Distinguished Professor., and Maggie Walter (. "Review: weaving stories and data to decolonize methodologies." *Indigenous Women's Voices: 20 Years on from Linda Tuhiwai Smith's* . By Linda Tuhiwai Smith. London: Zed Books, 2022. 189–204. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350237506.0009>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 09:41 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.

Review: weaving stories and data to decolonize methodologies

Distinguished Professor Maggie Walter (*palawa*)

This edited collection, developed and written by a global group of all Indigenous female scholars, is a tribute to the ground-breaking work of Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith, especially her radical and formative text, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Each author, through their individual scholarly voice and from different Indigenous worldviews, reflects how their journey through research and academia has been shaped and influenced by Tuhiwai Smith's inspirational work. In doing so, all the essays mirror how *Decolonizing Methodologies* finally broke open the Western paradigm of methodology. This cracking of the status quo demonstrated not only the poverty of what had been the traditional trope of research about Indigenous Peoples, but also what Indigenous research, particularly Indigenous research by Indigenous researchers, could be.

There remains stubborn patches of resistance to the decolonizing and the Indigenizing of methodology. This resistance, however, is largely limited to non-Indigenous researchers whose dominance of the field was challenged by this new way of understanding the research process. Tuhiwai Smith's book forever disrupted the old model by rebutting and refuting the power relationship of the Indigene as the fitting object of the non-Indigenous research gaze. Indigenous researchers, globally, enthusiastically threw off the damaging methodological shackles that constrained how, why and what we could research and how we could be researchers. We also gleefully began to challenge the long pattern of chastisement from grant reviewers, journals editors and institutions that our research and scholarship did not follow the traditional Western models of research about Indigenous Peoples, nor was it as rigorous, robust or valid as that which did. It was and it is.

This edited collection definitely, and defiantly, rejects the Western paradigm of Indigenous research. The result is a divergent, yet coherent, set of scholarly essays that all decolonize methodology but also reflect a wide gamut of Indigenous scholarly views from different Indigenous shores. In this final chapter, it is my role to consider each of these in turn, as well as draw together some thoughts on what they bring collectively to our understanding of the many ways that a decolonizing Indigenous methodological approach adds to the richness of our scholarly understanding of Indigenous lived realities.

This book is also somewhat prescient. As I write this chapter in September 2020, the hashtag *#BecauseofLindaTuhiwaiSmith* is trending globally. Twitter users are being asked to share how the academic work of world-renowned Indigenous educator Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith has impacted them. Within three days the hashtag had been used more than 3800 times and was the number one trending hashtag for a short period during September (Gabel 2020). The hashtag has globally prompted many scholars, not only just Indigenous scholars, to take the time to reflect on how their own scholarship, research and careers had been impacted by the work of Professor Tuhiwai Smith. The resultant tweets reflect both a looking back on the impact Tuhiwai Smith, her scholarship and advocacy have had on individuals, as well as a looking forward on how her work has changed the way in which they live and the work that they do now and into future. They include, from Māori and other Indigenous scholars:

I will be doing some deep reflecting about what kind of legacy I want to leave in my role as Māori public servant, and as mama, for our mokopuna.

She helped me to see that the answers and the future is in our hands. We just need to free our minds from the colonial misinformation and trauma, and look within ourselves, to our culture, to our values, our korero, our waiata! Keir a Tatou!

Wearing Purple in solidarity and memory of the historical sacrifice of Indigenous ancestors.

Referring to Tuhiwai Smith's book, another writes:

This is the key academic textbook I have read since joining (a university) and I regularly return to in my academic work – it has been instrumental in setting me on a journey of self-discovery as a European researcher in Aotearoa.

Even the Royal Society Te Aparangi adds a tweet:

The final 150th Te Takararigi book is Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith's landmark publication *Decolonizing Methodologies*. This revolutionary text continues to resonate powerfully with indigenous scholars and indigenous communities.

It is fitting, before I address my task of reviewing the essays in this collection, to reflect on the impact of Tuhiwai Smith's scholarship on my own journey. I am *palawa*, an Aboriginal woman from *lutruwita*/Tasmania who, like so many Indigenous scholars, came late to academia. Leaving school early meant I had to take the long trail through an undergraduate degree, part-time and by distance, and then to an honor's year – all the while being in paid employment as well as raising small children. I finally started my PhD at the age of 42. I read *Decolonizing Methodologies* soon after I began my first tenured academic position, and like all those writing in this book, it completely changed how I understood Indigenous research, both my own and that of others. All the research and writing I have done over the 20 odd years since has reflected this altered mindset and way of seeing the research world. Until that time, I had not really thought about methodology (as opposed to research method) and, once I did, I could not help but see the research process from this new vantage point. What also became immediately obvious was not just how restricted and restricting the standard trope of Western Indigenous research methodologies were, but of their hegemonic power. This hegemony was maintained, unquestioned, by Western researchers mostly, with the power of the model upheld by a reluctance to discuss or think about methodology at all. I noted, and have been noting since, that most Western researchers never discuss their epistemological or ontological approach to why they are asking the research questions that they are, why they are choosing to research this particular topic, or why they are researching topics in a particular way. Instead the focus is all on the method: why and how they are using qualitative in-depth interviews, for example.

More critically, they *never, never*, discuss their own socio-cultural and racial positioning as it relates to their research, something Indigenous researchers have always done. Indeed, I have observed that even many ally non-Indigenous researchers, even writing in Indigenous focused books, often struggle hugely with the task of including such positioning alongside their Indigenous co-authors. It is not that they do not want to do it, it is just that as a member of the dominant group (within academia and without), despite their commitment to Indigenous rights, they are complete novices in self socio-cultural and racial examination. But imagine how much better all research would be, not just

Indigenous research, if all researchers reflected on their own epistemological and ontological stance as a standard part of their scholarship.

Volume essays

In the following section I overview each of the book's essays. My purpose is not to summarize or repeat what each author has written. Rather, my purpose is to highlight the key decolonizing message of each essay and to demonstrate how they link together and to the decolonizing framework of Tuhiwai Smith's paradigm setting scholarship.

The first Part of the volume, "Country and Connection", begins with Karen Fisher's essay "Decolonizing rivers in Aotearoa New Zealand" (Essay 1) and uses Māori knowledges to decolonize environmental governance. This essay emphasizes the interconnectedness and complexity of natural and social systems, which underpin the centrality of relationality and reciprocity between humans and non-humans in Te Ao Māori, or the Māori worldview. Comparing Indigenous ontology with the nature/culture divide that characterizes Western knowledge systems, the essay highlights the damage wrought through colonization of Māori spaces and places, reshaping the environment to the detriment of all. Focusing on rivers as "sites of ontological inconsistency" (p. 20) the author applies a scholarly lens to the rigidity of the focus on ownership and rights within colonizing settler water management. Bringing her personal experience, as an academic and a member of Ngāti Maniapoto, the author details the long, but Māori knowledge-centered, process of recognition of the Waipā River. "By centering a *taniwha* into all considerations ... and the relationship between Waiwaia, the Waipā and Ngāti Maniapoto, the river became more than a physical object or entity to be carved up into discrete resource units to be managed" (p. 29). As the essay concludes, it is not simply a matter of what is done but how it is done. The benefits of decolonizing river management outweigh the needs of settler institutions, for rivers and for people.

Essay 2 by Jennifer Evans (*Dharug* woman living on, and with connections to, *palawa* country), "Can men weave baskets in Queer country?", explores the decolonization of the concept and reality of Country. Through the related

application of critical and political theory to Country (queer theory, query ecology, eco-feminism and nature conservation), Evans asks: “[i]f country is non-gendered, and has its own agency, what boundaries apply to gendered cultural practices including *nokegerrerr*?” (p. 33). Country, the essay argues, has been gendered through the eyes of the colonizer and the traditional Western androcentric view; however, making space for *palawa* realities allows the possibility that *terri* (baskets) have agency themselves, that they are not empty. Visualizing her methodology as a form of weaving, the author casts the four clubs of theory onto Country, seeing where they fall. Through this decolonizing theoretical act, none is a good fit, but all add something to the puzzle. Country, the essay concludes, is open to possibilities. Country can be queered and it has the agency to invite Queer connections and relations. Rather than arriving at a definitive answer, Country is positioned as allowing our bodies and Dreaming to be sites of social change that disrupt the colonized power systems that dictate cultural practices: a place where men could seek to weave baskets.

In the second Part, “Violence and Safety”, Essay 3, “Black panopticon: who wins with lateral violence?” by Jacinta Vanderfeen (*trawlulwuy*), explores lateral violence, where the phenomenon in need of decolonization is Indigenous identity. Pointing to the co-occurrence of the physical assaults of colonization with the assaults on the minds of the colonized survivors, the essay reminds us that being the object of surveillance across multiple dimensions always results in being subject to multiple oppressions. Drawing on Foucault’s use of Bentham’s term for ideal prison architecture, the panopticon, as a way of illustrating the power relationships implicit in discipline, control and surveillance, the author builds the case for a black panopticon. Using her own people of *lutruwita* Tasmania, and the structural violence of identity politics, as the lived example, she highlights how the black panopticon makes Indigenous Peoples both our own prisoners and our own keepers, reinforcing the structures of colonization. Lateral violence, she argues, is the core means of discipline under the Black panopticon and the perfect tool for keeping *palawa* colonized. Through the Black panopticon, *palawa* control *palawa*, mirroring the same patterns of Indigenous identity denial that were used by the colonizer to declare the *palawa* Peoples extinct in 1876. Decolonizing identity would expose this identity lateral violence, common to many colonized Indigenous Peoples, as a colonizing, not Indigenous, tool of control.

In the same vein, Essay 4, “Blak & Salty: reflections on violence and racism” by Donna Moodie, Kelly Menzel, Liz Cameron and Nikki Moodie, looks at the decolonization of Indigenous spaces in institutions. Reflecting the experience of four Indigenous academic women (a Gomeroi mother and daughter, a Ngadjuri and a Dharug woman) the essay asks first, how can Indigenous women do Indigenous research in the White Australian academy? The second aligned question is how can this work better support the creation of safe cultural spaces in the academy? Citing Tuhiwai Smith’s thoughts on the implications of Indigenous governance of Indigenous education, the authors juxtapose the realities of universities as Indigenous spaces and as on-going sites of settler-colonial racism and violence. The authors note that contestability within Indigenous spaces can extend into lateral violence, whereby internalized racism leads to harmful, undermining practices aimed at some by other group members. Such practices are especially prevalent when Aboriginal people are achieving, rather than being in need of “help”. Set out as the individual experiences of these four academics, the essay positions universities as sites of articulation of Indigenous identities, Indigenous strengthening and the resurgence of Indigenous knowledge. All authors have experienced culturally unsafe practices within universities, being treated differently because of their Aboriginality and having obligations imposed that did not apply to their non-Indigenous colleagues. All have also observed or experienced what they describe as “mobbing” (p. 80), whereby Indigenous staff are exposed to vindictive and disruptive attacks, by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous colleagues. The authors conclude that Indigenous women’s role in universities is to combat racism in all its forms, and to “create spaces and practices in the academy that have a high degree of cultural fidelity” (p. 85).

In the third Part, “Wisdom and Knowledge”, the personal facet of Indigenous scholarship is at the heart of these essays. Decolonizing is a process, not a state, and it is this aspect, the journey of decolonizing the self, that is the topic of Essay 5 by Kelly Ratana. Positioning Indigenous researchers as a bridge between decolonizing theories and decolonizing practice, this role becomes multidimensional. Building the essay across a series of the self as “bridge”, through our approach to our work, through time, that journey (as it is for all Indigenous scholars) is one of intense learnings, but also uncertainties: being “comfortable with being uncomfortable” (p. 92). The essay details the tensions struggled with, “both seen and unseen” (p. 90), between her place in Te Ao Māori and the Western scientific academy. Part of that journey and its

inherent tensions is of being an academic in a system where Indigenous methodologies and the ideas that sit under them are almost entirely absent, yet still understanding and living via our research the validity of Indigenous knowledges. The author also details here the experience of being a decolonizing bridge between accepting and supporting the potential value of Western science to our communities, while keeping in mind that we must always still ask the epistemological questions of “whose science?” and “why this science?”, creating the opportunity for our communities to access “all the available knowledge and tools to achieve their research aspirations” (p. 101).

In Essay 6, “A spoke in the wheel: Ancestral women’s legacies”, by Angela Burt (*palawa*), epistemology is the subject of decolonization. Told through her own history, as a *palawa* woman and framed around the writings of her great aunt, Auntie Molly Mallett, a renowned *palawa* leader and educator, the author argues that the decolonization of epistemological norms requires Indigenous Peoples to be able to tell our own histories and stipulate our own knowledges. For the *palawa*, and many, many other Indigenous Peoples, stories of our colonization provide a fertile topic of scholarship. These histories, most of which only depict Indigenous Peoples as existing through colonization, as though this is the event that defines us, can be empathetic and careful. But they remain, despite such empathy and care, as history from the colonial and colonizer lens, while our stories and knowledges are excluded within them. While our bodies are there, our voices are not. The essay demonstrates via the scholarship and writings of Auntie Molly of her own life story, inclusive of her childhood experience and memories of herself and her community being subjected to personal and invasive research from anthropologists, that telling our history is the only way we can be known: to ourselves and to others. As Auntie Molly wrote, “Can’t people see that the written history is not true . . . I think we have enough educated Tasmanian Aboriginal people . . . to put a spoke in some of the wheels and write the truth about us” (Mallett 2001, p. 46). It falls to all of us to continue Auntie Molly’s legacy, and the legacy of Tuhiwai Smith to continue to disrupt the colonized epistemological trope of what can be known, how it can be known, who is a knower and whose knowledge prevails.

The decolonizing focus of Essay 7 by Lori Campbell, “Indigeneity, Indigenous feminisms and Indigenization”, introduces us to the fourth Part, “De/colonizing Minds”, and refers to the global movement to Indigenize institutions, particularly universities, in Anglo-colonized nation states. Drawing on her experience in the

Canadian nation-state, and her own deep, personal reflection of Indigenization, the name argues that the Indigenous-centered concept of Indigenization has itself now been “stolen, interpreted, translated and repurposed into a colonized idea of what Indigenization should be” (p. 124). This co-option of the term, and concept and discussion of how Indigenous people might successfully navigate this process, are the essay’s focus. Situating herself, first as one of the many First Nations children taken by the state from their parents in the modern era, the author details her initial embrace of feminism and then her rejection of a feminism that “ignored and erased” (p. 125) her Indigeneity. Discovering Indigenous feminisms recovered her engagement, but also led to a broader exploration of allyship, with the work of non-Indigenous feminists in the field. Citing the work of Flowers (2015), the author questions whether many non-Indigenous scholars derive personal benefit from their “witnessing” (p. 127) of Indigenous recountings of colonization’s depredations. Settlers, she argues, do not need to be allies to have good relations with Indigenous women, nor can they claim Indigeneity by association. Using the widely adopted Castellano (2014, n.p.) definition of Indigenization as “that every subject at every level is examined to consider how and to what extent current content and pedagogy reflect the presence of Indigenous peoples and the valid contribution of Indigenous knowledge”, the author explores how the concept is being strategically adopted at Canadian universities. The reality, the essay contends, is that many are happy to promote courses on Indigenous knowledge. But there is far less willingness to position Indigenous knowledges as equal to White knowledge, or to allow Indigeneity within the university outside of the confines of named courses, or to examine universities’ own complicity in colonialism. Returning to her own experience, she relates how she is now constantly bombarded by non-Indigenous center requests to Indigenize, with expectations of something convenient, colonized and quite different from Indigenous understandings of Indigeneity. From this perspective, Indigenization can itself be a weapon of embedding colonization.

Essay 8, from *tebrakunna* country and Emma Lee, “Reclaiming the first person voice”, decolonizes the embedded academic practices of othering through how referents are deployed. Writing from the position of a *trawlwulwuy* woman from Country, the authors address the use of the referent point of “I” and “you” as powerful tools of Western privilege, where Indigenous peoples are permanently positioned, as you, they and them; the perpetual other. This is an even more

fraught positioning where, as in the authors' case, the Peoples being othered have also been deemed "extinct" by colonial powers. In Tasmania, the colonized demand of the other to demonstrate their humanness is always accompanied by the preceding need to prove their very existence. As *tebrakunna* country and Lee write, the very act of "creating a first-person authorship out of non-existence suggests that the impact of 'I' and 'you' referents is vitally important in locating the self and place as a means of decolonization" (p. 150). It also allows the scholarly transition from not existing to being an action-orientated, reciprocal researcher. With Country as a co-author, these connections to Country and belonging from kinship and reciprocity become the scaffolding for decolonizing work. In conclusion, the author argues that a critical decolonizing act of the academy is to redefine how referent points are used when Indigenous authors write with non-Indigenous authors. The simple reversal of who is "I" and who is "you" decolonizes the foundations of collaborative work.

In the final Part, "Seeing Ourselves", Essay 9, "Resist and assert – Indigenous work in GLAM" by Lauren Booker, queries the decolonizing process in galleries, archives, libraries and museums (GLAM). Framed around the exhausting Indigenous labor of "pushing back" against the assumed right of colonial framed institutions to collect, keep and categorize Indigenous knowledges and Peoples, Booker applies the decolonizing lens to institutional processes and practices, illuminating how coloniality is still the underpinning rationale on how and why they collect. Booker draws on her personal experience as an archivist and researcher to documents how these institutions remain both windows into colonial power and simultaneously tools of colonial power. Despite the regular discussion of decolonizing at GLAM seminars and conferences, the essay points to difference between the rhetoric and reality in the sector, where the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander voice is still actively excluded even as these institutions proclaim their decolonizing ambitions. The key question of this essay is how can collecting institutions support a decolonizing agenda? Using Articles, 11, 12 and 31 of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), Booker reasserts Indigenous Peoples' rights to control over access, maintenance and use of materials and knowledges held in GLAM institutions. Decolonizing such institutions will require a radical reimagining of the responsibilities and obligations of institutions to both the Indigenous collections that they hold and to the Peoples to whom those collections belong.

Essay 10 by Pauliina Feodoroff (skolt sámi), “What form can an atonement take?”, takes the concept of decolonization into the actualization space. What is it that decolonization needs to do to be decolonization? A poetic contribution that, after Fisher’s essay, also includes a river, the River Njâuddam, the essay is a chronicle of ecological destruction and the physical and existential threats that the destruction creates. But it also about much more. The story told, with beauty and with depth, is deeply personal as it catalogues the struggle to hold onto our Indigenous identity in the face of colonization and the price of that struggle. It is about denial, about loss, about theft, about forced change, about violence, the common realities of colonized Peoples across the world. The essay also embraces the commonly felt uncertainty as we try to make sense of our ontological position. The term decolonization, the author notes, “has been, rightfully, criticized because it sets the colonization in the middle of our focus” (p. 185). The fundamental but critical truth that the colonizer needs to engage with is that decolonization is not a mindset alone; it needs to be accompanied by action. Just as the damage of colonization is physical as well as psychological, the damage needs to be undone to the land, to the natural systems, to the rivers, to the animals, to the Peoples and to the generations. There can be no decolonization without an atonement.

Decolonizing and Indigenizing data

It is now time for my small contribution. My topic is Indigenous data and how such data sit at the center of the colonization processes and structures, then and now. Indigenous data are information about Indigenous Peoples that relate to or impact Indigenous Peoples’ lives. More broadly, the term “Indigenous data” refers to information or knowledge in any format, inclusive of statistics that are about Indigenous Peoples and that impact Indigenous lives at the collective and/or individual level (Walter et al 2018; Walter & Russo Carroll 2020). Three prominent categories fit within this definition of Indigenous data. These are: data related to Indigenous resources, environments, lands, geological or water information; data about Indigenous Peoples or populations, inclusive of demographic or social data such as legal, health and education; and data from Indigenous Peoples such as traditional knowledge or cultural data, archives, oral literature or community stories.

My quantitative background leads me to concentrate on the second category – data about us – and my scholarship and Indigenous data advocacy work revolves

around these types of data. It is important to note that Tuhiwai Smith's groundbreaking 1999 publication *Decolonizing Methodologies* did not specify a particular research method as synonymous with Indigenous research. However, for a variety of reasons, including the (often valid) suspicion that many Indigenous Peoples have towards statistics, most Indigenous scholarship on decolonizing research has tended to be aligned with qualitative research (see Kovach 2009; Walter & Suina 2019; S. Wilson 2008). In the following section I discuss Indigenous data in terms of both decolonization and Indigenization, different but both critical processes to turning Indigenous data from a tool of the colonizer to a tool for Indigenous Peoples.

Decolonizing Indigenous data

Decolonization of data is the process that needs to be applied to the existing processes and practices of Indigenous data. These data, both now and in the past, have been a primary tool of colonization (Walter & Andersen 2013). Data are political and data are powerful. In Australia, for example, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples were specifically excluded from being counted in the national census by the 1901 Australian Constitution. This exclusion did not, however, stop the counting of Indigenous Peoples in Australia, where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations have been heavily surveilled by the colonial and later nation-state since colonization. Rather, the purpose was to exclude these populations from the numerical portrait of Australia as a country, as if by such exclusion the nation-state could pretend that these populations did not exist; they were part of the unspoken, and unspeakable, past.

With this constitutional clause overturned by referendum in 1967, the inclusion of Indigenous populations in the 1971 Census of Population and Housing made some change. But while this inclusion meant that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People were now visible in population counts, the way we were and are counted reinforced our colonized position (Chesterman & Gallagin 1997). In a pattern that is similar across the Anglo-colonized world, the data that are collected about our populations concentrate, to the virtual exclusion of all other data, on statistical tallies of Indigenous disparity, deprivation, disadvantage, dysfunction and difference: what I have labeled "5 D Data" (Walter 2016, p. 80). Those of us working in this space sometimes joke to ourselves that these counts are only undertaken to check that colonization is still working – still the poorest,

tick; still the sickest, tick; still the least educated, tick; still the most incarcerated, tick.

It is these data that need to be decolonized. The focus needs to be altered so that these data are presented in context. The data need to do more than just (repeatedly) focus on the “what”. Why, for example, are Indigenous Peoples always the sickest, poorest, most incarcerated and least educated? The answer, then and now, is that colonization, as a structure and a process, sits behind these devastating statistical pictures. And if the “why” is never asked in these official statistics, then they will just continue to be part of the colonizing process, positioning Indigenous populations within the nation-state as hopeless, helpless and complicit in their disadvantage and marginalization (Walter & Russo Carroll 2020).

Indigenizing Indigenous data

Decolonizing these data, however, is not enough. The use of data as a tool of colonization has meant that the only data that are produced are based around what the colonizing nation-state wants to know about its Indigenous sub-populations. There is almost no overlap between what the nation-state wants to know and what Indigenous Peoples themselves want and need to know. Indigenous data should reflect Indigenous priorities, values, culture, lifeworlds and diversity. Indigenizing the data, therefore, means collecting Indigenous data that reflect Indigenous lifeworlds. By this, I mean data that allow us to reflect, and measure as needed, the realities of Indigenous Peoples' lives. For example, how do urban communities function? How is the Indigenous lifecourse negotiated within households, communities and the wider nation-state? These and many, many other questions cannot be answered by current data. We also need data that is at the level that our First Nations and communities need. Yet most current Indigenous data is at the national or state level. Such data are unusable by communities and nations. Indigenous defined data priorities and needs are also missing from existing data and the data infrastructure of the nation-state, in Australia at least, seems incapable of understanding Indigenous data needs. This is primarily a function of official statistics agencies being unable to conceptualize Indigenous data outside of the needs of the nation-state. But we need data for our nations also, for First Nation rebuilding and redevelopment (Kukutai & Cormack 2020).

Indigenous data sovereignty

The key to decolonizing and Indigenizing Indigenous data is Indigenous data sovereignty. Indigenous data sovereignty centers on Indigenous collective rights to data about our peoples, territories, lifeways and natural resources and is supported by Indigenous Peoples' inherent rights of self-determination and governance over their communities, Country and resources as described in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (Taylor & Kukutai 2015). The concept is defined as the right of Indigenous Peoples to determine the means of collection, access, analysis, interpretation, management, dissemination and reuse of data pertaining to the Indigenous Peoples from whom it has been derived, or to whom it relates (Kukutai & Taylor 2016; Snipp 2016). Data sovereignty is practiced through Indigenous data governance, which assert Indigenous interests and Indigenous decision-making across the data ecosystem; from data conception to control of access and usage of data. Indigenous decision-making is a prerequisite for both the decolonization and Indigenization of data. As such, I am a founding member of the Australian Maïam nayri Wingara Indigenous Data Sovereignty Collective and also a founding member of the Global Indigenous Data Alliance, a "network of networks" that brings together Indigenous data sovereignty networks from around the globe.

Conclusion

Reading through this collection of essays, the first thing that strikes is the strength of the Indigenous voices in each of the essays and the frequent use of Indigenous scholarship. Strong Indigenous scholarly voices are the essential ingredient in decolonizing research and academia. Critically, the use of this scholarship to support, inspire and evidence the on-going production of more scholarship is a necessary aspect of decolonizing research. Scholarly knowledge is built, one piece of scholarly writing at a time, and we all need to know and cite the literature in our field. Yet, in the field of Indigenous research, especially in my nation-state, Australia, it is still not unusual to read a reference list that does not cite Indigenous scholarly literature at all. I am not sure if this is because many of the non-Indigenous researchers in the field do not understand the ontological frame of their Indigenous colleagues, or if Indigenous scholarship is still viewed as niche – nice to have but a sidebar to the serious work going on in the halls of

the academy. Mostly, it is left up to Indigenous framed books, such as this one, to lead the way in citing our scholars and scholarship.

All essays are also personal journeys. This again is a key aspect of decolonizing. Research and scholarly writing are personal. To pretend otherwise is a colonizing fiction. But it is not work for the faint-hearted. Putting ourselves into our work is dangerous and it takes bravery to reject the comfortable pretense that the scholarship is not shaped, formed and framed by the ontological, axiological and epistemological positioning of the scholar. The personal journey is also a timely reminder that although each Indigenous Peoples have their own story of colonization to tell, colonization is both structure and a process. As per Wolfe (2006), colonization processes, then and now, bring predictable ways of dispossessing and oppressing those whose lands and identity they covet. Each, in its own way, embodies one of the key messages of Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* that, as Indigenous researchers and Indigenous scholars, we will and must always go into spaces and places where we struggle with the near absolute dominance of the Western way of seeing the world, and our Indigenous place within it. We must forge ahead, in our scholarly challenge, in our Indigenous framed approach to research in spite of our fear.

Speaking to this reality, the book also includes a dedication to all Indigenous and First Nations women and their contributions to creating a better, fairer world for our children and communities. There is also a specific acknowledgement to two authors who were unable to participate in the volume. For one author, this was because of pressure to *not* write her essay because of the risk to her career. As the acknowledgement notes, this reinforces the core reality, as faced by Tuhiwai Smith, and the many Indigenous female scholars before and following her work, that to challenge colonial power is dangerous work. The danger can be even more pronounced when we speak from positions of strength, such as from an accomplished academic format, because then we cannot be so easily dismissed as inferior or lacking. When our challenge has a chance of succeeding in changing mindsets and practices we become serious threats and face serious risks. It is up to those of us who are heading towards the end of our careers, who are secure in our employment and our scholarly standing, to take the most risks, to draw the most fire, and in doing so, protect our more vulnerable sisters (as in career and other mainstream opportunities).

This set of essays has traversed a broad terrain around the concept and the practice of decolonizing methodologies. In doing so, many have also outlined key aspects of Indigenizing methodologies. As per my own short contribution, decolonizing and Indigenizing are part of the same methodological spectrum. We cannot Indigenize without decolonizing, and decolonizing on its own is not enough – it requires the careful attention and inclusion of Indigenous scholars.

This volume has done something remarkable in giving back to Indigenous women their rights to research and reclaim their space as a collective and as a restitution towards women's governance and business. These women have made it their task to honor Tuhiwai Smith's body of work that, 20 years ago, set the foundational questions of what is important to Indigenous Peoples in research. For other Indigenous women, this book should provide an avenue of confidence that their stories and scholarship are important and should be published as legitimate research.

For those for whom this volume is their first foray into decolonizing and Indigenizing methodologies, I recommend that you read widely and read specifically the work of Indigenous scholars in the field, established and emerging, to inform new ways of engaging with diverse knowledge. For those who are familiar with the concept and its practical aspects, my advice is the same – continue to dig deep into the literature and find something new in Indigenous concepts or ways of thinking. These essays are as rich in tone as they are in substance, which assists to return to them again and again as multiple understandings are gained from reflecting on their messages. However, there is still a large gap between the articulation of the concepts and their practical implementation into our institutions and social systems. We all have a role to play and this volume will become part of our guidebooks into respectful scholarship with, of, for and from Indigenous Peoples.

Wulika.