

This second vantage point also allows us to escape from the confines of settler-imposed definitions of what it is to be an Indigenous scholar. For example, in challenging a book reviewer's criticism of her use of conventional academic rhetoric in formulating an argument, Moreton-Robinson (2006: 249) stated that the non-Indigenous reviewer appeared to be arguing that "Aborigines only speak with a colloquial flavour and, by implication, when we use conventional and or academic language we become less Aboriginal." Torres Strait Islander scholar Martin Nakata (1998: 5) argues similarly that "the issue for Indigenous scholars is one of how to speak back to the knowledges that have formed around what is perceived to be the Indigenous positions in the Coloniser settler 'order of things.'" As *Indigenous* scholars within academic relations of power, practitioners need to avail themselves of the symbolic power of, and launch part of their critique using, the very disciplinary knowledges that they are critiquing.

Conclusion

We conclude this chapter by arguing that first world Indigenous quantitative methodologies allow us to challenge methodological concepts and research practices that emphasize our *difference* at the expense of the *density* on full display in our relationship with modernity. Moreover, the terms and the social relations encapsulated in our relationship to modernity comprise an important part of the density of contemporary Indigeneity. Writing off or ignoring these concepts is the analytical equivalent of burying our heads in the sand. *A priori* don't simply evaporate if we fail to problematize them; rather, they nigger their way further into the foundations of discursive representations, insulating themselves from critique. Similarly, their dismissal creates a situation in which a dominant modality of knowledge production about Indigenous subjectivities is left to the labors of those who have little experience with or knowledge about our communities. As such, they "measure" us using methodologies that, though longstanding, carve out only narrow slices of our daily lives. In Chapters 4 and 5, we explore this issue in more practical detail, beginning with a discussion of *nayri kati* to explore Indigenous statistical space in Australia. We follow this with a discussion of similar issues in a Canadian context.

Notes

- 1 Also see Wacquant 1997.
- 2 For a general discussion regarding Canadian colonialism as seductive *as well as* oppressive, see Day 2000.
- 3 We should also balance the argument by stating the social fact that these power relations cut both ways, such that the constitution of our colonizing settler populations and institutions are also powerfully influenced and shaped by their long-standing interaction

with Indigeneity. As with first world colonized Indigenous peoples, the traditions, culture, identity, and knowledge systems of our respective colonizer settler peoples have also evolved via the process of colonization and settler state establishment and maintenance. Why is it that only Indigenous peoples' culture, knowledges, traditions, and identity are expected to remain unchanged?

- 4 I say similar in their apparent difference from whitestream normality, but I am certainly not conflating their subject positions. Moreton-Robinson argues elsewhere in a feminist context that the very prestige and privilege through which white, middle-class women are able to articulate their oppressions vis-à-vis their position in patriarchal societies as a universal experience is made possible by the unacknowledged dispossession of Indigenous territory. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *Talkin up to the White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism*, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 2000 (hereafter *Talkin Up to the White Woman*).