experienced social change. Specific repertories for this purpose may be well established, as in the case of the Navajo Enemy Way (McAllester [1954] 1973), performed when an individual has been away and seeks reintegration into the community. Or they may be less formal, as in the case of Innu sojourns in “the country” or Aboriginal Australian walkabouts, which enable a renewing of relationships with land.
6. Formally legitimizing new roles and responsibilities. Protocols involving feasting, speech making, gift giving, and performance constitute law and may be elaborately presented, as in the case of the potlatch of Northwest Coast First Nations in Canada. Ceremonies for naming or marking life cycle changes play a similar role (Frisbie 1967).

7. Defining acceptable ways to voice criticism or resolve conflict. Certain genres such as Inuit drum dances or, in Scandinavia, Sámi joiks may be used to point out socially unacceptable actions or personal traits. More elaborate forms of conflict resolution exist, especially in a number of African nations, where customary mechanisms that parallel and complement the laws of nation-states are constituted (Qashu 2016; Nannyonga-Tamusuza 2005). Traditional practices may be employed to reintegrate offenders or rebuild the capacity for empathy (Gow 2008, 250–56).

I am not suggesting, of course, that settler cultures should appropriate Indigenous ways in yet one more violation of the sovereignty and integrity of Indigenous culture, but rather that the active purposes of tradition, rather than its thingness, should underpin conversations. What might an action orientation to ethnomusicologists’ work look like? With that question in mind, I turn to moments in our history, focusing on the purposefulness of listening within ethnomusicological research. My aim is to further conversations on hearing Indigeneity as a response to Ochoa Gautier’s vivid demonstration that colonial listening in Colombia was a significant means of inscribing the concept of modernity.

PURPOSEFULLY HEARING INDIGENEITY
AND INDIGENOUS APPROACHES TO LISTENING

I reflect on selected examples (among many) of the explicit or implicit intentionality of listening evident in the work of ethnomusicologists, often engaging my own work reflexively in text boxes. In some cases our attitudes and aims retain hints of colonial hierarchies described earlier. In others they reflect shifts in the orientation of the senses as relationships are redefined. Implicit in my reflection is a need to think about who listens in what way, what can be heard, and what should or should not be heard. This discussion complements and builds on Victoria Lindsay Levine’s excellent consideration of inscription practices in her introduction to Writing American Indian Music (2002). Notation itself
represented the lettered classes and inscribed the colonial hierarchy that Ochoa Gautier describes. Whereas many ethnomusicologists invent ways to convey nuance by inscribing what we hear (Béla Bartók was a diligent model), few would deny that Western notation was both an inadequate visualization and a colonial imposition, a symbolically violent act (like stereotypes and other reductive representations) that contrasts starkly with forms of notation within Indigenous tradition such as visual or tactile aids to memory, including the order of songs in ceremony, or pictographs that map rich cross-references among places, living beings, spirits, and forms of human expression.

Victoria Lindsay Levine selected for *Writing American Indian Music: Historic Transcriptions, Notations, and Arrangements* (2002) a transcription of mine that raises other ethical issues. For an early study I made comparative transcriptions of variants of the same song—lining them up vertically so the differences were easy to see. This obvious gesture toward the classificatory projects of science were still encouraged during my graduate-student days, however objectifying and decontextualizing they seem to me now. Of course, when explored together with singers’ narratives, variants *can* point to meaningful stories about why certain songs may be performed differently in different circumstances or about the malleability of Indigenous tradition in response to different sociopolitical sites and situations (cf. Cruikshank 1998). I did record some of the stories about specific songs, but without the sociopolitical nuance about specific performances that I would discover years later in Julie Cruikshank’s work.

**LISTENING TO LEARN THE MUSIC OR DANCE**

Settlers often posit the right to learn as universal, yet in Indigenous contexts one often encounters a different emphasis. Individuals are encouraged to learn certain repertories or skills when (or if) they are deemed able to fulfill the responsibilities of that knowledge, responsibilities that may relate to clan, family, or social position but that may also be determined by a particular skill set. In some instances Indigenous culture bearers have entrusted scholars (insiders and outsiders) with song knowledge, although more often as recorders and preservers of knowledge in a time when it is under threat (Coleman and Coombe 2009). There are times,
however, when everyone is invited to participate in some way if they can fulfill the responsibility of animating life and giving thanks for the gifts of Creation.

During a course on Haudenosaunee arts taught at my university by a Seneca-Cayuga instructor, students learned to sing Ehsgán:ye songs (Women’s Shuffle Dance songs) used for socials in the community. Students had to learn not only the songs and drumming patterns but also the dance steps and ways of providing appropriate food for a community event that they were expected to host at the end of the course—as the final exam. In other words, “listening to learn the music and dance” related to their responsibility to animate a successful event for Haudenosaunee and their friends in nearby communities, thereby contributing to the vibrant energy of life. There have occasionally been other instances where I was privileged to be able to listen to learn other music. One was a powwow drum within the federal prison for women in Kingston, Ontario, which I visited regularly from 1986 to 1988 to see two Indigenous friends who were incarcerated far from their children and other family for minor offences. I joined an Aboriginal Circle that was offering support to inmates. While female powwow drums are now more common (see Hoefnagels 2012), it was rare in that decade for women to sit around the big drum, but the constrained circumstances of a federal prison led the elders and circle leaders to teach powwow drumming and singing to all the “sisters,” both Indigenous and settler. The drum hosted an annual powwow for the larger community in Kingston. It was inevitably a powerful and emotional event—an act of generosity by inmates, who created handmade gifts as well as the gift of song for all who played a role and even for authorities who were not kind to them on a daily basis. I am grateful for this opportunity to sing some powwow music even as I deplore the justice system that remains inequitable for certain populations.

LISTENING FOR COMPLEXITY TO COUNTER SIMPLISTIC STEREOTYPES

Whereas close attention to nuance is undoubtedly the mark of all good research, I suggest that listening for complexity has had a different ethical motivation—to
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demonstrate the falsity of racist stereotypes—in the work of ethnomusicologists who have worked with Indigenous singers and drummers or with archival materials from Indigenous communities.

In the 1980s I undertook an organology project because so many early evolutionist studies and even late twentieth-century textbooks offered dismissive representations of Inuit and First Nations music as just drums and rattles. The project was congruent with the desire of some Indigenous advisers to learn more about artifacts that were “imprisoned” in museums and archives. The wide range of technologies, artistry, and sonic nuance evident in the more than seven hundred artifacts in twenty-five museum collections that my research team studied purposefully belied such simplifications, visually and sonically. Such objects, of course, also drew attention to the loss of the embodied individual or shared experiences of using these sound producers. Some instruments were gifts of the natural world requiring no modifications (gourds or seed pods that produced the sounds of creation when the seeds dried). Others were complex assemblages of meaningful material elements with qualities, colors, or sounds needed for medicinal or other purposes; many were beautifully crafted artistic productions. The hidden-from-view materials inside shakers were particularly diverse—some fine-grained and delicate, some loud and piercing, some sound reducing, even one silent (a shaker, we were told by an elder adviser, intended for spirits). These unique creations connect the materiality of sound to environments and lives and taught me about the artificiality of a nature-culture divide.

There is evidence that other scholars were similarly motivated to listen for complexity. At a symposium in 1963, David McAllester modestly asserted that “I need more musical sophistication than I have” to study Navajo music well, noting the many genres that Navajo have created, alongside their sand paintings, silver work, and rug weaving, and arguing that “a tribal music may well be as complex as a classical music” (qtd. in B. Diamond 2015b). We consider attention to detail as a mark of good scholarship, but it belies a voracious desire to possess the knowledge of another. While I can’t assess the purposefulness of other scholars, I suspect that there are many instances where looking and listening for complexity was motivated by the clear need to counter oversimplified stereotypes.
and homogenized accounts of Indigenous sonic culture that were, and still are, prevalent in textbooks, media, and social experiences. These worthy intentions may nonetheless reflect assumptions about entitlement unless Indigenous collaborators anticipate social as well as academic benefit.

LISTENING FOR BORROWED STYLES TO UNDERSTAND RELATIONS

Given that listening is inherently relational, it is not surprising that sharing and borrowing (as well as more coercive practices including stealing songs or foisting one’s music on others) are widespread across cultures. Such repertories are neither hybrid nor outside the lived experience of people who use them. This is certainly true of Indigenous people who often gifted songs to neighbors or shared them in other ways and who learned the music of colonizers. For example, Christian hymns are the most widespread of adopted repertories that reflect changing assumptions about settler-Indigenous relationships.

More than any other genre of Western music, the Indigenous adoption of hymns has been documented since the late nineteenth century. Early collectors, including Frances Densmore (1938, 1941), Gertrude Kurath (1957, 1959), and Willard Rhodes (1952a, 1960) were students of Native American hymnody, interpreting the practice as acculturation (with its implications of inauthenticity and loss). But Densmore traced hymn influences on certain genres of traditional music, and she and David McAllester (1952) studied the syncretic Native American Church. Rhodes acknowledged the role of boarding schools, and Kurath used the language of syncretism to replace the acculturation paradigm, recognizing Indigenous agency and foreshadowing recent work by Ann Morrison Spinney (2006), Chad Hamill (2012), and Kimberly Jenkins Marshall (2016) on the adaptations and power dynamics of Indigenous and Christian leaders. Studies of Indigenous hymnody burgeoned in the late 1970s and 1980s, with more attention to usage in traditional Indigenous contexts (cf. Grant 1980; Keillor 1987; B. Diamond 1992). In the early twenty-first century, collaborative approaches have enabled more nuanced views of the ways hymns are meaningful for individuals (cf. Lassiter and Ellis 2002). The narrative of borrowed genres shifted slowly from the colonialist paradigm of inauthenticity and accul-
turation to syncretism, sociopolitical agency, and personal accounts of the emotional and social meaning of specific repertories.

But why hymnody? What does it say about music scholars that they focused extensively on this tool of conversion and assimilation? Why were other genres such as country music, fiddle, and band ignored by most academics prior to the 1980s and 1990s (cf. Whidden 1984; Preston 1985; Mishler 1993)? Why were individual processes of mapping meaning across generations and landscapes ignored until recently (cf. Vander 1988; Lassiter and Ellis 2002; Samuels 2004; Levine 2014b, 2015)? One might surmise that studies of rap and reggae (Vosen 2013b; Aplin 2012; Marsh 2012), as well as Indigenous opera, classical music, experimental performance, and jazz (Karantonis and Robinson 2011; Avery 2012; J.-C. Perea 2012a; D. Robinson 2012), began to appear after 2000 because they emerged recently, but opera, classical music, and jazz, of course, have deep historical roots. Did we fail to recognize Indigenous work in elite and virtuosic idioms, or did we think populist genres were more capable of articulating a politics of Indigeneity? Also relevant is how genres originating in African American culture trouble the mapping of modernity and tradition onto settler and Indigenous peoples.

LISTENING TO REDEFINE HOW HYBRID STYLES EMBODY AND COMMENT ON RELATIONS

Listening to relationality is arguably inherent when sonic styles are juxtaposed, and this has become a pressing issue in an era of industry-defined world music and digital technologies that facilitate easy production and dissemination of sonic hybrids. Most ethnomusicologists are less interested in “expert” interpretations of sonic texts than in the potential of music’s polysemy. But listening to sonic mixture is often shaped by broad institutional forces, which effected huge erasures of the differences in the auralities of hundreds of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis in the public imaginary and invented stereotypic markers of Indigenous sound in North America, as Tara Browner (1997), Philip Deloria (2004), and Michael Pisani (2005), among others, have demonstrated. One might legitimately ask whether it is possible to listen to Indigenous-style references without invoking the stereotypes that continue in world music and movie production. Dylan Robinson (2016a) has problematized this issue, noting even further erasures in
songs with a “we are the world” message that effectively denies the specificity of colonial victimization.

Ethnomusicological studies of Indigenous music production, however, vary significantly in approaches to interpreting the juxtaposition of diverse styles. Jessica Bissett Perea (2012) reminds us of the mixed heritages that many Indigenous musicians embody. What might be heard as hybridity is unified in their own lives. Both Bissett Perea and Avery (2012) explore concepts in Indigenous languages that naturalize mixtures. But attention to the processes of production and the hierarchies reinscribed in both text and performance trouble settler and Indigenous hybrids. Both Richard Jones-Bamman (2006) and Dylan Robinson (2012) write cogently about power in cross-cultural musical collaborations, observing instances where the control of such things as tempo and balance was determined by the non-Indigenous conductor or where the enclosure of Indigenous elements in a dominant mainstream idiom replicated colonialist power dynamics. Indigenous musicians who master several styles have reflected on their personal experience of collaborating interculturally, often emphasizing common philosophies more than similar musical languages (R. Wallace 2012; Avery 2012).

On the other hand, I have suggested (B. Diamond 2007, 2011b, 2016) that listening closely to subtle cultural differences in style—to the slippages that make something not quite what one expects—might be a decolonizing strategy that resists the aforementioned elisions and stereotypes promoted under the “world music” industry label. In a genre such as opera, for instance, an Indigenous composer who juxtaposes languages, vocal timbres, and instrumental styles can render colonial relationships audible and visible (B. Diamond 2011b, 31–56). Like the cultural geographer Jennifer Robinson (2013), who looks at intersecting histories in the lives of contemporary urbanites, ethnomusicologists who explore the circulation of sonic styles can sharpen awareness of intersecting and uneven histories. I agree with the Australian theater director Rachel Swain (2014), who regards the “copresence of multiple stories” (in theater) as a way of talking back to colonial perceptions. Consider Dawn Avery’s performance of a Bach unaccompanied cello suite with interspersed segments of a Mohawk song. At the very least, listeners must wrestle with the question of what these two styles have to say to each other and perhaps with their own preconceptions about stylistic coherence or even pastiche. Only with more conversation about actual divergences among culturally diverse listeners and interpreters of contemporary Indigenous music will we understand capacities and limitations of the sonically hybrid in mediating intercultural differences.
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LISTENING FOR POWER, PAYING CLOSE ATTENTION, AND LISTENING TO SURVIVE

Recently, literature on music and violence has altered approaches to listening for power. Suzanne Cusick (2006) was a pioneer, addressing sound as torture, demonstrating that sound that might be pleasurable for some can be extremely painful for others. Listening for power moved in profoundly new directions in work by Martin Daughtry where, as he recounts vividly, listening for sounds of specific weapons in war zones is a matter of life and death and also relates to trauma. He recounts the “fine-grained experiences of individuals” and observes, “to say that we are always free to choose how to interpret these sounds, however, is to ignore the structural impediments that a state of profound vulnerability creates” (2015, 47). Daughtry suggests that sound “coerces bodies into involuntary vibration and co-opts them into participation, through resonance” (165). Sound, then, is potentially always violent in that it enters the body and has both physical and psychological ramifications. But the same quality that creates this potential also creates the potential for attuning positively. Such observations suggest approaches to listening in war zones or listening to orient oneself in everyday life arguably resemble ways in which Indigenous hunters and others pay attention to sonic environments.

In the context of isolated communities, I have often been astonished at the acuity with which Indigenous people hear their environment. Children distinguish the different engine noises of each neighbor’s snowmobile. A hunter knows the distance away and direction a goose is flying, through knowledge of its call and atmospheric conditions. Aboriginal languages often reflect this acuity. Inuktitut, for instance, is structurally more “relational” than English, with subject and verb both indicated in the verb tenses (e.g., tusaaavaa means “he hears something or someone”). My Inuktitut dictionary (Schneider 1985) adds further nuance: s/he knows because s/he hears. That basic verb can be easily modified in this polysynthetic language to indicate subtleties such as hearing only once, hearing repeated sound, or listening but not obeying. One can indicate “weather that makes hearing difficult and hunting easy,” “hunting in good hearing weather,” or “weather that makes hearing easy and hunting difficult.” Although I am a relative
beginner and ongoing learner of this language, it is clear that the many inflections relate listening to survival.

Practices of listening that Indigenous hunters employ are key to finding food or navigating space, clearly relating to survival in some circumstances. But, unlike soldiers under fire, elders engage in a sort of sonic attuning that integrates humans with the animate world they share.

LISTENING FOR MIMESIS, STRIVING TO ATTUNE

Michael Taussig (1993), among others, has written that seeing and listening to imitate something or someone is a common, often politically charged, response to the world external to one's self. Mimesis, as he defines it, is a way of miming the world into being with high stakes.\(^\text{13}\)

I’ve tried to learn mimetic Indigenous genres, including Inuit vocal games or Sámi *joik*. But my skill in listening for mimesis is childlike, searching simply for recognizable resemblance. I hear the sound of the goose in a vocal game but rarely recognize the personalities or spatial nuances. In Sámi *joik* I miss the fleeting rhythm that signals the quality of movement (of a bird or animal or human) that *joik* composers are so good at, and I need help to understand the double meanings of texts that characterize people critically but lovingly or that map social and ecological relationships.

With reference to the Quechua-speaking Runa of Ecuador, the linguistic anthropologist Janis B. Nuckolls describes such vocal simulation as “sonic alignment.” “Runa model natural processes with sound by imitating the resonant, rhythmic properties of experiential phenomena: ongoingness in time, distribution in space, instantaneousness, disruption, rearrangement, and completion. I want to claim, further, that in the act of constructing natural processes with ideophonic sound, Runa are at the same time foregrounding their shared animacy with such processes” (2004, 66). Paul Carter similarly observes that “echoic mimicry is communication in the absence of anything to say” but is significant because it expresses “the desire or necessity to communicate” (2004, 46).
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When anthropologists have written about the way place may reflect systems of social relationships (Armitage 2011), evoke memories of people and the songs they loved (Samuels 2004), or summon stories that instruct newcomers about the teachings of the land, a similar sort of alignment seems to be at play. Anthony Seeger ([1987] 2004, 65–78) describes such a process when he writes about the Suyá (or Kĩsɛdjɛ) in Brazil, where the sonic recreates a spatial map of relationships. Given the widespread practices of mimetic vocalization to which these culturally diverse references point, listening for mimesis—though arguably not yet a very common practice among ethnomusicologists—might be a way of respecting sonic alignment and a means to explore ontologies that emphasizes emplacement and resonance among human and other-than-human environments.

In her thought-provoking article “Prelude: An Accountability, Written in the Year 2108,” the anthropologist Carolyn Nordstrom asks challenging questions related to purposefulness: “Did scholars at the dawn of the twenty-first century recognize that their work not only illuminated the past and shaped the present but also produced the future? Did they see in their analyses the harbingers of new kinds of wars, unprecedented forms of violence, undeveloped potentialities? . . . What intellectual and moral bearings animate the heartbeat of their epistemologies as they ripple across and interact to configure, in however large or small a way, our emergent tomorrows!” (2008, 1–2).

The aural regimes of coloniality were still evident in the mid-twentieth century, when ethnomusicology emerged as a named discipline, and I recognize them in my own work. Close attention to our own intentions when we listen to Indigeneity not only enables us to see ourselves in relation to the colonial aurality that Ochoa Gautier identifies but might also assist in determining what types of purposeful listening could best contribute to an emergent tomorrow in which diverse and sovereign cultural communities could exist without one subsuming another or addressing differences violently.

It is apparent that the purposefulness that I refer to in relation to Indigenous tradition differs in scale from what I identify as some examples of the purposefulness of listening in ethnomusicology. A next step may be to identify the larger social purposes of different kinds of listening. I have signaled a few that might relate to anticolonialism and decolonization. From a utopian perspective, one
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might argue that such actions, if successful, could contribute to better balance, sustainable social and environmental ecologies, and less violence. But the disjunctures (like stylistic and generic sonic differences) may simply open space for dialogue about purposefulness, the content of which I would not presume to predict. Our different strategies must all take heed of a potential problem that Ochoa Gautier (among others) identified: that some practices undertaken “in the name of decolonizing” actually “recolonize” (2014, 17). To mitigate recolonization, I suggest that our scholarship continue to focus on the way that regimes of sound are mutually constitutive but use horizontal rather than hierarchical thinking and consider the many pasts that circulate and inform the present. This will be an evolving process in the work of anyone involved in Indigenous arts who is committed to recognize colonial processes that continue to shape contemporary societies but willing to accept responsibility for helping to animate a future.
14. *Pu’ Itaaqatsit aw Tuuqayta*  
(Listening to Our Modern Lives)

How do we locate Indigenous modernities? Is modernity a condition imposed through colonization that seeps into sounds Indigenous peoples create? Is it a kind of social and intellectual mobility that empowers us to speak to broader audiences through new technologies and expanded social networks? The contributors to this volume have heard *modernity* in diverse ways. Looking toward the future, I wish to explore the stakes of methodology in music research with Indigenous “moderns.” Bruno Latour (1993) describes modernity as a two-part process. First, it involves the strategic hybridization, translation, and interconnection of seemingly autonomous domains such as science, religion, or art into new functional combinations. Second, it involves the processes of “purification”—the means whereby these new functional combinations take on independent identities, leaving behind any remnant of the former social lives of their component parts. Once purified, the new thing that emerges is given its place in the civilized world, one partitioned by Enlightenment-era divisions of nature and culture (Latour 1993, 11). Examples of musical hybridizations and purifications abound in modernity: the domains of music and politics, mobilized together for some social end, become purified as cultural policy; sound-recording technologies employed to conceptualize and express “the environment” result in the purified art form we know as soundscape; certain categories of sound administered as medical remedies becomes music therapy.

This collection suggests that Indigenous musicians may or may not be participants in modernity’s work of hybridization and purification. Rather, a significant number are involved in revealing modernity’s purifications, making bare the social lives behind the components of various musical or political forms. This
is probably owing to the fact that in our Indigenous worlds hybrids are constantly being generated, often against our will. Lands we conceptualize as ours are merged with oil- and gas-extraction methods, political power, and capital investment and then purified into discrete domains like economic development, pollution, and government corruption. Traditional medicines, business practices, and patent law generate valuable new drugs along with novel opportunity costs; traditional knowledge, ceremonial practices, and academic ambitions become anthropological data and carefully guarded cultural resources.

Cloaked from view, hybrids can become purified or segmented into manageable, categorizable “things” and their socially motivated aspects erased through what Ana María Ochoa Gautier has called the “epistemological work of invisibilization” (2006, 810). As long as the twin processes of hybridization and purification coexist but do not reveal each other, modernity perpetuates itself, and we believe we are in a state of stable progress (Latour 1993, 11). But, as Latour reminds us, inevitably new forms of disruption—including musical ones—manage to reconnect the erased links connecting processes of hybridization and purification, making modernity precarious if not impossible to sustain. Searching for these disjunctures may be a key entry point for understanding Indigenous modernities.

Doing anthropology of “moderns” and the purified hybrids they create is complicated because modernity is particularly opaque, despite claims to self-awareness, self-analysis, critique, and rationality (Latour 2013, 18). So much of what we see as Indigenous musical modernity may come across as resistance to settler-colonialism, yet how can we be certain we truly understand all that is happening in modern Indigenous sonic spaces? Latour argues that in modern contexts we need to bridge “the abyss that separates what the Moderns say from what they do” and to look at the “plurality of ontologies” that are swept under the rug through modernity’s logics—logics that purport to be rooted in universal human values. This opens the possibility that, as anthropologists of Indigenous music, we have to engage with “entities that no longer have a place in theory,” to accurately map the sound worlds of Indigenous modernity (21).

CULTURAL PROPERTY: A MODERN EXAMPLE

Latour’s deconstruction of modernity serves as a useful starting point because it asks us to look for meaning in the social powers that produce modern hybrids as well as the forces and motivations that purify them of their sometimes messy or hegemonic social relations. As the contributors to this collection argue,
modernity’s projects and processes do not necessarily fall along a convenient Indigenous/settler binary. Indeed, the Indigenous musicians discussed here are often doing the hybridizing, purifying, and determining which domains are modern and which are not. The logics of modernity have a direct bearing on my own research and community activism involving the repatriation of ritual song recordings to the Hopi people. Repatriation of Indigenous ceremonial culture takes as its baseline the proposition that Indigenous ceremonial performances are originally owned by those who create and perform them and, if the creators or performers are no longer living, their lineal descendants or those who carry on the ceremonial practices. Indigenous peoples, therefore, have the right to control how recordings of their ceremonial culture circulate. If a recording was made illegitimately or is circulating outside of the original owners’ control, it should be returned to the rightful owners and restitution made for any harm done (cf. United Nations 2007; Seeger 1996).

At the outset of my work on Hopitutskwa (Hopi lands), I considered Hopi songs to be “cultural property”—the bundle of rights belonging to an Indigenous group by virtue of the fact that its members jointly held the culture manifest in the artifact or archival medium. I assumed all I needed to do as a researcher-activist was to discover how those rights should be distributed and then redistribute those rights to the object in legally sound ways. Over several years of meetings with Hopi community members across the reservation, I documented and began trying to make sense of Hopi people’s opinions on how and to whom the recordings and their associated rights should be returned, believing that some sort of underlying traditional cultural property principle would emerge to solve a very modern problem. My efforts to locate “the sovereign will of the autochthonous Hopi sociopolitical organization” (Richland 2011, 223) did not provide the panacea I sought. I discovered that thinking of Hopi ceremonial songs in terms of property rights actually did very little to explain what should be done to repatriate the songs in any meaningful way.

Indigenous ceremonial song recordings are inevitably hybrids, products of Indigenous modernity generated from multiple, ontologically diverse networks. From their place on archival shelves, they are purified from nearly all their social relations for the sake of keeping them organized, contained, and accessible to researchers. Yet, despite their scholarly value, recordings like these hold comparatively little value outside of their uses within Indigenous networks. On one hand, they are intellectual and physical property—the exclusive fruits of Lockean labor lingering as an intellectual asset within an academic cosmology.
On the other hand, they are Indigenous ceremonial performances—the fruits of Hopi ritual labor. They are latent voices existing within a living Hopi cosmology. When they are purified as cultural and intellectual property, an Indigenous community may be empowered by reclaiming and taking ownership of songs like these as cultural resources (Yudice 2003). But, as James Leach has warned, treating ritual songs as property may enact a modern conceptual colonialism over Indigenous groups, requiring them to rely on Enlightenment divisions of nature and culture to assert their rights, while ignoring the diverse stakes of the other actors vital to Indigenous ritual culture (2007, 99).

Some Hopis with whom I collaborated insisted that the Hopi Tribe should control access to all ritual recordings containing Hopi esoteric knowledge because they have been declared to be the “cultural property of the Hopi people” (Hopi Tribe 1994; see also Brown 2004). But to say that Hopi ritual songs do their work within the Hopi community as property is to adopt wholesale the hybridizing and purifying processes at play in modernity. Hybridizing Hopi ritual songs with the conceptual container of property may allow songs to be transferred back to Hopis within the U.S. legal domain, but an additional layer of analysis is needed to allow those actors necessary to a ritual song’s vitality to speak to its optimal circulation on the ground. Hopi songs originate through joint partnership with humans, other-than-humans, and environmental phenomena and become owned by all those who invest their time and energy in hearing and internalizing them. Even beyond generating artistic satisfaction or entertainment value, the performance of ritual songs accomplishes work on the environment and produces transformative effects in individuals who perform and listen to them. While many Hopis with whom I collaborated supported the use of cultural property as a framework for decolonizing the voices of their ancestors, many also resisted the potential effects of transforming Hopi ritual into tribal or individual property.

In sum, without an ontologically oriented approach to understanding Indigenous musical contexts, we may lose a richer understanding of Indigenous people’s interactions with modernity’s processes and logics. If we fail to ontologically situate our research in modern Indigenous contexts, we may actually be enabling colonization by taking for granted the purified hybrids we encounter therein.

A MODERN METHODOLOGY

This collection deals with important contemporary Indigenous contexts in which the fusion of social forces and sonic forms is clearly evident. Some contributors
unpack how musical fusions are playing out in activist Indigeneity; some focus on the recontextualization of these forms; and some consider the emplacement of traditionalized musical forms in contemporary multicultural or neoliberal spheres of governance. These chapters raise the overarching question: Is a unified goal emerging for research in the area of Indigenous musical modernities? If so, is it to interrogate the hybridizing and purifying processes happening across Indigenous sonic spaces? Is it to celebrate Indigenous creativity and activism despite modernity’s forces? Or can it be both, and more?

Even with the breadth of musical activity among Indigenous peoples today, these chapters reveal a deep resonance between modernity and Indigenous activism’s expression through hip-hop and powwow. But what is it about hip-hop or powwow and Indigenous social activism, including cultural revitalization, protest, and community programs, that makes us as scholars hear and see modernity? These chapters frame hip-hop and powwow as performative social vehicles with the ability to penetrate and then work inside and across cultures, sometimes specifically to accomplish larger social goals. Contributors take note of Indigenous artists’ biographies, establish their connections to Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities, and often reveal postcolonial anger, all of which are brought into productive relationships with certain beats, timbres, performance styles, or linguistic characteristics that have acquired near iconic significance in other cultural contexts. The analyses rightly examine the political and economic inequalities in which the artists operate and their desires to remediate cultural harm caused by settler-colonialism, to reclaim or expand a particular social role or position, and to create dialogue or initiate resistance, all through exploration of the meanings generated at the confluences of music, genre, culture, or political movements.

If these contexts are in fact paradigmatic of Indigenous modernities, then we should be able to not only perform postcolonial analyses but also examine the domains that generated them and the conditions under which they have been purified into neatly segmented categories of political discourse and naturalized sound-objects. Since hybridizations of different Indigenous sociopolitical configurations with powwow or hip-hop sound are each so carefully analyzed here through lenses focused on their actors’ decolonizing thrust, perhaps the next step is to consider the purifications that make these hybrids accessible or inaccessible to and for certain publics. I wonder if there is a conscious link between activist musicians’ hybridizing work and the kinds of new epistemologies or ontologies of sound that seem to be emerging as they circulate: worlds that articulate who
“we” are and who “they” are; that claim rights, assuming those rights have always been there; and that persistently grapple with who is a sellout and who is real.

This approach to studying Indigenous musical modernities would make persistent use of audience ethnography — understanding how and what sonic messages and strategies actually link performer to audience and whether or not the ideologies or desires the artists convey are actually being realized or linked back to their hybrid forms within the Indigenous communities we are imagining. This is critical because simply hybridizing Indigenous or Indigenized sounds with modern social or political institutions does not always produce the decolonizing results we should be able to expect. What for some might be an empowering expression of collective Indigenous presence in a systemically colonized space may unfortunately be for others just another manifestation of a purified genre living up to its stereotypes. Audience ethnography can tell us about the networks in which modern Indigenous musical hybrids circulate and the entities that enable or disable them, disrupting, through diverse social vantage points, any modernizing thrust to purify Indigenous musical experience and relocate it along a predetermined nature/culture binary (Latour 1993, 11).

The empowered tone of these chapters is both intellectually and politically satisfying. It shows that Indigenous moderns are assessing and capitalizing on North American insecurities, fears, and weaknesses. They assert an Indigenous creative agency in the world and in doing so work toward a decolonization of music, anthropology, the academy, and the world in which we live. Yet there are important opportunities going forward to explore the effects these kinds of hybridization and purification are having on Indigenous peoples themselves.

If hybridizations and purifications are key aspects of Indigenous musical modernities, have we sufficiently explored what effects these processes are having on Indigenous communities and their cosmologies? From the point of view of an Indigenous community, is it the same thing to generate music from within local networks of exchange as it is to appropriate it from elsewhere or even to appropriate foreign concepts about music from another tribe, social group, or species? (cf. Viveiros de Castro 1992; Stolze Lima 1999). Are Indigenous musicians and their audiences hearing and being moved differently by sounds with diverse genealogies? Even for Indigenous musicians living in urban environments, I can’t help but wonder how their children, elders, ancestors, or deities are hearing and thinking about their choices of musical hybrids and how these choices impact their relationships and environments.

I am in no way advocating for a racialized or essentialized notion of Indigene-
ity that *limits* the experiential, intellectual, or political possibilities of Indigenous actors to the constraints of imagined social groups or social stereotypes. Rather, I am suggesting that we need not confine ourselves to the partitioned, purportedly rational domains modernity has left for us. This volume is a springboard for further engagement in an expansive exploration of Indigenous musical modernities that takes into account diverse ontologies in its analysis. That these authors and the artists they study have opened up a decolonized intellectual space for this kind of dialogue is cause for celebration. *Kwa’kwhay’s*
NOTES

1. Music, Modernity, and Indigeneity

1. Protocols of welcoming and situating oneself relationally are values shared widely among the Indigenous peoples of North America.

2. Here I am paraphrasing the Tahltan artist Peter Morin (2016, 75). For additional information on how Indigenous gestures of welcome enact sovereignty and establish authority in Native spaces, see D. Robinson (2016b).

2. The Oldest Songs They Remember


2. Diamond, Szego, and Sparling (2012, 2) concur, seeing in the term “Indigenous Modernities” a call to “emphasize the fragmentation, deterritorialization, and struggles for reclamation that are parts of indigenous experience” of modernity.

3. For a discussion of the problem with reading recognizable iconicity and indexicality, see Samuels (2004).

4. Rhodes’s latent critique of researchers of Densmore’s generation stops short of explicitness, in part because he approached these creative processes through the zero-sum game of acculturation theory.

5. “Hybrid” is the term Rhodes preferred, using it decades before the term gained firmer theoretical footing and wider circulation.

6. A celebratory songbook based on the organization’s emphasis on community music making was titled A Singing Nation Welcomes a Singing Army (1918).

7. The plea for community-based music was also met by the National Bureau for the
Advancement of Music and its widely successful campaign promoting Christmas caroling throughout the United States (Anonymous 1924).

8. For a discussion in greater depth, see Bristow (1996), especially 79–90.

9. My conclusion here differs from that presented by Kheshti (2015), who argues that the image reproduced here as figure 2.3 has become the most famous.

10. Writing of photographs that purported to document the “Vanishing Indian” and the inevitability of “Progress” and “Development,” Sandweiss notes, “If the photographs themselves were the centerpiece of the story, they were nonetheless incapable of conveying the burden of narrative themselves. Only with words could the mute pictures speak” (2002, 272).

11. With less than half the capacity of Carnegie Hall, which she surely could have filled, Aeolian Hall allowed Sembrich’s fans to hear her in a setting “that should establish the desirable intimacy between singer and audience in a kind of art whose essence is intimacy” (New York Times 1917).

12. Subsequent afternoon shows were titled “The Art-Song,” “The German Classics,” and “The Song Composers of Today.”

13. Often recounted is the incident with Red Cap, in which Densmore agreed to record the Ute leader’s message of complaint to the commissioner of Indian Affairs, but played it without a translator present (cf. Troutman 2009, 165; Brady 1999, 93; Scales 2012, 1).

3. Reclaiming Indigeneity

1. Mi’kmaq is used as the plural form and refers to the Mi’kmaw people and the Mi’kmaw language. Mi’kmaw is the singular and is also used for adjectival and adverbial forms.

2. For literature on fieldwork, see Feld (1976), Von Rosen (1990), Barz and Cooley (2008), Cooley, Meizel, and Syed (2008), Wissler (2009), and Deger (2006). For reclaiming Indigeneity, see Battiste (2000), Vizenor (2008), and Levine (2014b).

3. This is a contested figure when one considers patterns of identifying status and nonstatus Aboriginal people, as well as those who have lost, and are in the process of reclaiming, their identity as Mi’kmaq.

4. For descriptions of the economic, educational, cultural, and social infrastructures now in place in Eskasoni, see the Eskasoni Mi’kmaw Nation website (n.d.). Recent examples in the area of tourism include the Mi’kmaw trail on Goat Island at the eastern end of the Eskasoni reserve, opened in 2012 by Eskasoni Cultural Journeys.

5. The history of the Mi’kmaq and Roman Catholicism dates to the early seventeenth century, when Chief Membertou and members of his family were baptized by Catholic clergy who accompanied explorers from France. See Prins (1996) and A. Robinson (2005).
6. Changing funerary practices also occur in other Aboriginal contexts. See Frisbie (1978) and Griffen (1980). I thank Charlotte Frisbie for this information.

7. The choir at Holy Family Church has copies of the text version of *The Catholic Book of Worship II* (1980), the official hymnal of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada, as well as copies of the second edition of *Glory and Praise* (1984), a popular post-Vatican II hymnal from the U.S. Catholic Church.

8. Saint Anne, mother of Mary and grandmother of Jesus, became the patron saint of Mi’kmaq in the seventeenth century. A. Robinson (2005) explains that Saint Anne’s relationship to Jesus (*ki’ju*, or grandmother) resonates with Mi’kmaw culture because of the importance attached to the *ki’ju* as the progenitor of the family and, by extension, as the protector and giver of life. Mi’kmaw people regard Saint Anne as a source of healing and spiritual inspiration, and she is celebrated on July 26 in the annual pilgrimage to the Mi’kmaw mission at Potlotek on Cape Breton Island.

9. Kalolin Johnson of Eskasoni has become well known on YouTube singing Mi’kmaw translations of popular songs such as “The Climb” by Miley Cyrus and “You Are My Sunshine.” She became a young sensation through YouTube when she performed her Mi’kmaw version of “O Canada” at the closing ceremonies of the Jeux du Canada Games in Halifax, Nova Scotia in 2011.

10. Tulk (2009b) provides parallel sound recordings and describes her discovery of a Mi’kmaw version of the Catholic *Liber usualis* and the importance of Gregorian chants in the practice of Catholic liturgies among the Mi’kmaw.

11. Historically, the Mi’kmaw wrote in hieroglyphs scratched into tree bark or animal hides; some of these writings have been preserved as petroglyphs. Following contact, the history of written Mi’kmaw is linked to the work of missionaries in Mi’kmaw communities. See Battiste (1984).

12. The seven video excerpts illustrate the narratives in this chapter. Rather than definitive statements, the excerpts should be viewed as partial documents that initiate discussion about Indigenous identity and modernity.

13. View the seven video excerpts on YouTube; see “Video Excerpt 1” (2015) to “Video Excerpt 7” (2015). The excerpts can also be accessed by searching this chapter’s title on YouTube. A compact disc with the excerpts is located at the Beaton Institute (Mi’kmaw Holdings) at Cape Breton University, Nova Scotia, Canada.

14. The text of “Mo Dhachaidh” (“My Home”) appears in many nineteenth- and twentieth-century Gaelic songbooks, including Moffat (1907) and Whyte (1883). The song probably originated as a piping tune, as suggested by the modal turn at the final cadence. In the twenty-first century it is most often heard in instrumental versions. See Creighton’s ([1956] 2004) recording of the song as performed by the late Cape Breton singer Malcolm Angus MacLeod. I thank Stephanie Conn for this information.
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15. Alstrup (2003) contains a moving narrative of the climb to the top of the mountain where the church is located. Each Good Friday, the Stations of the Cross are observed at set stopping points along the pilgrimage climb to the cross at the top of the mountain, an event that links religious ritual to the natural surroundings for the Mi'kmaq.

16. Donald Marshall Jr., a Mi'kmaq from the Membertou reserve, was wrongly convicted of murder in 1971 and spent eleven years in prison before the life sentence was overturned. Marshall's name is synonymous with the fight for justice for the wrongly convicted, and he is a hero in the battle against racism toward Aboriginal people in Canada. His funeral in 2009 was recorded by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and by the Mi'kmaw filmmaker Catherine Martin.

17. Global examples include Hodges (2009), Johnson (2011), Toner (2007), and Wissler (2009), among others.

4. Indigenous Activism and Women's Voices in Canada

1. The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement (Kino-nda-Niimi Collective 2014) is an anthology of writings, art installations, and reflections on the Idle No More movement and contemporary issues confronting First Peoples in Canada in the early twenty-first century.

2. The earliest publication of this song on YouTube was by an audience member called “clockle” on YouTube (Ulali Project 2014). The official video release of this song on YouTube was published by Tapwe Production Projects on June 18, 2014.

3. For an overview of the origins, development, and music of Ulali, see Cain (2003).

4. For a discussion of the impact of Indigenous a cappella women's ensembles, see Cain (2003).


6. For a firsthand perspective on the origins of Idle No More, see McAdam (2014) and McLean (2014).

7. For a description and account of the Sixties Scoop and its impact on the people directly affected by it, see Ireland (2014).

8. Authors such as J. Green (2007), Anderson (2000), and Anderson and Lawrence (2003) are contributing significant publications addressing Indigenous women's rights and their agitation for increased respect and acknowledgment within their communities and throughout Canadian society.


10. Interestingly, feminism is not a term commonly used by Indigenous women to label female leadership and activism; however, the terms Indigenous feminism and tribal
feminism have been coined in relation to the advocacy work of contemporary Indigenous women. For a discussion of these terms, see Deerchild (2003), Huhndorf and Suzack (2010), and Hoefnagels (2007b). For readings on the reclamation of women's voices (figuratively and literally as singers and spokespeople) and Indigenous women's activism, see Amadahy (2003), B. Diamond (2002), Fiske (1996), Gould and Matthews (1999), Allen ([1986] 1992), Klein and Ackerman (1995), Mihesuah (2003), Miller and Chuchryk (1996), Mithlo (2009), and Silman (1987).

11. Additional information about Asani was found in their electronic press release (Asani 2007).

5. Hip-Hop Is Resistance

1. The Tohono O’odham Nation is federally recognized, with reservation lands in southern Arizona and approximately twenty-eight thousand members. Its traditional lands extend beyond Arizona into northern Mexico, with federally recognized tribal members residing in Mexican traditional territories as well as in the United States. The Tohono O’odham were previously and are sometimes still referred to as the Papago (cf. Erickson 1994; Griffin-Pierce 2000; Luna-Firebaugh 2005; Griffith 1992).

2. DJ Reflekshin joined Shining Soul during production of the group’s 2016 album Politics Aside.

3. The Chicano movement was marked by Mexican American youth demanding educational equality in U.S. classrooms, coinciding with broader civil rights movements for desegregation and the fair treatment of Mexican American farmworkers (cf. Navarro 2005; Muñoz 2007; Gutierrez 2011; Ontiveros 2014).

4. Xicano (Shi-ka-no) and Mexica (Me-shi-ka) are sometimes used in preference to Chicano (Gutierrez 2011; de la Torre and Gutiérrez Zúñiga 2013).

5. Corridos are Mexican narrative ballads, traditionally about local heroes fighting for community justice.

6. La migra is Spanish-language slang for “immigration police,” used to refer to Border Patrol and, previously, Immigration and Naturalization Services.

7. The line “young, gifted, and brown” is a reference to Nina Simone’s civil rights anthem, “Young, Gifted and Black,” inspired by the 1969 off-Broadway play, To Be Young, Gifted and Black: A Portrait of Lorraine Hansberry in Her Own Words.

8. ¡Ya basta! (Enough already!) is an anticolonial slogan popularized during the 1960s and 1970s Latin American liberation movement, later popularized among Chicano activists in the seventies (Ontiveros 2014, 24–25). First coined during Mexican nation building to instill pride in a mestizo citizenship, la raza (the race or people) became popularized in Chicano nation building.
6. Singing and Dancing Idle No More

1. The AIM song may be heard at “A.I.M. Song/B.I.A. Song” (2018).

7. Get Tribal

1. We encourage readers to open their ears by listening to these emcees’ sound recordings, available through artist websites, iTunes, Amazon, YouTube, and bandcamp.com.

2. Stomp Dances are a social and ceremonial genre performed by Creek, Seminole, and other Native Southeastern peoples. In the dance the women wear leg rattles made of terrapin shells or condensed milk cans and are known as shell shakers (R. Green 1992; Levine 2004, 2013, 2014a).

3. Quese references the Trail of Tears, or the forced relocation of many tribes west of the Mississippi River as a result of the Indian Removal Act (1830), enacted by President Andrew Jackson (A. Wallace 1993; Levine 2014b).

4. Hip-hop artist Angel Haze (2012) reinforced this point by revealing her Cherokee heritage and speaking the Tsalagi (Cherokee) language in an interview on Hot 97 FM radio.

5. *Nahui Ohlin* (Nahuatl) means “four movement” and describes both Quese’s affiliation with an Indigenous-centered store in Echo Park, Los Angeles, and a nascent cultural-political movement. The term refers to Native peoples’ shared ceremonial understanding of the number four.

6. Ye-ye is a French popular music style prominent in the early 1960s; songwriters and performers include Serge Gainsbourg, France Gall, and Francoise Hardy, among others.

7. “Orale” is a Chicano term meaning “that’s right.”

8. Native “Noise” and the Politics of Powwow Musicking in a University Soundscape

1. I follow Ellis and Lassiter in using the term *intertribal* as opposed to *pan-Indian* (2005, xiii). For many of my students, the experience of a powwow is integral to their ability to comprehend the fluidity of tribal and intertribal influences, since at a powwow they can see the process taking place before their eyes. I alternate between the terms *American Indian* and *Native American* in this chapter to reflect the shared language of my classroom. First Nations is used only in reference to tribes living within the geopolitical boundaries of what is now known as Canada.

2. In my use of the terms *expected* and *unexpected* in this chapter I follow Deloria, who defines expectation as “shorthand for the dense economies of meaning, representation, and act that have inflected both American culture writ large and individuals, both Indian and non-Indian (2004, 11). He explains, “Expectations and anomalies are mutually
constitutive—they make each other. To assert that a person or an event is anomalous cannot help but serve to create and to reinforce other expectations” (5). Finally, he breaks the binary relationship between expectation and anomaly by introducing the concept of unexpectedness, asking readers to “distinguish between the anomalous, which reinforces expectations, and the unexpected, which resists categorization and, thereby, questions expectation itself” (11).

3. Nettl has noted the importance of world music as a mediator in schools of music, using the example of the American Indian Dance Theater, which “combines many kinds of Indian music and dance—material from different cultural areas, from different times, and with varying degrees of fantasy and Westernization. Thus, a concert itself may be seen as a mediating institution among musical cultures” (1995, 90; emphasis added).

9. Powwow and Indigenous Modernities

1. Ojibwe people also refer to themselves as Anishinaabe, Saulteaux, Ojibway, Ojibwa, and Chippewa. Swampy Cree also refer to themselves as Mushkegowuk, Woodland Cree as Sakāwithiniwak, and Oji-Cree as Anishinininiwag.

2. Smudging is an act of purification in which participants wash themselves with the smoke of a smoldering medicine, often sage. The people with whom I spoke used the words "prayer," "spiritual," "sacred," "teachings," "Indian names," "drum groups," and "Aboriginal," and I follow their uses here. Terminology varies widely across North America, and some of these words may be regarded as problematic in other contexts.

3. It is not unusual for traditional powwows in Manitoba to open with a pipe ceremony.

4. AAA funding is different in a number of ways from the kinds of funding made available through the 1972 Indian Education Act in the United States. The AAA grant is a provincial (rather than federal) initiative, and it targets Indigenous achievement in public schools that are usually off-reserve and in which Native students are often in the minority.

5. For a comprehensive overview of Residential Schools in Canada, see Miller (1996) and TRC (2015b). Canadian Residential Schools were similar in some ways to Indian boarding schools in the United States; however, U.S. schools were run by the federal government, whereas Canadian ones were run by various Christian denominations (Riney 1997). On Indian boarding schools in the United States, see Lomawaima and McCarty (2006).

6. The corrections system is another branch of the state that has had immensely disruptive effects on Indigenous communities; here, too, traditional cultural activities have been made available to prisoners.

7. More recently, the federal government has apologized for the abuses suffered by Residential School students, extended financial compensation to many (but not all) who were mistreated in such schools, and funded a five-year Truth and Reconciliation
Commission to examine their legacy. The findings of the commission (TRC 2015c) can be viewed on the website of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation.

8. Although increased community control of schooling has been cause for optimism (see Taylor, Crago, and McAlpine 2001, 46), concerns remain about how much autonomy the federal government allows Indigenous communities in educating their young people (see, e.g., Canada 2011, 8).

9. In Canada the provinces are responsible for public education, the exception being the education of status Indians, which is a responsibility of the federal government. Nevertheless, many Indigenous people attend provincial schools, either because they are not status Indians, because they do not live on reserves, or because their reserve has ceded responsibility for education to the province. For a discussion of the financial factors that may inform such decisions, see Drummond and Rosenbluth (2013).

10. Ray is referring to a stretch of Winnipeg’s Main Street that has frequently been regarded as that city’s skid row.


12. This section discusses areas of deep disagreement; I hope I am able to convey a range of perspectives sympathetically.


14. “Culture” has a number of senses in this chapter. Many Indigenous people use “the culture” to designate traditional cultural practices. Yúdice (2003) uses “expedient culture” to refer to practices (typically artistic ones) deployed in the hope of attaining social and economic results. Both of these senses are more circumscribed than is typical in anthropology and ethnomusicology.

15. The ceremonial protocols associated with the culture establish another kind of independence. While smudging and prayer at powwow club meetings and the complex sequences of opening events at powwows acknowledge and orient participants to the relations around them, they also do other kinds of work, including marking certain times and spaces as those in which Indigenous priorities and practices are sovereign.

10. Inuit Sound Worlding and Audioreelism in Flying Wild Alaska

1. ”Alaska Native” is a designation for Indigenous people and original inhabitants of what is now known as Alaska. Although Alaska Natives have been understood historically as encompassing three equally broad subgroupings of “Indians,” “Eskimos,” and “Aleuts,” they typically define themselves in the early twenty-first century in relation to cultural groupings distinguished along linguistic lines, such as Iñupiaq, Yup’ik, Unangan, Gwich’in,
and Tlingit. The term "native Alaskan" refers to non-Indigenous residents whose ancestors immigrated to Alaska. Whereas some have questioned the grammatical correctness of "Alaska Native" (instead of Alaskan Native), this designation has a very specific history and is indeed the correct term, evidenced by the naming of many prominent Indigenous organizations (e.g., Alaska Native Heritage Center, Alaska Native Justice Center, Alaska Native Medical Center).

2. There are twenty distinct Indigenous languages spoken in Alaska; two that are typically grouped under the term Inuit include Inupiaq and Yupik, speakers of which come historically from the northern and western coastal regions, respectively. It is significant that the coastal village Unalakleet Northwestern sits at the historical boundary between Yupik- and Inupiaq-speaking peoples, one of the many Alaskan locations where intertribalism and cultural mixing have been a way of life since time immemorial (see Holton and Parks 2011).

3. Paraphrasing a recent call by scholars to reinvigorate a sounded anthropology, my work aligns with those interested in the continued development of a sounded Native American studies to expand the field’s tendency toward ocularcentrism (see Samuels et al. 2010).

4. This working list of nonfiction television projects filmed in Alaska includes shows that intended to run for one or more seasons and either were filmed solely in Alaska or regularly feature an Alaskan-based team (e.g., Papac Alaskan logging in the History Channel’s Ax Men). Reruns and reality television specials (e.g., Discovery Channel’s The Klondike, Alaska Week, or the Deadliest Catch spin-off Hillstranded) and one-shots (e.g., appearances on History Channel’s Top Gear, Travel Channel’s Man v. Food, or Discovery Channel’s Dirty Jobs) are not included. It is worth noting here a few discrepancies from two multisited shows: seasons 1–2 (2007–8) and 7–8 (2013–17) of Ice Road Truckers featured drivers and routes based solely in Canada; seasons 3–6 (2009–12) alternated between drivers and routes in Alaska and Canada. Ax Men did not feature an Alaska-based logging operation until season 4 (2010–15), as seasons 1–3 (2008–10) followed logging operations based only in Oregon, Washington, Montana, Louisiana, and Florida.

5. According to a 1995 Inuit-language map published by the Alaska Native Language Center, twenty-four thousand Canadian Inuit people identified as speaking Inuktutun out of a total seventy-three thousand speakers across Alaska, Canada, and Greenland (see Holton and Parks 2011).


8. In this case, Pamyua’s arrangement of “Reindeer Herding Song” was composed by Cecelia Foxie (Yup’ik) and was used by permission. The song is primarily vocables, with a few short Yugtun phrases, “All of us here have fun when we sing; All of us here have fun when we dance” (liner notes, Pamyua 1998).

9. For extensive accounts of these styles, see Grawunder (2009) and Levin and Süzükei (2006).

10. UNK is the three-letter identifier for the Unalakleet Airport.


12. Bossi also notes BMI awards “go to the person or persons with the most cues on the show” (email corr., March 14, 2018).

13. Some of these videos are still available on YouTube (see Discovery 2012).

14. Bossi notes that the composition crew used a combination of samples performed on frame drums from Alaska and Lower 48 hand drums (email corr., March 14, 2018).

15. I maintain that some of the most well-known examples include composers of original cue sheets and restoration scores for Robert Flaherty’s infamous film Nanook of the North (see Bissett Perea 2017). For discussions of European and North American settler-colonial representations of Inuit music, see Krejci (2010) and Van den Scott (2016).


17. The version of the main title song heard at the beginning of each show is further embellished with diegetic sounds of prop engines, radio chatter, bird strikes, and aircraft alarms, to name a few.


19. The following shows also released soundtrack albums on iTunes: Deadliest Catch (September 25, 2007); Ice Road Truckers, for which volumes 1 and 2 are original compositions by Bruce Hanifan (May 20, 2008, and September 18, 2012) and vol. 3 (aka “Trucker Tracks”) is a combination of licensed and third-party music and original compositions, all in the country-music genre (April 20, 2010); Alaska: The Last Frontier (October 5, 2014), the theme song for which features Jewel, a member of the show’s Kilcher family and one of Alaska’s most widely known pop-music stars; and Alaskan Bush People (April 25, 2016).

20. Interestingly, of these three shows only Deadliest Catch retained its original hard rock anthem throughout—most other shows rely on original compositions for their theme songs, perhaps because of the high cost of licensing popular hard rock anthems. In the case of Alaska State Troopers and Gold Rush: Alaska, they too opted for brief, instrumental drama underscores as their main titles.

21. Tweto’s organization is called Popping Bubbles (2014).
11. Native Classical Music


2. The Kanienkéha (Mohawk), along with the Oneida, Cayuga, Onondaga, Seneca, and Tuscarora, are the Six Nations that compose the Rotinonhsión:ni (Iroquois) Confederacy. The Six Nations Kanienkéha territory is located on the Grand River in Ontario, Canada.

3. Other Native Classical composers include Timothy Archambault (Kickespirini), Louis Ballard (Quapaw), Sadie Buck (Seneca), Barbara Croall (Anishinaabe), Brent Michael Davids (Mohican), Russell Goodluck (Navajo), R. Carlos Nakai (Navajo-Ute), George Quincy (Choctaw), Jerod Impichchaacha’ha’ Tate (Chickasaw), and Ron Warren (Echota Tsalagi).


5. Ethnomusicologists have only recently begun to explore classical music in relation to culture and ethnicity, largely because the focus of ethnomusicology was defined until somewhat recently as the study of non-Western and folk music (Nettl 2005, 4), whereas analytic and historical studies of classical music were the domain of musicology. Interest in Western classical music composed by members of diverse ethnic groups is relatively new (cf. Kingsbury 1988; Born 1995; Yoshihara 2007; Karantonis and Robinson 2011).

6. Kanatsiohare:ke is built on land in the Mohawk Valley, New York, that was repurchased by the Kanienkéha in 1993 “To promote the development of a community based on the traditions, philosophy, and governance of the Rotinonhésion:ni, and to contribute to the preservation of the culture of people as a framework for a blend of traditional Native concerns with the best of the emerging new earth friendly, environmental ideologies that run parallel to these traditions. To conduct programs in the culture and traditions of the people; to foster an active accumulation of spoken Mohawk language by members of the community; and to continue oral traditions, stories, songs and dances in the unique spirit of the Mohawk path” (Kanatsiohare:ke Community 1993).


8. For more on twinship or complementarity, see Avery (2014), Browner (2000, 2009a), and Diamond, Cronk, and Von Rosen (1994).

9. For more detailed information on graphic models for Native Classical composition that incorporate the medicine wheel and the turtle, see Avery (2014), Huber (1993), Lane et al. (1989), and Walker (2001).
10. The concepts of “cultural accents,” described by Graf (1947) and Bennett (1976), as well as sonic and cultural borrowing, are worth exploring as part of both the product and process of composition by Native composers. A cultural flavor (indirect references) and direct cultural understanding may be expressed in music itself, in the explanation of particular pieces, or as a tool for preparing the performance of particular pieces. In terms of compositional creation, Gidal (2010) refers to this as “cross-cultural competence.”

11. Reichard explains that the “swastika is a favorite Navaho design, probably because whirling log (tsil nôôli) is a theme of the Night and Feather Chants. The chant symbol of the Hail Chant is a cross to the ends of which down feathers are fastened, giving it a swastika-like effect. It (tônąxabil) is the protective device of Winter Thunder’s and Frog’s home. . . . It is Thunder’s whirling seat. When angry, Winter and Dark Thunder twirled their seats; when the gods were good-tempered, the seats became rainbows” (1983, 603–5).

12. Yé’i are Navajo deities with spiritual powers; they include “Water Sprinkler, Fringed Mouth, Hunchback . . . Coyote, Big Snake Man, Crooked Snake People, Thunder People, and Wind People. . . . These beings and powers . . . are undependable, even though they may have given mankind many of their prized possessions. . . . [They are] forever present to Navaho consciousness as threats to prosperity” (Kluckholn and Leighton 1962, 182–83; see also Reichard 1983).

13. Further information on Southwest Indian concepts of time and pitch indeterminacy appears in Shapiro and Talamantez (1986), Givens (1977), and List (1985).

12. Speaking to Water, Singing to Stone

1. Defining Indigenous-centered methodologies and models of music analysis remains a challenge to be addressed in the field of Indigenous music and sound studies. Indigenous and Native American scholars here might look to the growing nation-specific forms of literary criticism, including Justice (2005) and Martin (2012). Debates on Native literary nationalism and resurgent theory are similarly useful in reflecting on nation-specific forms of criticism and interpretation.

2. The Aesthetics of Reconciliation project was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and led by Keavy Martin and Dylan Robinson. The project’s aim was to understand the role of the arts in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Peter Morin was a participant in this project, and Martin and Robinson commissioned him to create a work that responded to events he attended (see Robinson and Keavy 2016).

3. Witnesses at this gathering included Keavy Martin, Sam McKegney, Elizabeth Kalbleisch, Dylan Robinson, Helen Gilbert, Beverley Diamond, Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair, and Pauline Wakeham.
4. For a detailed examination of the discourse of witnessing at the TRC, see Gaertner (2016).

5. My use of capitals is here an attempt to convey the tone of Belmore’s oration, which was not angry but forcefully articulated.

13. Purposefully Reflecting on Tradition and Modernity

1. Latour’s analysis of the Western construction of the “modern”—a construction that relied on “separating the relations of political power from the relations of scientific reason while continuing to shore up power with reason and reason with power” (1993, 38) and the consequent situating of Indigenous cultures as “premodern”—is a thematic ground for many of the chapters in this volume. Since it is discussed elsewhere, I am not elaborating further in this chapter.

2. Some of these ideas were developed in Hovland (1996).

3. Their views resonate with others, since the relationship of Indigenous communities to development is contested worldwide. As Ravindran (2015) describes in relation to Indigenous groups in Bolivia, there are differences (and sometimes conflicts) between those who see Indigenous engagement with development as a means of benefiting the living conditions of their people and those who favor an “Indigenous cosmovision” that prioritizes ecological recovery. The divergent opinions reflect different concepts of well-being.

4. There are exceptions to this generalization, such as Judith Vander’s Songprints (1988), which documents the changing repertories and broader social changes in the lives of five women across several generations.

5. See Dharwadker (2011) for an exploration of this problem in the theater history of India.

6. There were some notable Sámi writers in earlier eras, but the corpus of published literature expanded enormously in the late decades of the twentieth century.

7. Sapmi is Sámi land, spanning four nation-states.

8. Chakrabarty’s “provincializing Europe” (2000) is a parallel conception.

9. This shift resonates with what Gaski describes as the necessary shift from “reactive politics” to “proactive praxis” (2013, 118).


11. D. Robinson (2017) references the “hungry listening” of scholars, a concept drawn from the word xwelitem, translated as “settler” but more accurately meaning “starving person” in Halq’emeylem, the language spoken by Stó:lo people.

12. Théberge (2003) has demonstrated that the industry practice of selling “samples” of Indigenous and ethnic music for use in the movie industry or other artistic work has largely perpetuated elisions and stereotyping.

Notes to Chapter 00 277
13. There are playful forms of mimesis in which the stakes may be low. The “zoom zoom” of cars or the “meow” of cats are familiar. Algonquian speakers connect morphemes for sound to the motion from one vowel to another in the diphthongs “ue” or “ueue” that may indicate sound or motion of other types. The name of the Innu drum, teueikan, incorporates this diphthong and might be translated more literally as the “thing that vibrates.” The syllables “ue” or “ueue” may be incorporated into words for other objects that move back and forth, such as flags or brooms.

14. Evidence of our growing concern includes frequent debates within the Society for Ethnomusicology about the problematic name of the discipline, which implies the priority and possibly the “purity” of ethnicity, as well as other discussions about such things as the imagery of the Indigenous “little man” that served as the logo for part of the society’s history.

14. Pu’ Itaaqatsit aw Tuuqayta (Listening to Our Modern Lives)

1. I thank Zoe Todd (2014, 2016) for exposing the ways Latour’s work in the area of object-oriented ontology fails to fully acknowledge the intellectual labor of Indigenous peoples that preceded it. Here I hope to begin to offer an Indigenized approach to the kinds of theories Latour has advanced on the topic of modernity, which I think may be useful in reading the work of these exceptional Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars.
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