Burt (, Angela. "A spoke in the wheel: Ancestral women's legacies." *Indigenous Women's Voices: 20 Years on from Linda Tuhiwai Smith's* . By Linda Tuhiwai Smith. London: Zed Books, 2022. 107–120. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350237506.ch-006>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:57 UTC.

Copyright © Emma Lee and Jennifer Evans 2022. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

A spoke in the wheel: Ancestral women's legacies

Angela Burt (*palawa*)

Introduction

I am a First Nations woman descended from a matriarchy who held together a sovereign people and have defied the odds by surviving. I am an Islander, a *palawa* woman of *trouwunna* (Cape Barren Island), an isolated island in the Bass Strait, the body of water that separates mainland Australia from *lutruwita* (Tasmania). Colonization is a tiny fragment of our story that dates back over 40,000 years to the last ice age, when *trouwunna* formed part of a larger landmass known as the Bassian Plain (Ryan 2012). As the sea level steadily rose and engulfed the landscape, *trouwunna* was realized and remains in place today (Maynard 1985). The term *palawa* is a collective term, a familial term used to identify and position First Nations Peoples of Tasmania. In contrast, most of what is written about us fails to acknowledge our identity, referring to us as the Aborigines of Tasmania.

The disconnect between how we are known, and who we are, is a problem that weighs heavily on the hearts of my people. The outside world has come to know us through the unnamed portraits of my family (Bonyhady & Lehman 2018) – spiritually and narratively held captive in the museum archives, through the catalogs that list cranial measurements and through the blood samples taken without consent – and are known through the physical bits that accompany the visual record of our colonization. The disconnect between “knowledge about” First Nations Peoples and “knowing” First Nations Peoples lies at the heart of our collective struggle for survival within settler-colonial states.

This essay tells a story that is not dissimilar to that of other First Nations Peoples globally who have been defined and known by events and acts outside their control. Positioned as subjects, sometimes as objects, these histories render

First Nations Peoples as voiceless “extras” whose presence is needed, but certainly not wanted. This story aligns with the basic premise of all colonial tales which position the superior against the inferior, with the colonizer victorious based on their intellect, superior resources and systems of governance. For First Nations Peoples of *lutruwita*, our tale of colonization was written prior to the British setting foot on the island, influenced by the sharpening of their tactics through other colonial battles. Our story ended with the supposed extinction of the “Aborigines of Tasmania” (Reynolds 2008; Ryan 1996), of our people discontinuing as a First Nations identity. From the arrival of the colonizers, it took just 30 years for the *palawa* population to fall by over 90 per cent and is a brutality unlikely to be seen again in the modern world (Reynolds 2008; Reynolds 2012; Ryan 2012; West 1852). My people have come to be known through quantifiers, our lives mapped out linearly, from existence to non-existence. Such reductive generalizations do not adequately represent Indigenous knowledges that are “theoretically sophisticated and robust” (Rigney 2001, p. 9). The language and terminologies used do not belong to us, the accounts of our actions are not our own, our silence and our inability to respond is not our choice. Whilst we have no control over the marginalization of our knowledges within these colonized spaces, our knowledges, which are inherited and influenced by our relationship to Country, our people and our ancestral creator beings, refuse to be silenced (Moreton-Robinson 2013). Through the voices and actions of our women, in particular, these matriarchal knowledges are challenging the ways in which we are known.

In writing from a position that is both *palawa* and female, my existence disputes the generalized knowledge about *palawa* by inserting contrasting knowledge: knowledge that is not white or male. Therefore, I tell the story of one of the women in my family and how her story influences my work, while I, in turn, strive to reclaim her place in colonizing space. This is an exploration of how women are woven through my family tree as part of Country and belonging, where their voices are a “powerful form of resistance” (Smith 1999, p. 34).

I share with you the story of my Great Aunt Molly – Dr Mary Maynard Mallett – a published author, Elder and advocate for children. In her text, *My Past – Their Future: Stories from Cape Barren Island* (Mallett 2001), Aunt Molly combines her experience, academic knowledge and culture to expose and refute the knowledge generated about *palawa* through the 1939 Harvard – South Australia University Anthropological Expedition to Cape Barren Island. In doing so, Aunt Molly becomes a framework for future generations of *palawa* women to decolonize the knowledges that define, limit and silence us. I use this

framework as a guide to further interrogate the conditions that enable knowledge to be created about *palawa*. I also use the text of Aunty Molly as a case study to reframe the normative narratives of Western knowledge systems and create a space for female Indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing. Drawing upon the theories of First Nations and other scholars including Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Gayatri Spivak (1988) and Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2011), I expand this framework to include global perspectives and, in turn, bring the voices of *palawa* women to this global dialogue.

Our knowledges

For First Nations Peoples our ways of knowing, being and doing, when compared with Western knowledge systems, are classified as naïve, with no scientific basis or cognitive credibility (Foucault 1980). This classification has less to do with the integrity and legitimacy of our knowledges and more to do with who has the power to decide what constitutes knowledge (Fanon 2008; Foucault 1980; Moreton-Robinson 2011; Spivak 1988). The established rules that dictate whose knowledges are most valued are deeply rooted within and influenced by imperialism and colonialism – both predicated on Western superiority (Smith 1999). This superiority was strengthened as Western explorers and researchers traveled the globe, growing the empire and collecting evidence that strengthened their status, whilst controlling the discourse about First Nations Peoples (Bourdieu 1986; Foucault 1980).

It is important to recognize the pivotal role that research played in the subjugation of First Nations knowledges (Said 1978; Smith 1999; Wolfe 2006). Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith goes so far as to say that research is one of the “dirtiest” words in the vocabulary of Indigenous People (Smith 1999, p. 1). Colonization, among many other things, brought to First Nations people a menagerie of “researchers” – crew, convicts, free settlers – all collecting knowledge about the “natives” (Smith 1999). Their opinions were sent back to the Empire, shaping the way that the outside world would forever know First Nations Peoples (Smith 1999). The only people who were not contributing to this growing body of knowledge were First Nations Peoples themselves (Mallett 2001; Manne 2003; Smith 1999; Watson 2007). “The significance of travelers’ tales and adventurers’ adventures is that they represented the Other to a general audience back in Europe which became fixed in the milieu of cultural ideas” (Smith 1999, p. 8). These travelers’ tales represented First Nations Peoples as

primitive beings, more animal than human. Women were excluded from these tales, which were spread back home through church sermons, newspapers and by word of mouth. Imperial thoughts were normalized and unchallenged, fitting comfortably within the global discourse (Smith 1999; Wolfe 2006). Thus, we are known in the ways that support a Western narrative of intellectual superiority, while our knowledges are always the Other and decrepit (Gramsci 1971; Said 1978).

Spivak (1988), in expanding Gramsci's (1971) subaltern theory through a focus on women, has examined what happens to the voices of oppressed and marginalized female outsiders when they speak within a space that is dominated and ruled by the elite (the insiders). In her essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak (1988) asks whether it is possible for women of color and of lower-class, who inhabit the periphery of society, to speak or be heard. Spivak's view is valuable here; First Nations women are appreciated as more than just female objects in a settler state – they *are* the understanding of what subalternity looks like and does. In exploring whether marginalized women can speak, Spivak (1988, 1999) examined the value placed on the knowledge that these women have to share. In doing so, she shifted the spotlight away from the validity of female knowledge systems, moving it towards how knowledge is created about women and by whom (Spivak 1988, 1999).

For those Western men who control the production and dissemination of knowledge, First Nations Peoples are obviously marginalized away from centers of power. In particular, First Nations women are subject to further colonizing burdens (Smith 1999), such as erasure from the record completely, which create the conditions of un-belonging:

The process of en-gendering descriptions of the Other has had very real consequences for indigenous women in that the ways in which indigenous women were described, objectified and represented by Europeans in the nineteenth century has left a legacy of marginalization within indigenous societies as much as within the colonizing society.

Smith 1999, p. 98

The invisibility of our women from the record has a profound and ongoing impact. Spivak (1988) introduced the term "epistemic violence" to expand the work of Bourdieu (1986) and Foucault (1980) to include the ongoing impact of subjugation on the body, mind and spirit of women. By expanding people's understanding of the ongoing impact of knowledge subjugation, Spivak (1988) highlighted how imperative it is to not only understand the conditions that

enable this subjugation, but to challenge them and interrupt this cycle of knowledge oppression.

Epistemic violence

Thus, one way that Western superiority is legitimized by its own power and knowledge is the enactment of an epistemic violence against First Nations women that renders us either silent or missing. Distinguished Professor Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2011), an Australian Indigenous researcher, looks closely at how subaltern conditions are created for our women, but more importantly how we emerge away from them. Moreton-Robinson (2011), in understanding that power comes through knowing and naming the conditions that subjugate our knowledges, opens a discussion about who is best placed to generate knowledge about us.

When we speak of epistemic violence it is important to acknowledge that this is an ongoing violence, which for First Nations women occurred through colonization, but is propagated through colonialism and patriarchal whiteness:

Patriarchal whiteness operates possessively as a raced and gendered epistemological a priori within knowledge production as universals, dominant norms, values, and beliefs. Patriarchal whiteness is thus epistemologically and ontologically privileged but invisible within its socio-discursive regime capillarising through Australian disciplinary knowledges and modern colonial practices.

Moreton-Robinson 2011, p. 414

In “The White Man’s Burden” (2011), Moreton-Robinson highlights the ongoing subjugation of the knowledges of female First Nations scholars within Australia. The article responds to commentary made by white male academic Dirk Moses (2010) on the Northern Territory Intervention, a national emergency response to protect Aboriginal children in the Northern Territory from alleged sexual abuse and family violence (AHRC 2007). Within this critique, Moreton-Robinson draws attention to Moses’ description of the work of First Nations women and criticizes the government’s handling of the response as being “emotional and political in order to reduce its validity by discursively positioning himself as the embodiment of rationality and reason: the disinvested white patriarchal knower” (Moreton-Robinson 2011, p. 420).

Moreton-Robinson draws attention to the language chosen by Moses to describe Aboriginal women, language that he does not use when describing the

work of Aboriginal men. Moreton-Robinson then goes further, applying the same logic to challenge Moses' credibility as an expert on Aboriginal affairs, an area in which he has no formal qualifications. In doing so, she draws attention to his white patriarchal belief that knowledge produced by objective white male experts will always trump that of subjective black female non-experts (Moreton-Robinson 2011). Within this, she further critiques his assertion that one can only become an expert through formal Western education. By highlighting that Moses attacks only the logic and credibility of black female academics, rather than black males, she exposes his belief that, regardless of education, title or social capital, black women and their knowledges will always remain on the periphery (Moreton-Robinson 2011). Moreton-Robinson's critique achieves its purpose to expose the white patriarchal beliefs that constrain knowledge production and dissemination about First Nations women, highlighting that the subjugation of female Indigenous knowledges that began in 1788 persists today (Applebaum 2010; Moreton-Robinson 2011).

Decolonization and justice

Based on the continuity of colonization, and its relentless shaping of First Nations societies, Patrick Wolfe (2006, p. 388) reclassifies settler-colonialism as a "structure", rather than "an event". It is for this reason that the inverse process of decolonization requires a supporting structure, or framework, and cannot be achieved through a single process/event (Smith 1999). In relation to the decolonization of knowledges, and knowledge production, sustained labor is required from First Nations Peoples living in settler-colonial states (Battiste 2000; Bond 2006; Moreton-Robinson 2013; Smith 1999; Watson 2007; Wolfe 2006). It is for this reason that Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith challenges First Nations Peoples to consider whether *this* knowledge, one that controls, silences and erases, is of importance to who they are, and where they are headed (Smith 1999). This is both a valid and necessary question that First Nations Peoples collectively seek to resolve. In doing so, they must first locate themselves within these knowledges – a process that is both violent and traumatic (Simpson 2014). For some, the burden of this process is too much; and for others, who can bear the load, this process leads to further critical inquiry. In critiquing and deconstructing the romanticism that underpins anthropological work about them, First Nations Peoples can reveal the racial structures that protect and enable whiteness. In doing so, we can increase both our agency and power,

which can be used by First Nations People to negotiate space for our sovereignty and truth (Coulthard 2014; Deloria 2003).

Smith's theory of decolonization speaks of the power that First Nations Peoples can gain from understanding the conditions that oppress and marginalize (Smith 1999). The idea of knowing where we have come from is central to our ability to have autonomy over where we are headed. Fricker (2013) refers to this as epistemic justice whereby epistemic subjects use their knowledge of the conditions that marginalize them to change their social condition. The purposeful movement of First Nations Peoples away from simply surviving colonization, to re-writing narratives and re-righting our position as sovereign peoples has gathered traction over the past 50 years as Smith (1999, p. 72) states, "Indigenous peoples want to tell our own stories, write our own versions, in our own ways, for our own purposes". The production of knowledges about First Nations Peoples from this perspective breaks the rules about how knowledge is produced about First Nations Peoples and by whom. "When the people we speak of speak for themselves, their sovereignty interrupts anthropological portraits of timelessness, procedure and function that dominate representations of their past and, sometimes, their present" (Simpson, 2014, p. 97). This is why our stories need to be told. Through voicing our narratives we are giving testimony to the injustices of our past and emancipating our people from the grips of colonialism (Dudgeon 2017; Fredericks & White 2018; Huggins 1998; Martin & Mirraboop 2003; Smith 1999; Watson 2017).

A spoke in the wheel

palawa women are great initiators and fierce fighters, especially when it comes to protecting our own and fighting for justice (Cameron 1994; Felton 1989; Mallett 2001). As a result of the work of female Tasmanian Aboriginal academics (Cameron 1994; Cameron & Miller 2016; Mallett 2001; *tebrakunna* country & Lee 2017, 2019) we are changing the ways in which we are known. Through sharing our culture and our ways, we are claiming a space for Aboriginal voices that previously did not exist. Within this space we can develop our own methodologies and interrogate our contested knowledges, bringing our women and our knowledges back to a place that reflects and respects the matriarchy from whom we descended (Dodson & Cronin 2011; Watson 2017). The story of one *palawa* woman – Dr Mary Maynard Mallett (Aunty Molly) – provides a case study in how our women are using their knowledge and culture to find a form of

epistemic justice. A self-described “spoke in the wheel” of colonialism and a strong matriarchal leader for my people, Aunty Molly’s story puts into action the theories discussed in this essay and offers an alternative framework that is uniquely *palawa* and of *trouwunna*.

Aunty Molly

Mary Frances Maynard was born on Cape Barren Island in 1926 to James Henry Paul Maynard, a World War I veteran, and Augusta Lavinia Mansell. She had 11 siblings – with one being Baden, who is my grandfather. Known to everyone on the island as Molly, her childhood was idyllic, surrounded by her family, her people and her culture. She affectionately remembers attending school, caring for her siblings and mutton-birding with the community. As is common in our family, she could be a child, aware of, but not concerned with, politics:

Those years on Cape Barren were wonderful times to look back on. We were free and there was so much love. We grew up without being surrounded by people who treated us as if we were inferior.

Mallett 2001, p. 52

After leaving Cape Barren at the age of 14, and eventually moving to northern Tasmania, Aunty Molly later married, started her own family, and devoted her life to helping Aboriginal youth.

That was something that I knew there was a need for and so I just went ahead and did it. My involvement with children went back to when I started to take “wards of the state children” in. I knew the need was there for these children to be cared for and better themselves.

Mallett 2001, p. 63

After attending the first Aboriginal Child Survival Seminar in 1979, Aunty Molly decided that she would establish an Aboriginal childcare center in Tasmania (Mallett 2001). After sourcing funding and finding a suitable location on King’s Wharf in Hobart, she began preparing the facility. With no money to employ contractors, Aunty Molly rolled-up her sleeves and proceeded to transform the derelict building. She went on to be the inaugural coordinator of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Childcare Centre and donated her salary back to the center to buy food and clothing. Once the center was operational, she became chairperson of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Education Council, a role which she filled for six years.

In 1998, in her role as Elder-in-Residence at the University of Tasmania, Aunty Molly returned to *trouwunna*. In 2000, she received an Honorary Doctorate of Letters from the University of Tasmania. In 2002, she was made a Member of the Order of Australia for her service to the Aboriginal community. She later published a book about her early life on Cape Barren Island titled *My Past – Their Future: Stories from Cape Barren Island*.

My Past – Their Future

Can't people see that the written history is not true? So many reports have been written about Cape Barren Island people. . . . Who starts this history? So much of it is malicious gossip. You've got to see and hear before you can repeat anything about us. I think we have enough educated Tasmanian Aboriginal people in today's society to be able to put a spoke in some of the wheels and write the truth about us.

Mallett 2001, p. 46

My Past – Their Future focuses our attention on the 1939 Harvard-Adelaide anthropological expedition to Cape Barren Island (*trouwunna*), one leg of a whirlwind tour of Aboriginal reserves in Australia. The purpose of the expedition was to examine whether race-mixing and hybridity presented a safety risk to the general population of Australia (D'Arcy 2007). To do this, it was necessary to collect data from a "half-caste" population that had existed in relative isolation from outside contamination, and Cape Barren Island was the perfect provider (D'Arcy 2007). At the time, the expedition was described as revolutionary; it is now described as an extreme practice of whiteness, superiority and control (Davis 2009). This criticism is based not only on the actions of the researchers, but on the racist policy of assimilation that underpinned and funded the tours (D'Arcy 2007; Hasluck 1961; Mallett 2001). Eugenics, the belief that more suitable races or strains of blood had a better chance of prevailing over the less suitable, while unconfirmed, was a silent partner within this research project (Anderson 2008; D'Arcy 2007; Davis 2009).

The tour group comprised two white male researchers – Joseph Birdsell and Norman Tindale. Together with their wives, they arrived on the shores of Cape Barren in January of 1939 (D'Arcy 2007; Tindale 1939). Over a period of nine days, the men extracted samples of blood, took measurements of body parts and photographic records (Anderson 2008; Birdsell 1939; Bonwick 1870; D'Arcy 2007; Malcolm 1920; Tindale 1939, 1941). The data were meticulously recorded

and later cataloged as the Tindale Collection, which is held in the South Australian Museum Archives. The collection contains the genealogies of over 50,000 Indigenous People including thousands of photographic portraits (AIATSIS 2018).

In her book, Aunty Molly purposefully omits known facts about the expedition, knowledge that already exists, published by other non-Indigenous researchers. Instead, she includes first-hand recollections of events, anecdotal “non-scientific” data; knowledge that sits in stark contrast to that collected and collated by Tindale and Birdsell. She re-publishes the photographs taken by Tindale, but this time she adds captions and detailed descriptions of each person’s interests, their mannerisms and other intimate knowledge. The knowledge that Aunty Molly shares is personable, her language is colloquial, these purposeful choices being the binary opposite to the way in which Tindale and Birdsell generated and presented knowledge about my people.

Of the collection of samples, Aunty Molly writes:

I can remember as a young teenager getting undressed and standing in line with boys while we were examined by the scientists. I was very embarrassed, we were taught to never expose our bodies to the opposite sex . . . I cried all the time, I wasn't the only one who had their head measured, looked up nose, in ears, structure of cheek bone, hair, fingers, toes recorded.

Mallett 2001, p. 43

In sharing this memory, from the perspective of a young vulnerable Aboriginal woman, she is humanizing the data, at the same time drawing attention to the unethical practice of the researchers and their agenda. This anecdote highlights that whilst she was physically present, through the dehumanizing process of research, her being was erased from the record (Spivak 1988).

Of the purpose of the expedition she writes:

When Norman B. Tindale came to Cape Barren Island in 1939, he was looking for specimens for testing of an Aboriginal-European community. I learnt later that Tindale was looking for the scientific point of view. I did not expect to see such disgusting photographs. Why were we picked? We were human beings just like the rest of the people in the world.

Mallett 2001, p. 43

In this excerpt Aunty Molly writes from the perspective of the “naïve” subject, but at the same time uses pointed language such as “specimen” and “disgusting”

to allude to the more sinister motives of the researchers. Her use of the pronoun “he”, and her refusal to use correct titles, draws attention to gender and the power that is afforded, without question, to white male researchers (Moreton-Robinson 2013; Smith 1999).

The juxtaposition of these anecdotes against the photographic samples taken by Tindale expertly highlights the disconnect between how our people have been known, and who we are. In addition, Aunt Molly reclassifies us from unknown to known. She takes knowledge (photographs) generated by a white male Western researcher and superimposes new knowledge (names and stories). In doing so, she demonstrates that there is more than one way to know our people and that it is possible for Indigenous knowledges to exist alongside Western knowledges. In writing her story, Aunt Molly has interrupted the stagnant representations of our people, animating, naming and humanizing them (Simpson 2014). The expert way in which she weaponizes her knowledge (and words) to draw attention to and diffuse the power structures that enable white male researchers to construct knowledge about our peoples is inspired. In her own words, Aunt Molly has put a spoke in the wheel, stopping the cycle of misrepresentation and misinformation of knowledge about our people:

Previously they were just unknown black faces, no features at all, these wonderful people who were born on Cape Barren and most of them buried on the Island. These old people were our teachers, our Elders . . . I feel that it is important for me to tell this story, and to bring dignity to my people who were treated with such disrespect by this researcher.

Mallett 2001, p. 43

From subject to expert

The title of expert is afforded to those who possess the ability to produce objective and scientifically sound knowledge about a subject (Foucault 1980), and the rules that govern who can generate such knowledge are set by those with power and privilege. Thus, the title of expert seems unattainable by First Nations women, who remain marginalized and silenced by the dominant patriarchal power structures that govern knowledge production (Moreton-Robinson 2011; Spivak 1988). Within this space, our women remain passive subjects, with knowledge created about them, but never by them. This arrangement, though, is dependent on the cooperation of the subject to remain on the periphery – never speaking, thus never being heard. An arrangement that comes unstuck when

our women change the rules, shifting from subalternity to an alternate place where black female voices can be heard, where they can assume the role of knower, rather than the known (Mallett 2001). The knowledge they generate within this space contrasts and, in the case of Auntie Molly, contradicts Western knowledges about them and draws attention to the white patriarchal ways in which it was generated. This, in turn, breaks the rules set by the patriarchy, opening debate around who is the expert and who is the subject.

Dr Mary Francis Mallett was just a girl at the time of the expedition; it was 60 years later that she published a book to rewrite and re-right the injustices inflicted upon her. Her purpose was to name, and make known, the unknown black faces featured in a series of photographs taken by the researchers. Auntie Molly's insertion of new knowledge to accompany the unnamed photographs contributed in part to the seismic readjustment of existing power structures required to transform First Nations Peoples from unknown to known. Through this sharing, Auntie Molly provided not only new knowledge, but also a valuable framework for decolonization: a framework based on sharp tools that are uniquely female and *palawa*.

In subverting the epistemic violence against her, the tactics Auntie Molly uses and shares within her text are not dissimilar to the tactics used by the colonizers when growing their empire. These tactics were based on the superiority of Western knowledges over all others. In this case, the obvious difference being that Auntie Molly's decolonizing tactics privilege female First Nations knowledges. The knowledge Auntie Molly draws upon within her decolonizing framework is sophisticated and robust, inherited and influenced by her relationship to Country and Peoples (Rigney 2001, Moreton-Robinson 2011). This depth of knowledge enables her to challenge the assumption that, as a First Nations woman, she is limited by the conditions of her subalternity (Spivak 1999). Whilst Auntie Molly acknowledges her subalternity within her experiences, she goes further in demonstrating how this can be shaped into a set of tools that can be utilized to dismantle the white patriarchal structures that marginalize and oppress black female knowledges (Moreton-Robinson 2011). Auntie Molly then demonstrates, through her writing, how to enact these frameworks to derive a form of justice, not as a subaltern, but as a powerful First Nations woman in her own right.

The title of her book is a reminder Auntie Molly has afforded me a form of justice that was unknown to her for much of her life. This justice gives me the space, confidence and freedom to continue to speak and push boundaries. I know this justice is conditional, and there will always be tension and struggle in

how I am able to use her story to further our rights while avoiding crossing a line in appropriating her own experiences as my own. But I also know this justice is generational, and it is my cultural obligation to learn from Auntie Molly's story and discover new tools that I can gift to my daughter to continue this decolonizing work and fight for our family's right to belong.

Conclusion

The influence of power on the production and control of knowledges about First Nations Peoples is irrefutable. It has kept our people at the margins of society, limiting our ability to speak and, thus, be heard. For First Nations women, our marginalization is further impacted by the erasure of our beings by a patriarchal belief system that dictates who is best placed to generate knowledge about us. Our experiences as First Nations women living in settler-colonial states has provided us with an objective and intimate understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge. Our knowing, and the collective labor of First Nations women like Smith, Moreton-Robinson and Mallett has provided us with a framework that supports us to challenge the patriarchal structures by allowing us to share our stories and our knowledge in a way that privileges our voices and celebrates us as black women. Thus, we are enabling ourselves to be our own version of a spoke in the wheel of colonialism.

While Smith's decolonizing theory speaks of the power that comes from reclaiming and rewriting our stories, and Moreton-Robinson challenges us on how to dismantle the patriarchal structures that oppress, Dr Mary Francis Mallett – Auntie Molly – has provided me with a specific and familial practical framework that will equip my family's future generations to continue this decolonizing work. Auntie Molly becomes an anchor for many from *lutruwita*, who will grow our rights, while the Harvard expedition is left to float on a historical tide.